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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>WHO</td>
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SUMMARY

This summary highlights major areas of importance in the environmental analysis as required by Section 15123 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines (CEQA Guidelines). This chapter briefly summarizes the Nob Hill Masonic Center Renovation Project at 1111 California Street (referred to in this Environmental Impact Report [EIR] as “the proposed project”) and the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project. It provides a synopsis of the proposed project, a description of the alternatives to the proposed project that are addressed in this EIR, and a summary of environmental issues to be resolved and areas of known controversy.

In addition, the summary table for this EIR (Table S.1, beginning on p. S.4) provides an overview of the following:

- Environmental impacts with the potential to occur as a result of the proposed project;
- The level of significance of the environmental impacts before implementation of any applicable mitigation measures;
- Improvement measures identified to further reduce less-than-significant environmental impacts; and
- The levels of significance for each impact after improvement measures are implemented.

S.1 PROJECT SYNOPSIS

The Nob Hill Masonic Center (hereinafter referred to as Masonic Center or Center) is located at 1111 California Street, at the southwest corner of California and Taylor Streets, in the Nob Hill neighborhood. The project block is bound by California, Taylor, Pine and Jones Streets. The project site is defined as Assessor’s Block 0253, Lot 020 and is located within an RM-4 (Residential-Mixed, High Density) Zoning District, a 65-A Height and Bulk District, and the Nob Hill Special Use District (SUD). The Masonic Center is an assembly and entertainment venue that includes a 3,166-seat Auditorium, conference/exhibition space, a 565-space underground parking garage accessed from California Street, a small loading dock area mid-block on Pine Street, and cultural facilities and offices of the Masons of California. The Masonic Center contains approximately 325,093 square feet of floor area.

The California Masonic Memorial Temple, the project sponsor, proposes to renovate and modernize the existing Auditorium and ground-floor California Room, Exhibition Hall, and catering kitchen. The existing fixed seating area on the main floor of the Auditorium would be removed and replaced with four tiered floor levels to allow for flexible audience and seating configurations on the main floor, ranging from general admission (standing only on the main floor; existing fixed seating in the balcony), to classroom-style, banquet, and cabaret-style
seating. The fixed seating on the second-floor Auditorium balcony would not change. New lighting and sound systems would be installed in the Auditorium and the existing stage would be replaced. The ground-floor California Room would be renovated to create a “VIP Lounge” and pre-concert hospitality area. The Exhibition Hall would be upgraded, including renovations to the existing ceiling. The existing catering kitchen on the ground floor would be renovated and upgraded to a full commercial kitchen. The proposed project renovations would not alter the existing second-floor Henry Wilson Coil Library and Museum of Freemasonry, the third-floor offices of the Masons and their affiliates, or the underground garage. Proposed renovations would not change the Masonic Center’s existing total square footage, total assembly space capacity, building height, facades, or footprint.

With the proposed renovation project, the number of large events (e.g., those for over 250 attendees) would change from an existing annual maximum of 230 events to an estimated annual maximum of 315 events, an increase of about 85 large events per year. The maximum number of event attendees within the Auditorium would increase from 3,166 up to a maximum of 3,300 at a sold-out event with general admission (standing only on the main floor of the Auditorium, fixed seating in the balcony), an increase of 134 attendees per event. The Masonic Center’s existing building capacity of 4,674 persons in its assembly spaces would not change with the proposed renovation project.

The project sponsor seeks a conditional use authorization to change the currently authorized nonconforming assembly and entertainment use to a conditionally permitted “Other Entertainment” use (Planning Code Section 182(b)(1)) and for intensification of a conditional use (Planning Code Section 723.48). Alternately, the project sponsor would request amendments to the Nob Hill Special Use District (Nob Hill SUD) (Section 238 of the San Francisco Planning Code) to authorize the intensification of a large, nonconforming assembly and entertainment use within the Nob Hill SUD. The project sponsor is seeking conditional use authorization for installation of permanent on-site food and beverage service for event patrons only in the Nob Hill SUD under Planning Code Section 238(d).

S.2 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES

The Planning Department prepared an Initial Study (IS) and published a Notice of Preparation of an EIR (NOP) on October 10, 2012, announcing its intent to prepare and distribute an EIR (the NOP/IS is included in Chapter 8, Appendices, as Appendix A). The IS found that the proposed project may have potentially significant impacts related to Land Use and Land Use Planning, Transportation and Circulation, Noise, and Public Services (Police, Fire Protection, and Emergency Services), and these topics are evaluated in this EIR. The IS determined that the
proposed project would have less-than-significant impacts related to the following topics, and these topics are not evaluated further in the EIR:

- Aesthetics
- Population and Housing
- Cultural and Paleontological Resources
- Air Quality
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Wind and Shadow
- Recreation
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Public Services (Schools and Libraries)
- Biological Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral and Energy Resources
- Agricultural and Forest Resources

The NOP/IS determined that the project analyzed in the NOP/IS may result in potentially significant environmental impacts related to the following environmental topics: Land Use and Land Use Planning; Transportation and Circulation; Noise; and Public Services (Police, Fire Protection, and Emergency Services). For the topics evaluated in the EIR, the levels of significance of impacts are identified as no impact or less than significant. There are no significant or significant and unavoidable impacts identified for the proposed project in the EIR. Therefore, there are no mitigation measures identified in the EIR. However, where called for, improvement measures are identified to reduce the effects of impacts that would be less than significant. All impacts of the proposed project and associated improvement measures identified in this EIR are summarized in Table S.1: Summary of Impacts of Proposed Project Identified in the EIR, beginning on p. S.4. These impacts are listed in the same order as they appear in the text of Chapter 4, Environmental Setting and Impacts, of this EIR. This table should not be relied upon for a thorough understanding of the proposed project and its impacts and mitigation needs, but is presented for the reader as an overview of project impacts and improvement measures. Please see the relevant environmental topic sections in Chapter 4 of this EIR for a thorough discussion and analysis of the impacts of the proposed project, and the improvement measures identified to further reduce the less-than-significant impacts identified for the proposed project.
### Table S.1: Summary of Impacts of Proposed Project Identified in the EIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation and Improvement Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance after Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use and Land Use Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU-1: The proposed project would not physically divide an established community.</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU-2: The proposed project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU-3: The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse impact on the existing character of the vicinity.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-LU-1: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative land use impact.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation and Circulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR-1: The proposed project would not cause a substantial increase in traffic that would cause the level of service to decline from LOS D or better to LOS E or F, or from LOS E to F at seven intersections studied in the project vicinity.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR-2: The proposed project would not cause a substantial increase in transit demand that could not be accommodated by adjacent transit capacity; nor would it cause a substantial increase in delays or costs such that significant adverse impacts in transit service levels could occur.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>Improvement Measure I-TR-2a - The project sponsor shall update project websites that provide public transit travel information to include links to transit service providers, such as BART and Muni, and transit trip planning websites, such as 511.org that provide transit system services updates in real time; and.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Level of Significance before Mitigation</td>
<td>Mitigation and Improvement Measures</td>
<td>Level of Significance after Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TR-3:</strong> The proposed project would not result in substantial overcrowding on public sidewalks, nor create potentially hazardous conditions for pedestrians, or otherwise interfere with pedestrian accessibility to the site and adjoining areas.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td><strong>Improvement Measure I-TR-2b</strong> - The project sponsor shall offer incentives for those patrons arriving to the event by public transportation, such as providing a free water or soda.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TR-4:</strong> The proposed project would not create potentially hazardous conditions for bicyclists, or otherwise substantially interfere with bicycle accessibility to the site and adjoining areas.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td><strong>Improvement Measure I-TR-4a</strong> - The project sponsor shall expand project websites that provide transportation information to include bicycle route maps and indicate to patrons and employees ways of access to the site via the California/Taylor (#310) and the Sutter/Post (#16) bicycle routes; and <strong>Improvement Measure I-TR-4b</strong> - The project sponsor shall install signage indicating the location of the bicycle parking spaces at the Masonic Center garage.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TR-5:</strong> The loading demand of the proposed project during the peak hour of loading activities would be accommodated within the proposed on-site loading facilities or within convenient on-street loading zones, and would not create potentially hazardous traffic conditions or significant delays involving traffic, transit, bicycles, or pedestrians.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td><strong>Improvement Measure I-TR-5a</strong> – Except during the one and one-half hour period before and during events, the on-site Masonic Center Production Manager and staff shall direct trucks and performer buses to park as far west as possible within the 185-foot loading zone on California Street as shown in Figure 13 of the TIS to minimize conflicts with the 1177 California Street (Gramercy Tower) driveway and cross traffic onto California Street. <strong>Improvement Measure I-TR-5b</strong> - The project sponsor shall prohibit the use of the California Street entrances and designate the Pine Street loading dock as the sole access for all loading and unloading to the commercial kitchen and for normal building operation supplies.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TR-6:</strong> Construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Level of Significance before Mitigation</td>
<td>Mitigation and Improvement Measures</td>
<td>Level of Significance after Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR-7: Construction-related impacts of the proposed project would not be considered significant.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-TR-1: The proposed project would not contribute considerably to future cumulative traffic increases that would cause levels of service to deteriorate to unacceptable levels at seven intersections.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-TR-2: The proposed project would not contribute considerably to cumulative increases in transit ridership that would cause the levels of service to deteriorate to unacceptable levels.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-TR-3: The construction impacts of the proposed project would not result in a considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact when combined with other nearby proposed projects.</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| NO-1: Construction of the proposed project would not generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the noise ordinance and would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the proposed project. | LS | **Improvement Measure I-NO-1 – Construction Debris Box Delivery, Loading and Removal.**  
The project sponsor shall require the construction contractor to fully incorporate the following requirements into all of the contractor and subcontractor agreement documents to be implemented by the construction contractor:  
- Provide well maintained vehicles to deliver and pick-up debris boxes on-site.  
- Schedule delivery and pick-up of debris boxes during periods of higher ambient noise levels – after 9AM and no later than scheduled construction hours as required by Noise Ordinance.  
- Pick-up of debris boxes is prohibited in the evening hours after 6:00 PM.  
- Train/educate personnel to load debris boxes as quietly as possible. | LS |
### Summary

**Table S.1 (Continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation and Improvement Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance after Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO-2: The proposed project would not expose people or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the Noise Ordinance and would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the proposed project.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td><strong>Improvement Measure I-NO-2a – Appointment of a Noise Control Officer(s).</strong>&lt;br&gt;The project sponsor shall appoint a “Noise Control Officer(s)” to monitor loading/unloading procedures as well as perform crowd control and monitor exterior terraces for excessive noise and compliance with the Conditions of Approval.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO-3: The proposed project would not expose people to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td><strong>Improvement Measure I-NO-3 – Installation of New Sound System.</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Once the preliminary sound system design is completed, an acoustical engineer shall review the preliminary design specifications prior to installation to confirm that noise levels inside the auditorium will remain inaudible at the exterior of the Center and specify any needed modifications to the preliminary design necessary to assure noise is inaudible at the exterior. The project sponsor in consultation with the acoustical engineer shall be responsible for ensuring the sound system installed adheres to the recommendations of the acoustical engineer.&lt;br&gt;• Following installation of the new system, an acoustical engineer shall test the system to determine if any adjustments are necessary to assure noise levels inside the auditorium will remain inaudible at the exterior.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Level of Significance before Mitigation</td>
<td>Mitigation and Improvement Measures</td>
<td>Level of Significance after Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-NO-1:</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to noise impacts related to construction renovation activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-NO-2:</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operation of the proposed project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-NO-3:</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS-1:</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed project would not increase demand for public services to the extent that new facilities would have to be constructed or existing facilities altered in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for police protection services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI = No Impact; LS = Less than Significant; NA = Not Applicable
S.3. SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

ALTERNATIVE A: NO PROJECT

Under Alternative A: No Project, the existing conditions at the Masonic Center site would not change and existing event-operations would remain. The existing Masonic Center in its current condition would be retained, and would not undergo any renovations. The existing Auditorium, including renovations to the main-floor Auditorium and balcony concourses, and second-floor balcony lobby also would not be renovated. Renovations would not occur in the ground-floor California Room and Exhibition Hall. The existing ground-floor catering kitchen would remain and would not be upgraded to a commercial kitchen. During events, there would continue to be up to five portable concession areas during events in the main entrance lobby, concourse area in the main floor Auditorium, and main floor balcony. New sound and lighting systems would not be installed in the Auditorium.

With the No Project Alternative, the existing 12,860 gross sq. ft. of accessible and private outdoor open space would not be used during daytime events for occasional outdoor refreshment and break areas. Existing parking and loading operations would not change.

The No Project Alternative would implement the conditions of approval imposed by the April 2012 Conditional Use authorization (April 2012 CU authorization). The total seated capacity in the Auditorium would remain at 3,166 persons. As required by Condition No. 34 of the April 2012 CU authorization, the annual maximum number of large (over 250 attendees) events would continue to be limited to 54 events, and the maximum number of large non-live events would be limited to 176 events, for a maximum total of 230 large events per year. As under existing conditions, the No Project Alternative would have no limitations on events with 250 or fewer attendees, which would be in addition to large events.

ALTERNATIVE B: NO MAJOR AUDITORIUM RENOVATIONS

Alternative B: No Major Auditorium Renovations would not increase the total number of attendees at large events (over 250 attendees); however, it would increase the maximum number of large events from 230 to 315 per year, as with the proposed project.

Alternative B would not change the existing fixed seating (3,166 total) on the main floor and balcony would not change and existing stage would not be replaced. As under existing conditions, there would continue to be a total of 1,860 fixed seats in the main floor of the Auditorium, and a total of 1,306 fixed seats in the second-floor balcony that would accommodate a total of 3,166 patrons in the Masonic Center Auditorium. Without renovations that would remove the existing stage and install tiered flooring on the main floor of the Auditorium, there
would be no increase of up to 134 attendees during large, sold-out general admissions events in the Auditorium in comparison to the proposed project.

The No Major Auditorium Renovations Alternative would only renovate the ground-floor California Room and Exhibition Hall, upgrade the existing ground-floor catering kitchen to a commercial kitchen, and provide up to three additional portable food and beverage concession areas, for a total of eight depending on the type of event. Occasional outdoor seating for daytime events would be included in this alternative, as with the proposed project. Alternative B would include installation of a new lighting and sound in the Auditorium.

The No Major Auditorium Renovations Alternative would increase the total number of annual events from 230 to 315, as with the proposed project. As with the proposed project, the existing conditions of approval imposed by the April 2012 CU authorization would be required for all events at the Masonic Center.

**ALTERNATIVE C: REDUCED NUMBER OF LIVE ENTERTAINMENT EVENTS AND CONCESSION AREAS**

Alternative C: Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas would have all of the same features of the proposed project, including renovations to the main floor of the Auditorium that would increase attendance from 3,166 by up to 3,300 persons for large events, an increase of up to 134 attendees. In comparison to the proposed project, this alternative would reduce the number of annual large live-entertainment events in the Auditorium and would reduce the number of concession areas during public events from eight concession areas to five concession areas.

In comparison to the proposed project, this alternative would reduce the total number of large live entertainment events (250 attendees or more) per year to from 95 to 79 events per year. The Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas Alternative could increase the total number of annual large events by 69, from 230 to 299 large events. However, of the total 299 annual large (250 attendees or more) events, there would be an annual limit of 79 large live entertainment events, including music concerts, electronic dance music events, community concerts and comedy shows, 16 fewer than with the proposed project. Of the 79 large live entertainment events, this alternative would have an annual maximum limit of 54 large live entertainments events that would be live music and electronic dance music events, such that no more than 79 of the total 299 large events per year would be live entertainment events. Similar to the proposed project, the total number of non-live entertainments per year would increase by 44, from 176 to 220 events per year.

Except for the elimination of three concession areas, the Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas Alternative would have all of the same physical features of the...
proposed project, including renovations to the main floor of the Auditorium. As with the proposed project, a new lighting and sound system would be installed in the Auditorium. The Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas Alternative would renovate the ground-floor California Room and Exhibition Hall and upgrade the existing ground-floor catering kitchen to a commercial kitchen.

As with the proposed project, the existing conditions of approval imposed by the April 2012 CU authorization would be implemented; however, Condition No. 34, which limits large live entertainment events to a total of 54 events per year, would no longer be applicable and would be modified as part of the proposed project approval process.

ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

An EIR is required to identify the environmentally superior alternative that has the fewest significant environmental impacts from among the alternatives evaluated, in addition to Alternative A: No Project. The Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative as it would decrease the frequency of the less-than-significant impacts identified for the proposed project.

S.4 AREAS OF KNOWN CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

The NOP/IS for this project was published on October 10, 2012, announcing the intent to prepare and distribute an EIR. Individuals and agencies that received these notices included owners of properties within 300 feet of the project site and potentially interested parties, including regional and state agencies. Based on the public comments on the NOP/IS, potential areas of controversy that were identified by one resident at Gramercy Towers at 1177 California Street include:

- Traffic impacts during performances at the Masonic Center;
- Noise impacts on adjacent residents related to performer truck loading before and after events at the Masonic Center on California Street; and
- Noise impacts on adjacent residents related to increased vehicular traffic and pedestrian activity on California Street and in the vicinity (e.g., honking horns and loud conversations) before and after events at the Masonic Center on California Street.

As discussed in Chapter 1, Introduction, pp. 1.2-1.4, the San Francisco Superior Court has issued a Statement of Decision and a Writ of Mandate regarding the intensification of a legal nonconforming use. These discretionary approvals are not environmental issues and will be considered by the City decision-makers during their deliberations on the proposed project.
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1. INTRODUCTION

A. PURPOSE OF THIS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared by the San Francisco Planning Department (Planning Department) in the City and County of San Francisco, the Lead Agency for the proposed project, in conformance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq., and California Code of Regulations Title 14, Section 15000 et seq., “CEQA Guidelines”), and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. The lead agency is the public agency that has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project.

The California Masonic Memorial Temple, the project sponsor, proposes to renovate and modernize the Auditorium and the other assembly and entertainment components of the existing Masonic Center at 1111 California Street, at the southwest corner of California and Taylor Streets, in the Nob Hill neighborhood of San Francisco, to allow for flexible audience and seating configurations, upgraded stage, sound and lighting, a commercial kitchen and permanent food and beverage concession areas. With the proposed project, the maximum number of large events (events with more than 250 patrons) at the Center would increase from 230 events per year under existing conditions to 315 events, an increase of 85 events, and the maximum number of attendees at events in the Auditorium would increase from 3,166 to 3,300.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15161, this is a project-level EIR, defined as an EIR that examines the physical environmental impacts of a specific development project. The project sponsor has provided sufficient information about the proposed project for a project-level analysis to be conducted. This EIR assesses potentially significant impacts in the areas of land use and land use planning, transportation and circulation, noise, and public services (police protection, fire protection and emergency services). As defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15382, a “significant effect on the environment” is:

. . . a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. An economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. A social or economic change related to a physical change may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant.

As stated in the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR is an informational document intended to inform public agency decision-makers and the public of the significant environmental effects of a
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...project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project. CEQA provides that public agencies should not approve projects until all feasible means available have been employed to substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects. Before any discretionary project approvals may be granted for the project, the San Francisco Planning Commission (Planning Commission) must certify the EIR as adequate, accurate, and objective. City decision-makers will use the certified EIR, along with other information and public processes, to determine whether to approve, modify, or disapprove the proposed project, and to specify any applicable environmental conditions as part of project approvals.

B. PROJECT HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

The Masonic Center was completed and dedicated for use by the Masons in 1958. At that time the site was zoned as “Commercial,” which permitted use of the facility as a commercial assembly and entertainment venue—a use that has continued since the Center was built. The Masonic Center became a “legal nonconforming use” in the 1960s when the site was rezoned to a residential classification that did not permit entertainment and assembly uses. The Center has not undergone any substantial renovations since it was completed.

In 2008 and 2009, the project sponsor filed environmental evaluation and conditional use applications, respectively, with the San Francisco Planning Department (Planning Department) for the renovation project. On February 18, 2010, the Planning Department issued a determination that the renovation project is categorically exempt from environmental review. On March 4, 2010, the San Francisco Planning Commission (Planning Commission) granted conditional use authorization to (1) change the Masonic Center from a legal nonconforming use to a conditionally permitted “Other Entertainment” use and intensify the uses pursuant to Planning Code Sections 182(b)(1) and 723.48, (2) add permanent food and beverage service pursuant to Section 238(d), and (3) impose conditions of approval on the operation of the Masonic Center.

Four lawsuits challenging these decisions were filed, and the San Francisco Superior Court (Superior Court) issued two decisions in response to these lawsuits. On April 28, 2011, the

---

1 “Feasible” means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time taking into account economic, environmental, social, and technological factors (Public Resources Code Section 21061.1).

2 The Zoning Administrator issued a Letter of Determination in 2009 stating that the Masonic Center was entitled as a commercial assembly and entertainment venue (rather than a private lodge) in 1956 with no operating conditions of approval and is a now legal nonconforming use. The Board of Appeals upheld that determination in 2010, and the Superior Court upheld the Zoning Administrator and Board of Appeals in 2011. San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. 510365.

3 San Francisco Planning Commission Motion No. 18042, adopted March 4, 2010.
Superior Court issued a Statement of Decision and a Writ of Mandate voiding the categorical exemption, which voided the conditional use authorization. As a result of this decision, the City is required to prepare an Initial Study, followed by a Negative Declaration or an EIR, to comply with the requirements of CEQA before the project approvals can be reconsidered.

The Superior Court also issued a Statement of Decision on April 27, 2011 and a Writ of Mandate on June 28, 2011 confirming that the Masonic Center is a legal nonconforming use but determining that the City improperly authorized the intensification of the legal nonconforming use at the Masonic Center in violation of Section 182(b)(1). As a result of this decision, implementation of the renovation project would require a rezoning of the property (i.e., a legislative land use amendment that would allow the legal nonconforming use to be intensified would have to be adopted by the City).

The June 28, 2011 Writ of Mandate has been appealed by the City and the project sponsor (the California Masonic Memorial Temple). If the appeal is successful, then the renovation project would not conflict with Section 182(b)(1), and the implementation of the renovation project could proceed pursuant to Section 182(b)(1), similarly to how it was pursued in 2010. If the appeal is denied and the writ is upheld, then the renovation project would conflict with Section 182(b)(1). A legislative land use amendment would be required to allow the legal nonconforming use at the Masonic Center to be intensified before any approvals for the renovation project could be reconsidered. Such a legislative land use amendment could consist of an amendment to Section 182(b)(1), an amendment to the provisions of the Nob Hill Special Use District (SUD), or the creation of a new SUD that would be applicable to the project site. The exact mechanism for resolving this conflict will be considered by the project sponsor and the Planning Department at a future date, should it become necessary.

Under Planning Code Section 185(b), the legal nonconforming status of a Type I construction building located in a residential zoning district, such as the Masonic Center, expires after 50 years unless the Planning Commission extends the nonconforming status by approving a conditional use authorization. On January 19, 2012, the Planning Commission approved a conditional use authorization to extend the status of the Masonic Center as a nonconforming use for an indefinite period of time without allowing any intensification of the use. On April 3, 2012, this conditional use authorization was upheld by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors with one modification (hereinafter referred to as the April 2012 CU authorization).

The April 2012 CU authorization imposed a maximum limit on the number of large events (250 or more attendees) per year. A maximum of 54 large live entertainment events and 176 non-live entertainment events are currently allowed in the existing Masonic Center, for a total of 230 large events per year. Prior to this approval, no maximum limit on the number of events existed. This maximum limit was based on an analysis of the Masonic Center’s existing use pattern and
established the baseline conditions for analyzing changes to the existing Masonic Center in comparison to the proposed project in this EIR. The April 2012 CU authorization included 35 conditions of approval that restrict the existing total occupancy, number and times of events, and event operations, and impose other requirements concerning food and beverage service, parking, traffic, loading, noise, odors, waste storage and removal, exterior lighting, public safety, emergency access, community outreach, exterior signage, and monitoring and enforcement of these conditions. The Masonic Center has implemented the April 2012 conditions of approval, except for one element of Condition No. 6.4

C. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

The environmental review process includes a number of steps: publication of a Notice of Preparation or a Notice of Preparation / Initial Study (NOP/IS), public scoping, publication of a Draft EIR for public review and comment, preparation and publication of responses to public and agency comments on the Draft EIR, and certification of the Final EIR. The environmental review process is initiated when a project sponsor files an Environmental Evaluation application.

NOTICE OF PREPARATION / INITIAL STUDY

A revised Environmental Evaluation application was submitted to the Planning Department on May 2, 2011. The Planning Department prepared an Initial Study and published a Notice of Preparation of an EIR on October 10, 2012, announcing its intent to prepare and distribute an EIR (the NOP/IS is presented as Appendix A in Chapter 8, Appendices). Publication of the NOP/IS initiated a 30-day public review and comment period that began on October 10, 2012 and ended on November 8, 2012. During the public review and comment period, one comment letter was submitted to the Planning Department by an interested party, a resident at 1177 California Street, Gramercy Towers, adjacent to the Masonic Center. The comment letter on the NOP/IS identified the following topics to be evaluated in the Draft EIR:

- Traffic impacts during performances at the Masonic Center;
- Noise impacts on adjacent residents related to performer truck loading before and after events at the Masonic Auditorium on California Street; and

---

4 Condition No. 6 (refer to Appendix B) requires that the project sponsor allow patrons with pre-paid parking to enter the garage through the Pine Street loading dock prior to events to reduce vehicle queuing on California Street. According to the project sponsor, this element of Condition No. 6 currently is not being implemented under the April 2012 Conditional Use authorization, but would be implemented after proposed project renovations are completed in 2014. The other aspect of Condition No. 6, which allows patrons to exit the garage from the Pine Street loading dock, is currently being implemented.
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- Noise impacts on adjacent residents related to increased vehicular traffic and pedestrian activity on California Street and in the vicinity (e.g., honking horns and loud conversations) before and after events at the Masonic Center on California Street.

These comments are addressed in this EIR in Chapter 4, Environmental Setting and Impacts, in Section 4.C, Traffic and Circulation, and Section 4.D, Noise. No other public agencies or other interested parties submitted comments to the Planning Department during the 30-day public comment period.

Environmental Effects Found to Be Less than Significant in the NOP/IS

The NOP/IS found that the following potential individual and cumulative environmental effects of the project, as analyzed in the NOP/IS, would be less than significant:

- Aesthetics
- Population and Housing
- Cultural and Paleontological Resources
- Air Quality
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Wind and Shadow
- Recreation
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Public Services (Schools and Libraries)
- Biological Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral and Energy Resources
- Agricultural and Forest Resources

Environmental Effects Requiring Further Study in the EIR

The NOP/IS determined that the project analyzed in the NOP/IS may result in potentially significant environmental impacts related to the following environmental topics: Land Use and Land Use Planning; Transportation and Circulation; Noise; and Public Services (Police, Fire Protection, and Emergency Services). These topics are evaluated in the EIR prepared for the proposed project.

DRAFT EIR

This Draft EIR has been prepared in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. It provides an analysis of the project-specific physical environmental impacts of construction and
operation of the proposed project, and the project’s contribution to the environmental impacts from foreseeable cumulative development in the project site vicinity and City as a whole.

Copies of the Draft EIR are available at the Planning Information Counter, San Francisco Planning Department, 1660 Mission Street, 1st Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103. The Draft EIR is also available for viewing or downloading at the Planning Department website, http://tinyurl.com/sfceqadocs, by choosing the link for Negative Declarations and EIRs under “Current Documents for Public Review” and searching for Case File No. 2011.0471E. You may also request that a copy be sent to you by calling (415) 575-9024 or emailing the EIR Coordinator, Brett Bollinger, at brett.bollinger@sfgov.org. All documents referenced in this Draft EIR and the distribution list for the Draft EIR are available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103, as part of Case File No. 2011.0471E.

How to Comment on the Draft EIR

This Draft EIR was published on April 17, 2013. There will be a public hearing before the Planning Commission during the 45-day public review and comment period for this EIR to solicit public comment on the adequacy and accuracy of information presented in this Draft EIR. The public comment period for this EIR is from April 18, 2013 to June 3, 2013. The public hearing on this Draft EIR has been scheduled before the Planning Commission for May 23, 2013 in Room 400, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place beginning at 12:00 PM or later. Please call (415) 558-6422 the week of the hearing for a recorded message giving a more specific time. In addition, members of the public are invited to submit written comments on the adequacy of the document, that is, whether this Draft EIR identifies and analyzes the possible environmental impacts and identifies appropriate mitigation measures. Comments are most helpful when they suggest specific alternatives and/or additional measures that would better mitigate significant environmental effects. CEQA Guidelines Section 15096(d) calls for responsible agencies\(^5\) to provide comments on project activities within the agencies’ areas of expertise or which will be subject to the approval by the agencies and to support comments with either oral or written documentation.

Written comments should be submitted to:

Sarah B. Jones, Acting Environmental Review Officer
Re: Nob Hill Masonic Center Renovation Project Draft EIR
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

\(^5\) CEQA Section 21069 defines a responsible agency as a “public agency, other than the lead agency, which has responsibility for carrying out or approving a project.”
Comments may also be submitted by email to sarah.b.jones@sfgov.org or to brett.bollinger@sfgov.org. Comments must be received by 5:00 PM on June 3, 2013.

**FINAL EIR**

Following the close of the Draft EIR public review and comment period, the Planning Department will prepare and publish a document titled “Responses to Comments,” which will contain a copy of all comments on this Draft EIR and the City’s responses to those comments, along with copies of the letters received and a transcript of the Planning Commission public hearing on the Draft EIR. This Draft EIR, together with the Responses to Comments document, will be considered by the Planning Commission in an advertised public meeting, and then certified as a Final EIR, if deemed adequate.

The Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors will use the information in the Final EIR in their deliberations on whether to approve, modify, or deny the proposed project or aspects of the proposed project. If the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors decide to approve the proposed project, their approval action must include findings that identify significant project-related impacts that would result; discuss mitigation measures or alternatives that have been adopted to reduce significant impacts to less-than-significant levels; determine whether mitigation measures or alternatives are within the jurisdiction of other public agencies; and explain reasons for rejecting mitigation measures or alternatives if any are infeasible for legal, social, economic, technological, or other reasons.

A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) must be adopted by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors as part of the adoption of the CEQA findings and project approvals by those bodies to the extent that mitigation measures are made part of the proposed project. The MMRP identifies the measures included in the proposed project, the entities responsible for carrying out the measures, and the timing of implementation. If significant unavoidable impacts would remain after all feasible mitigation measures are implemented, the approving body, if it elects to approve the proposed project, must adopt a statement of overriding considerations explaining how the benefits of the proposed project would outweigh the significant impacts.

**D. ORGANIZATION OF THIS EIR**

This EIR is organized into eight chapters, including appendices, as described below.

The Summary chapter provides a concise overview of the proposed project and the necessary approvals; the environmental impacts that would result from the proposed project; mitigation measures identified to reduce or eliminate these impacts; and project alternatives.
Chapter 1, Introduction, describes the type, purpose, and function of the EIR; the project history and background; the environmental review process and comments received on the NOP/IS; and the organization of the EIR.

Chapter 2, Project Description, presents details about the proposed project and all required approvals.

Chapter 3, Plans and Policies, describes inconsistencies of the proposed renovation project with applicable State, regional, and local plans and policies.

Chapter 4, Environmental Setting and Impacts, addresses the following topics: Land Use and Land Use Planning, Transportation and Circulation, Noise, and Public Services. Each topic section includes the environmental setting; regulatory framework; approach to analysis, when appropriate; project-specific and cumulative impacts; and mitigation measures and improvement measures, when appropriate.

Chapter 5, Other CEQA Issues, addresses potential growth-inducing impacts of the proposed project and identifies significant effects that cannot be avoided if the proposed project is implemented, as well as significant irreversible impacts of the project, and areas of known controversy and project-related issues that have not been resolved.

Chapter 6, Alternatives, presents and analyzes a range of alternatives to the proposed project. Three alternatives are described and evaluated: Alternative A: No Project Alternative; Alternative B: No Major Auditorium Renovations; and Alternative C: Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas. This chapter identifies the environmentally superior alternative. It also discusses any alternatives considered but rejected, and gives the reasons for rejection.

Chapter 7, Report Preparers, identifies the EIR authors and the agencies, organizations, and individuals who were consulted during preparation of the Draft EIR. In addition, the project sponsor, their attorneys and event operator, and any consultants working on their behalf are listed.

Chapter 8, Appendices, contains Appendix A: Notice of Preparation / Initial Study, and Appendix B: April 2012 Conditions of Approval.
2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Nob Hill Masonic Center (hereinafter referred to as Masonic Center or Center) is located at 1111 California Street, at the southwest corner of California and Taylor Streets, in the Nob Hill neighborhood of San Francisco on Assessor’s Block 0253, Lot 020. The project site has a total area of approximately 1.1 acres, or 49,840 square feet (sq. ft.). The project block is bounded by California, Taylor, Pine and Jones Streets, and is located within an RM-4 (Residential-Mixed, High Density) Zoning District, a 65-A Height and Bulk District, and the Nob Hill Special Use District (SUD). See Figure 2.1: Project Location. The Masonic Center fronts California Street and encompasses approximately 325,093 sq. ft. of floor area. The Center is an assembly and entertainment venue that includes a 3,166-seat Auditorium, conference/exhibition space, a 565-space underground parking garage accessed from California Street, a loading dock accessed from mid-block on Pine Street, and cultural facilities and offices of the Masons of California. The total existing building capacity of the assembly spaces in the building is 4,674 persons.¹

The California Masonic Memorial Temple, the project sponsor, proposes to renovate and modernize the existing Auditorium and ground-floor California Room, Exhibition Hall, and catering kitchen. The existing fixed seating area on the main-floor level of the Auditorium would be removed and replaced with four tiered floor levels to allow for flexible audience and seating configurations, ranging from standing general admission to classroom-style, banquet, and cabaret-style seating. The fixed seating on the second-floor Auditorium balcony would not change. New lighting and sound systems would be installed in the Auditorium and the existing stage would be replaced. As part of the proposed project, the ground-floor California Room would be renovated to create a “VIP Lounge” and pre-concert hospitality area. The Exhibition Hall would be upgraded, including renovations to the existing ceiling. The existing catering kitchen on the ground floor would also be renovated and upgraded to a full commercial kitchen.

The proposed project renovations would not alter the existing second-floor Henry Wilson Coil Library and Museum of Freemasonry, the third-floor offices of the Masons and their affiliates, or the underground parking garage. Proposed renovations would not change the Center’s existing total square footage, total building capacity, building height, facades, or footprint.

¹ Building capacity (as defined for life safety and fire code purposes) is based on the occupancy requirements specified in the 2010 California Building Code, Table 1004.1.1, Chapter 10, Section 1004; prepared by Heller Manus Architects, July 3, 2012.
With the proposed renovation project, the number of large events (more than 250 attendees) would change from an existing annual maximum of 230 events to an estimated 315 annual events, an increase of about 85 large events per year. The maximum number of event attendees within the Auditorium would increase from 3,166 up to a maximum of 3,300 at a sold-out event with general admission (standing only on the main floor of the Auditorium, fixed seating in the balcony), an increase of 134 attendees per event. The Center’s existing building capacity in the assembly spaces of 4,674 persons would not change with the proposed renovation project.

The project sponsor seeks a conditional use authorization to change the currently authorized nonconforming assembly and entertainment use to a conditionally permitted “Other Entertainment” use (Planning Code Section 182(b)(1)) and for intensification of a conditional use (Planning Code Section 723.48). Alternately, the project sponsor would request amendments to the Nob Hill SUD (Section 238 of the San Francisco Planning Code) to authorize the intensification of a large, nonconforming assembly and entertainment use within the Nob Hill SUD.\(^2\) The sponsor also is seeking conditional use authorization for installation of permanent on-site food and beverage service, for event patrons only, in the Nob Hill SUD under Planning Code Section 238(d).\(^3\)

**B. PROJECT SPONSOR’S OBJECTIVES**

The project owner and sponsor of the Nob Hill Masonic Center Renovation Project is the California Masonic Memorial Temple. The project architects are Heller Manus Architects. The overall purpose of the project is to renovate the Masonic Auditorium and its related function space to provide a modern, state-of-the art assembly and entertainment venue on Nob Hill. The project objectives are as follows:

1. To increase the revenue-generating uses and number of events at the Center and the capacity of the Center’s Auditorium in order to increase the income generated by the Center to support the charitable endeavors of the California Masonic Memorial Temple, primarily in support of public education in California.

2. To modernize and renovate the obsolete assembly and entertainment facilities of the 55-year-old Center to allow a flexible range of venue configurations, so that the Auditorium, Exhibition Hall and California Rooms are better able to accommodate the assembly and entertainment venue requirements of a variety of contemporary performers, artists, organizations, institutions, corporations and individuals.

---

\(^2\) Because the Masonic Center is the only large nonconforming assembly and entertainment use in the Nob Hill SUD, such an amendment to the Nob Hill SUD would not authorize any other large assembly and entertainment use in the Special Use District, which encompasses an area of approximately 10 blocks at the crest of Nob Hill, to be intensified with conditional use authorization.

\(^3\) An extension and continuation of the Masonic Center as a legal nonconforming commercial assembly and entertainment use under Section 185(e) of the Planning Code was approved by the Planning Commission on January 19, 2012, and by the Board of Supervisors on April 3, 2012.
3. To provide improved nearby meeting and assembly spaces to support the economic viability of the five nearby Nob Hill hotels.

4. To provide a state-of-the-art venue able to attract and retain a full-time professional management company willing to lease, operate, and promote concerts, ceremonies, assemblies, meetings, exhibitions, and other events at the Center, and professionally manage those events to protect the architectural character of the Center and preserve neighborhood safety, security and convenience.

5. To provide improved food and beverage services to attendees of events, including alcoholic beverages served pursuant to a permanent Type 47 California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control license, by providing on-site food preparation and both permanent and temporary food and beverage concession areas throughout the venue. 4

6. To improve other venue amenities for event attendees, including a VIP lounge in the California Room and enhanced sound and lighting systems in the Auditorium.

C. PROJECT LOCATION

The Masonic Center is located at 1111 California Street between Taylor and Jones Streets in the Nob Hill neighborhood of San Francisco. The project block is bordered by California Street to the north, Pine Street to the south, Taylor Street to the east, and Jones Street to the west. (See Figure 2.1 on p. 2.2.)

The Masonic Center site is irregularly shaped and encompasses all of Lot 20 on Assessor’s Block 0253. The site has a total area of approximately 1.1 acres, or 49,840 sq. ft., including a 25-foot-wide portion fronting on Pine Street that provides access to a loading dock. (See Figure 2.2: Site Plan.)

The Masonic Center is approximately 65 feet in height at the main entrance on California Street. The site slopes upward, a change in elevation of approximately 18 feet, from east to west along California Street with a 5 to 6 percent slope. (See Figure 2.3: Existing East West Section.) On Taylor Street, between California and Pine Streets, the site slopes sharply downward from north to south, dropping about 56 feet over a 275-foot distance, with a slope of around 20 percent. Pine Street slopes upward gradually from east to west.

---

4 California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control, Type 47 License – On Sale General – Eating Place. A Type 47 license permits the sale of beer, wine and distilled spirits for consumption on and off the licensed premise. California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control, Common ABC License Types and their Basic Privileges, ABC-616 (09-11). A Type 47 license requires that the establishment “operate and maintain the licensed premises as a bona fide eating place,” that includes maintaining suitable kitchen facilities, and actual and substantial sales of food for consumption on the premises. The April 2012 CU authorization prohibits food or beverage service off-site or to the general public. Food and beverage service is limited to service to patrons of on-site assembly and entertainment events within the Masonic Center (Condition No. 29. Food and Beverage Service).
FIGURE 2.3: EXISTING EAST WEST SECTION
The site is served by local and regional public transit service. The C California Street cable car line runs east-west along California Street, directly adjacent to the project site, and the PM Powell/Mason and PH Powell/Hyde Street cable car lines run north-south along Powell Street two blocks to the east. The nearest C California Street cable car stop is across the street from the project site at California and Taylor Streets.

The site is served by two Muni bus lines: the 1 California and the 27 Bryant. In the project vicinity, inbound and outbound bus lines operate on separate streets. The 1 California trolley bus line runs eastbound (inbound) on Clay Street and westbound (outbound) on Sacramento Street. The nearest inbound bus stops are located about two blocks north of the Center at Clay and Taylor Streets and Clay and Jones Streets; the nearest outbound bus stops are about one and a half blocks north at Sacramento and Jones Streets and Sacramento Street and Sproule Lane. In the project vicinity, the 27 Bryant motor coach bus line runs northbound (inbound) on Leavenworth Street and southbound (outbound) on Hyde Street. The nearest stops are one and a half blocks west of the project site at California and Leavenworth Streets, and two and a half blocks west of the project site at California and Hyde Streets.

The Embarcadero BART station is located three-quarters of a mile east of the project site and can be accessed from the Masonic Center via the 1 California bus and the C California cable car. The other nearest BART station, the Powell Street station, is located one-half mile south of the site and is accessed via the PM Powell/Mason and PH Powell/Hyde cable car lines and the 27 Bryant bus. The Caltrain terminal, at Fourth and King Streets, is located approximately one and a half miles southeast of the project site and can be accessed via the 27 Bryant bus. The Transbay Temporary Terminal, on the block bounded by Howard, Main, Folsom, and Beale Streets, is located approximately one mile southeast of the project site and can be accessed via the 1 California bus and the C California cable car lines.

The Masonic Center is located within an RM-4 Zoning District and within the Nob Hill SUD, which encompasses all or portions of ten blocks at the top of Nob Hill bounded by Sacramento, Bush, Stockton, and Jones Streets. The Nob Hill SUD (Planning Code Section 238) is a special use district overlay that permits certain commercial uses, such as hotels, restaurants and clubs that would otherwise not be permitted in an RM-4 district. The project site is within a 65-A Height and Bulk District. The Masonic Center is an existing, legal nonconforming use as defined by Section 180(a)(1) of the San Francisco Planning Code. The nonconforming status was

---

5 In the Muni service system, inbound service usually is heading toward downtown San Francisco, and outbound service is usually heading away from downtown.
extended indefinitely by the Planning Commission and affirmed by the Board of Supervisors on April 3, 2012, as permitted by Section 185(e) of the Planning Code.\textsuperscript{6}

**EXISTING MASONIC CENTER**

The proposed project renovations would modernize the existing Auditorium, California Room, Exhibition Hall, and catering kitchen of the existing Masonic Center, which was built in 1958. The project does not involve construction of facilities that would be substantially new or different from the existing uses at the Center. Therefore, potential project effects relate to physical changes to the existing facilities and current operations. The Masonic Center’s existing physical characteristics and existing operations are described below to provide the background context for the impact evaluations presented in Chapter 4, Environmental Setting and Impacts.

The existing Masonic Center, which would be retained in the proposed renovation project, is a four-level, above-grade structure, with a five-level, 565-space underground public parking garage. The Center contains approximately 325,093 gross sq. ft., plus about 12,860 gross sq. ft. of outdoor open-space areas. It is an assembly and entertainment venue that hosts a variety of assembly, live entertainment, and special events, as well as the annual convention of the Masons of California held in the fall of each year. The Center is used for live entertainment, assembly and cultural purposes and contains the offices of the Masons of California.

Architecturally, the Center features a relief on the upper eastern portion of the California Street façade that encases four 12-foot-high architectural elements depicting the four branches of the armed forces, accompanied by 14 marble figures engaged in a tug of war. The Center is also noted for its 38-by-48-foot-high endomosaic\textsuperscript{7} window along the south wall of the entrance lobby that depicts the founders of California Freemasonry.

The main entrance to the Center is on California Street. An open-air “porch” extends along the northwestern frontage of the building that leads to the main entrance lobby on the first floor. Assembly and live entertainment auditorium space, and related support facilities and services occupy the ground floor, first floor and the eastern half of the second floor. The western portion of the second floor and the entire third floor are occupied by the cultural facilities and offices of the Masons of California and their affiliates.

---

\textsuperscript{6} Conditional Use Authorization No. 2011.0471C, Planning Commission Motion No. 18520, as modified by Board of Supervisors Motion No. M12-42 (hereinafter April 2012 CU authorization). A copy of the April 2012 CU authorization is available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2011.047E.

\textsuperscript{7} Endomosaic is a technique invented by artist Emile Norman (1918-2009), who created the endomosaic window at the Masonic Center. The technique incorporates colored crushed glass and other materials such as stones, soil, fabric, and shells suspended between two panes of clear plastic or glass, and then soldered and hung in a window frame.
Existing Assembly and Entertainment Uses

The ground floor contains the 16,480-sq.-ft. Exhibition Hall, the 4,400-sq.-ft. California Room, a 1,700-sq.-ft. catering kitchen, and the main public restrooms for assembly and live entertainments. The Exhibition Hall and California Room are used for exhibitions, corporate events, meetings, banquets, private parties, and special events. Food for events at the Center, such as banquets and private parties, is prepared in the catering kitchen by an outside catering service. The ground-floor level is accessible from the first-floor elevators located at the southeast corner of the entrance lobby, from stairways located at the north and south ends of the main floor Auditorium, and directly from California Street. See Figure 2.4 on p. 2.19.

The first-floor main lobby serves as the entrance to the main level of the Auditorium, and includes a portable food and beverage (concession) area at the southern end of the lobby. The main entrance lobby contains approximately 12,000 sq. ft.

The first and second floors of the Center contain the Masonic Auditorium, a 3,166-seat auditorium and concert hall, with the main seating area and stage on the first floor and balcony seating on the second floor. The Auditorium is used for a variety of assembly events that include lectures, speaker events, corporate meetings, civic events (such as graduations and naturalization ceremonies), and entertainment events such as music concerts, comedy shows, and cultural performances.

The main floor of the Auditorium contains 1,860 fixed seats situated around a platform stage that extends into the audience seating area. Event patrons access the Auditorium through entryways located along the eastern wall of the main lobby, and enter the main-floor seating area of the Auditorium directly from doorways along the Auditorium concourse. The concourse area contains a small food preparation area, two portable food and beverage (concession) areas, a first aid office, and stairways leading to the second-floor balcony level. The backstage area is situated along a hallway east of the stage and main floor of the Auditorium; the backstage area contains several dressing rooms for performers, a lounge, two restrooms, and a tour and a production office.

From the first floor, the second floor is accessible by elevators located at the southeast end of the main lobby, by stairs located at the southwest corner of the entrance lobby, and by stairways located in the Auditorium concourse. Event patrons enter the second-floor balcony seating from a lobby that leads to the balcony concourse, and then through doorways situated along the concourse. The second-floor balcony contains 1,306 fixed seats. Restrooms are located at the northwest end of the balcony concourse. One portable food and beverage concession area is located in the second-floor lobby.
The Auditorium (main floor and balcony), main-floor concourse, balcony concourse, and second-floor lobby total almost 60,000 sq. ft.

**Existing Food and Beverage Concession Operations**

Depending on the type of event and number of attendees, the Masonic Center currently operates with three to five portable food and beverage stations (concession areas): one in the main entrance lobby, one or two in the concourse area in the main floor of the Auditorium, one in the second-floor balcony lobby, and one in the California Room when it is in use. Each concession area operates with multiple “points of sale” (cash registers). These concession areas are operated by an outside catering service and offer beverages, including alcoholic beverages, meals and snacks to event attendees during many, but not all, events. Alcoholic beverage sales are limited to a two-drink maximum, per transaction, and are further limited after the last intermission or one hour prior to the conclusion of live entertainment events. During private events, such as corporate meeting or banquets, alternative food and beverage service strategies, such as waiter service for tables or meal buffets, are sometimes employed. Although the Center has used multiple catering services in the past, it has had only one food and beverage vendor since 2010.

**Existing Uses Associated with the Masons of California**

The western portion of the second floor contains the approximately 800-sq.-ft. Henry Wilson Coil Library and Museum of Freemasonry. The library and museum contain the collections and archives that chronicle the history of the California Freemasonry. The third floor, which totals approximately 9,564 sq. ft., contains the administrative offices of the Masons of California and their affiliated organizations, including the project sponsor, California Masonic Memorial Temple.

**Existing Open Space**

The Masonic Center contains approximately 12,860 gross sq. ft. of publicly accessible and private outdoor open space, comprised of four areas: (1) a publicly accessible entrance porch (portico) at the northwest corner of the site; (2) a lower terrace on California Street along the northeast building face; (3) an upper terrace along the east side of the building facing Taylor Street; and (4) an outdoor patio at the south end of the main-floor entrance lobby behind the endomosaic window (see Figures 2.5 and 2.6 on pp. 2.20-2.21). The publicly accessible open-air entrance portico, which contains approximately 6,000 gross sq. ft., extends from the top of the entrance stairway on California Street to the main entrance lobby and is enclosed above by a roof frame supported by columns. The lower terrace is located at the northeast corner of the main floor.

---

8 April 2012 CU Authorization, Condition No. 30.
9 A portico is a porch with a roof structure supported by columns that leads to the entrance of a building.
above the parking garage entrance on California Street. This private terrace is a designated smoking area, which contains approximately 3,100 gross sq. ft., and is accessible only during events from the interior concourse on the main floor of the Auditorium. The upper terrace facing Taylor Street is accessed from an exterior stairway at the eastern end of the terrace. This private terrace encompasses about 3,400 gross sq. ft. and currently is not used by event attendees. A private outdoor patio, containing about 360 gross sq. ft., is located at the southern end of the main-floor lobby and affords elevated views to the south. The patio is enclosed by glass on its northern side and spans the width of the endomosaic window. Access to the patio is from the first-floor lobby. Due to its small size, this patio is open to patrons on a limited basis only during daytime events.

There are ornamental street trees and shrubbery on the project site along the Center’s California Street frontage. The upper outdoor terrace facing Taylor Street is landscaped with ornamental trees and shrubbery.

**Existing Parking, Loading, and Access**

**Masonic Center Garage Public Parking**

The Masonic Center includes a five-level, approximately 211,750-sq.-ft., 565-space, below-grade public parking garage. The garage has a main entrance/exit on California Street and a secondary exit from the loading dock on Pine Street. To improve garage operations and minimize vehicle queues before events, the main garage entrance on California Street was upgraded in 2010. At that time, a second garage entrance lane was added and the ticket dispenser was relocated to the first level of the garage, allowing up to approximately 18 vehicles to queue off-street before reaching the ticket dispenser.

**Pine Street Loading Dock/Parking Access**

The Center is served by one loading dock at the back of the building adjacent to the fifth level of the parking garage. The approximately 35-foot-long-by-10-foot-wide loading dock, accessed from Pine Street, accommodates small to mid-size trucks, typically up to 30 feet long by 8.5 feet wide in size. The loading dock is used primarily by catering service and delivery companies. The loading area and dock are accessible by a narrow entryway between two multi-family residential buildings. A freight elevator near the northern end of the loading dock extends only to the ground-floor level of the Center, adjacent to the kitchen, and does not access the main (Auditorium) level of the Center (see Figure 2.4 on p. 2.19).

After large events, the loading dock operates with a ramp for vehicles exiting the garage to Pine Street. After events with 1,000 patrons or more, vehicles are permitted to exit from the garage via either the Pine Street loading dock ramp or the ramps to California Street.
Performance Equipment Loading

Because of the dimensions, constrained access, and functional limitations of the Pine Street loading dock and freight elevator, trucks delivering stage equipment, sets, instruments, and other materials being transported to the Auditorium for performances are unloaded and loaded curbside on California Street in an approximately 185-foot-long temporary loading zone. The Center reserves the loading zone through the San Francisco Police Department prior to events that require curb-side loading. As required by the April 2012 CU authorization, once loading activities prior to events are completed, trucks using the temporary loading zone depart, park off-site, and do not return for loading until the performance is almost over. No overnight curb parking of trucks is permitted on California Street.10

Performer Tour Bus Parking

No more than two performer tour buses are allowed to park in the California Street temporary loading zone during the period 1.5 hours before and during some entertainment events so that the remainder of the temporary loading zone (the portion not occupied by performer buses) is available for use by taxis and other vehicles picking up and dropping off passengers and by vehicles queuing to enter the Masonic Center garage.11 Performer buses parked in the loading area have access to electric power provided by the Masonic Center so as to avoid running their engines and/or generators.12 When the California Street loading zone is not reserved by the Center for truck, bus or passenger loading, it is available for residential permit parking.

Disabled Access

Disabled access to the Center is provided from the parking garage elevator, the access ramp west of the main entrance stairway, and elevators into the California Room and the Exhibition Hall. The Auditorium also provides designated seating for event attendees with disabilities.

Number of Events in the Auditorium under Existing Conditions

The Masonic Center currently operates as a nonconforming use as permitted under Planning Code Section 185(e) and as extended by the April 2012 CU authorization approved by the Board of Supervisors.13 (See Section B, Project History and Background in Chapter 1, Introduction, pp. 1.2-1.4, for a detailed discussion of the April 2012 CU authorization.) Prior to April 2012, there were no limitations on the number or type of events permitted at the Center. The April

10 April 2012 CU authorization, Condition No. 10.
11 April 2012 CU authorization, Condition No. 13.
12 April 2012CU authorization, Condition No. 13.
2012 CU authorization imposed a maximum limit of 54 large live entertainment events and 176 large non-live entertainment events per year, for a maximum total of 230 large events per year. Live entertainment as defined in Planning Code Section 790.38 includes dramatic and musical performances (including comedy shows), and/or amplified taped music for dancing on the premises. Non-live entertainment includes all events other than live entertainment, such as meetings, conferences, trade shows, exhibits, and special events such as naturalization ceremonies, graduations, weddings, and banquets. There is no limitation on the number of events at the Center that are attended by 250 or fewer patrons; therefore, events with 250 or fewer attendees are in addition to the maximum annual limits for large events. For purposes of environmental review, the baseline number of events for existing conditions is the maximum total number of large events imposed by the April 2012 CU authorization, a total of 230 large events per year.

During events in the Auditorium, private functions associated with the events, such as VIP hospitality functions with performers or pre-concert receptions, may be held in the California Room or Exhibition Hall. However, for operational reasons, the Masonic Center does not book separate, additional or concurrent events (i.e., exhibitions, trade shows, corporate events, meetings, banquets, and private parties) in the California Room or Exhibition Hall when events are being held in the Auditorium.

Historical Number of Events in the Auditorium

The April 2012 CU authorization considered the historical number of events held in the Masonic Auditorium to determine the number of events that were approved for continuation of the Masonic Center as a nonconforming use.

Between 2002 and 2007, the Masonic Center operated with an average of about 229 total event-days per year. (The 229 historical average number of events closely approximates the 230 events per year approved by the April 2012 CU Authorization.) This period (2002-2007) is the most-recent representative period of operations, because bookings were curtailed in 2008 in anticipation of the proposed interior renovation of the Auditorium and the leasing of the Center to a professional operator (Live Nation). Total attendance during this period varied by event type.

As shown in Table 2.1, on average most of the annual events held at the Center each year were non-live entertainment events (about 76 percent). These events also comprised the highest number of daytime and all-day events held at the Center (63 percent). Live entertainment

---

14 April 2012 CU authorization, Condition No. 34, as modified.
15 A copy of a report prepared by California Masonic Memorial Temple detailing all events held at the Masonic Center during the period of 2002-2007 is available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2011.0471E.
Table 2.1: Average Number of Events by Type and Time of Day (2002-2007)\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>Daytime(^b)</th>
<th>Nighttime(^b)</th>
<th>All Day(^b)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live Entertainment(^c)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Live Entertainment(^d)</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
\(^a\) Total events by type and time of day represent the average of events between 2002 and 2007, which were representative of historic operating levels prior to leasing of the Center by Live Nation and curtailment of event booking in anticipation of construction activities. Since 2008, there have been about 66 events at the Center per year, on average.
\(^b\) Daytime events are defined as events that end before 6:00 PM; nighttime events are defined as events that end after 6:00 PM; and all-day events are defined as events that start before 6:00 PM and end after 6:00 PM.
\(^c\) Live entertainment as defined in Planning Code Section 790.38 includes dramatic and musical performances (including comedy shows), and/or amplified taped music for dancing on the premises.
\(^d\) Non-Live entertainment includes all events other than live entertainment, such as meetings, conferences, trade shows, exhibits, and special events such as naturalization ceremonies, graduations, weddings, and banquets.

Source: California Masonic Memorial Temple; Turnstone Consulting, 2012

comprised about 24 percent of the average total number of events during this period, and the highest percentage of nighttime events (about 67 percent).

As noted above, fewer events have been held at the Center since 2008. Between 2008 and 2011, the average number of events held at the Center each year decreased to about 66. About 19 of these events were live entertainment concerts.

Existing Number of Events and Attendees in the Auditorium

In 2009, the project sponsor retained Live Nation, a professional venue operator and entertainment promoter, to manage, operate, promote, and book all assembly and entertainment events at the Masonic Center. In this capacity, Live Nation is responsible for implementing and overseeing all aspects of event operations.\(^{16}\)

As noted above, the Masonic Center currently operates as a nonconforming use as permitted under Planning Code Section 185(e) and as extended by the April 2012 CU authorization. The April 2012 CU authorization contains conditions of approval for the operation of the Masonic Center, including the maximum number of events with more than 250 persons, as described in the subsection entitled “Number of Events in the Auditorium under Existing Conditions” on pp. 2.12-2.13. The conditions of approval imposed by the April 2012 CU authorization would continue to apply, unless any of them are modified through the approval of the renovation project.

\(^{16}\) The Masons retain the right to book events in the California Room, Henry Wilson Coil Library and Mason’s Museum and/or Exhibit Hall on days for which no events are planned for the first-floor Auditorium.
Under these conditions, the maximum number of attendees allowed in the Auditorium for all events (including live entertainment) is restricted to 3,166 persons. Events are also required to end by 11:00 PM on weeknights (non-holidays, Sunday through Thursday), and by 11:30 PM on weekends (Friday, Saturday, and holidays). The number of events that extend until 1:00 AM on weekends (Friday and Saturday and pre-holiday evenings) is restricted to no more than three events per year subject to prior consultation with and approval by the San Francisco Police Department, the San Francisco Planning Department, and the Entertainment Commission with 30 days’ advance notice.17

Existing Operations Related to Venue and Neighborhood Noise, Security, and Maintenance

Under the April 2012 CU authorization and current Place of Entertainment permit, the Masonic Center currently operates with a number of procedures before, during, and after events to control event-related noise, provide interior and exterior security, and maintain neighborhood safety and cleanliness. To control event-related noise, the Center operates with a queuing plan that limits patron queuing to the main lobby and front entrance porch,18 and all amplified assembly and entertainment functions are restricted to the interior of the building. The April 2012 CU authorization requires the Center to have adequate soundproofing and insulation so that amplified noise associated with assembly and entertainment functions is not audible outside of the Center and to meet the requirements of the San Francisco Noise Control Ordinance (San Francisco Police Code Article 29). Prior to and in compliance with the April 2012 CU authorization, Live Nation developed an Operations Manual in 2011 for the Masonic Center, which describes a security plan that includes measures for security within the venue and in the surrounding neighborhood. The Operations Manual also includes procedures for a post-event trash pick-up program that requires any trash within a two-block radius of the venue to be removed within two hours after each event. To further security, the April 2012 CU authorization also provides that the San Francisco Police Department can cancel an event based on a prior history of safety and security problems associated with a particular performer.19 Live Nation also has a security plan on file with the San Francisco Entertainment Commission included in its Place of Entertainment permit file, as required by the Police Code. Pursuant to that plan, during a typical live entertainment event, Live Nation and Avatar Foods, the Center’s food and beverage vendor, employs approximately 68 on-site security personnel, including ushers/ticket takers, security guards, and identification checkers (for alcoholic beverage service).20

17 April 2012 CU authorization, Condition No. 35.
18 April 2012 CU authorization, Condition No. 28.
19 April 2012 CU authorization, Condition No. 31.
D. PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

The proposed Masonic Center Renovation Project would modernize and upgrade the Masonic Center Auditorium to accommodate flexible audience configurations and food, beverage, and other services for a range of assembly and live entertainment events. Proposed renovations and improvements would occur primarily on the ground level and in the Auditorium, and would include interior demolition/removal; interior construction of walls, flooring, and stage platform; acoustical work; plumbing upgrades/replacements; electrical work; drywall framing; heating and ventilation upgrades/replacement; electrical work; millwork; new doors; ceiling replacement; carpeting; interior painting; and minor repairs in the areas affected by the renovations.

Table 2.2 shows the changes in use and floor area at the Center with the proposed renovations. The proposed renovations would not change the total square footage of the Masonic Center.

The remaining interior portions of the existing Masonic Center would not change with implementation of the renovation project. The Henry Wilson Coil Library and Museum of Freemasonry on the second floor and the third-floor administrative offices of the Masons of California, as well as the first-floor entrance lobby and endomosaic mural would not be altered as part of the proposed project.

PROPOSED GROUND-FLOOR RENOVATIONS

On the ground-floor level, the existing 1,700-sq.-ft. catering kitchen would be upgraded to a commercial kitchen where food would be prepared for food and beverage concession areas and banquet functions. The upgraded kitchen facility would be operated by a single food and beverage concessionaire. The proposed project would also be licensed for on-site sale of alcoholic beverages with food service (Type 47 license). As under current conditions, no outside food service is proposed as part of the project; only event attendees would have access to on-site food and beverage service. There would be no public restaurant or bar serving meals or beverages to persons not attending events at the Center.21

The California Room on the ground-floor level would be renovated to create a “VIP Lounge” and pre-concert hospitality area that would be used during live entertainment events. Renovations would include a new food and beverage area, and new men’s and women’s restrooms that would replace an existing dressing room and lounge area at the southeast corner of the California Room.

21 April 2012 CU authorization, Condition No. 29.
# 2. Project Description

## Table 2.2: Existing and Proposed Uses after Renovation, by Floor Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Uses</th>
<th>Floor Area (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Proposed&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition Hall</td>
<td>Assembly</td>
<td>Assembly</td>
<td>16,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Room</td>
<td>Assembly</td>
<td>Assembly</td>
<td>4,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Catering</td>
<td>Commercial Kitchen</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical/Restrooms</td>
<td>Ancillary</td>
<td>Ancillary</td>
<td>5,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>Ancillary</td>
<td>Ancillary</td>
<td>14,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium</td>
<td>Assembly/Entertainment</td>
<td>Assembly/Entertainment</td>
<td>24,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobby/Circulation</td>
<td>Ancillary</td>
<td>Ancillary</td>
<td>12,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium</td>
<td>Assembly/Entertainment</td>
<td>Assembly/Entertainment</td>
<td>16,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balcony</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum of Freemasonry/Henry Wilson Coil Library</td>
<td>Ancillary</td>
<td>Ancillary</td>
<td>6,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>Ancillary</td>
<td>Ancillary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Offices</td>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>9,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Garage</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>211,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(565 spaces)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Floor Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>325,093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

<sup>a</sup> Proposed changes in uses are shown in **boldface type**. There would be no change in floor area.

**Source:** Heller Manus Architects; Turnstone Consulting, 2012
The California Room would also continue to operate as an event space for smaller receptions and other events. (See Figure 2.4: Ground Floor Renovations.)

The existing ceiling in the Exhibition Hall would be renovated. An existing women’s restroom at the western end of the ground-floor hallway would be renovated. (See Figure 2.4.)

PROPOSED AUDITORIUM RENOVATIONS

The Auditorium, including the balcony, has a total of 3,166 fixed seats. Proposed renovations would remove all of the 1,860 existing fixed seats on the main floor of the Auditorium and replace the main-floor seating area with four tiered floor levels to allow for flexible audience and seating configurations, ranging from general admission (standing only on the main floor, existing fixed seating in the balcony) to classroom-style, banquet, and cabaret-style seating. The existing “thrust” stage\(^{22}\) in the Auditorium would be replaced with a new rectangular stage (approximately 40 feet in width and 32 feet in depth) intended to improve sightlines for live entertainment events. New permanent sound and lighting systems would be installed. Two new portable food and beverage areas would be added in areas north and south of the new stage. Renovations to the main floor of the auditorium would replace an existing men’s room and backstage production spaces with two new unisex restrooms at the southeast end of the backstage hallway, and would renovate an existing restroom at the northeast end of the backstage hallway. The existing second-floor, 1,306-seating in Auditorium balcony would not be altered (the fixed seats would remain) and would be retained for all types of events. A portable food and beverage area would be added at the northern end of the balcony concourse.

The maximum audience capacity of the Auditorium would increase from 3,166 to up to 3,300 patrons, a net increase of 134 patrons per event. (See Figure 2.5: First Floor Renovations – Main Floor Auditorium, and Figure 2.6: Second Floor – Auditorium Balcony.)

PROPOSED FOOD AND BEVERAGE CONCESSION OPERATIONS

Three additional portable food and beverage concession areas are proposed - one in the ground-floor California Room, and two in the main floor of the Auditorium - for a total of up to eight concession areas on the ground floor, main entrance lobby, first-floor Auditorium and concourse, and second-floor balcony lobby and concourse, each with several points of sale (see Figures 2.4, 2.5, and 2.6). The number and locations of the eight total concession areas in use at any time on

\(^{22}\) A thrust stage is a stage that extends into the audience’s portion of a theater or auditorium, and typically has seats facing the stage on three sides.
Fewer portable food and beverage areas may be in use than are shown under both existing and proposed conditions depending on the type of event.
Fewer portable food and beverage areas may be in use than are shown under both existing and proposed conditions depending on the type of event.
the ground floor, main floor Auditorium, and balcony would vary depending on the event and number of attendees. There would be no limit on the number or configuration of concession areas during private events open only to members and invitees of the sponsoring organization, such as corporate meetings and private ceremonies.

**PROPOSED USE OF OUTDOOR OPEN SPACE AREAS**

During daytime events, the existing portico leading to the California Street main entrance, the lower terrace on California Street, and the upper terrace facing Taylor Street would be used on occasion by event attendees. Portable tables and chairs also may be set up in these areas. Alcoholic beverages would not be served or allowed to be consumed in the outdoor areas. However, patrons attending events would be allowed to carry and consume snacks and non-alcoholic beverages purchased at the portable food and beverage areas onto the outdoor terraces. No amplified music, public address systems, or other types of audio equipment would be used in the outdoor areas. Event attendees would not be allowed to use any of the outdoor areas after 7:00 PM, with the exception of the portico (to enter the main lobby) and the lower terrace for smoking during nighttime events.

**PROPOSED PARKING, LOADING AND ACCESS**

**Masonic Center Garage Public Parking**

After implementation of the renovation project, the existing 565-space Masonic Center public parking garage on California Street would continue to operate as described under existing conditions on p. 2.11. During events of 1,000 patrons or more, the garage would continue to operate, as under existing conditions, with two entrance lanes on California Street to minimize vehicle queuing on California Street.

**Pine Street Loading Dock/Parking Access**

With implementation of the proposed project, attendee vehicles with pre-paid parking would be allowed to enter the Masonic Center garage from Pine Street before events of 1,000 patrons or more to reduce vehicle queuing on California Street before events. Vehicles would continue to be allowed to exit the garage via Pine Street after large events, as under existing conditions. The loading dock would continue to be used by small trucks delivering building supplies and for deliveries of food and beverages to the new commercial kitchen.

**Performance Equipment Loading and Performer Tour Bus Parking**

With implementation of the proposed renovation project, performers’ trucks and tour bus operations would continue as under existing conditions. Performers’ trucks would continue to unload and load equipment on the southern side of California Street directly in front of the main
entrance to the Masonic Center before and after events via the ramp west of the main stairs. Once loading activities are completed, trucks using the California Street curb loading zone would depart, park off-site, and not return for loading until the performance is almost over. No overnight curb parking of trucks would be permitted on California Street.23

Performers’ tour buses would also continue to park on the southern side of California Street before and during some live entertainment events, as under existing conditions. During the 1.5-hour period prior to the start of an event, as under existing conditions, no more than two buses would be permitted to park in the temporary curbside area, and any additional buses would be directed to park in other nearby bus parking zones designated by the City. Performer buses parked in the loading area would continue to have access to electric power provided by the Masonic Center so as to avoid running their engines and/or generators.24

Disabled Access

There would be no change to disabled access to the Center with the proposed renovations. Disabled access would continue to be provided from the parking garage elevator, the access ramp west of the main entrance stairway, and elevators into the California Room and the Exhibition Hall. Designated seating for event attendees with disabilities would continue to be provided in the renovated Auditorium.

PROPOSED VENUE AND NEIGHBORHOOD NOISE, SECURITY, AND MAINTENANCE OPERATIONS

As under existing conditions, the proposed project would continue to implement existing measures related to event crowd control, noise, security, and trash pick-up, as described on p. 2.15.

PROPOSED NUMBER OF EVENTS AND ATTENDEES IN THE AUDITORIUM

Number of Attendees

As described in Section B, Project Sponsor’s Objectives, pp. 2.3-2.4, the intent of the proposed renovation project is to make the Masonic Center a more attractive, flexible venue for performers and audience members, meeting planners, event destination companies, and corporations, which, in turn, would enable the Center to attract more live entertainment and other events. Table 2.3 shows the proposed change in event attendees in the Auditorium the main floor and second-floor balcony, in comparison to the number of attendees at existing events in the Auditorium. As shown in Table 2.3, the total estimated number of attendees could increase or decrease from

23 April 2012 CU authorization, Condition No. 10.
24 April 2012 CU authorization, Condition No. 13.
### Table 2.3: Existing and Proposed Number of Attendees per Large Events (More Than 250 Attendees), by Auditorium Configuration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Configuration</th>
<th>No. of Attendees</th>
<th>Total Attendees&lt;sup&gt;a,b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Change from Existing Conditions&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main Floor</td>
<td>Balcony</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attendants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seated Attendees</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>3,166</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium/Balcony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Admission</td>
<td>1,994</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Auditorium Main Floor Standing Only)&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium Style</td>
<td>1,231</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>2,537</td>
<td>-629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Auditorium Main Floor Seated/ Balcony Seated)&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom-Style</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>2,066</td>
<td>-1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Seated Auditorium/ Balcony Seated)&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabaret-Style</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>1,814</td>
<td>-1,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Auditorium Seated/ Balcony Seated Attendees)&lt;sup&gt;g&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

- n/a – not applicable
- <sup>a</sup> The number of attendees is for large events (over 250 attendees). This total does not include stage occupancy of approximately 117 persons under existing conditions, and stage occupancy of 102 persons with proposed renovations.
- <sup>b</sup> No separate events would occur in the ground-floor California Room or Exhibition Hall that are not associated with events taking place in the Auditorium.
- <sup>c</sup> Change in attendees is the difference between the total existing fixed seating attendance in both the main-floor Auditorium and balcony (3,166) and the proposed total number of attendees with each of the proposed seating configurations in the Auditorium.
- <sup>d</sup> General admission with standing audiences on the main-floor Auditorium and fixed seating on the balcony level.
- <sup>e</sup> Non-reserved and/or reserved seating on the main-floor Auditorium and fixed seating on the balcony level.
- <sup>f</sup> Table or desk seating on the main floor Auditorium, and fixed seating on the balcony level.
- <sup>g</sup> Cocktail-style seating with tables and chairs or banquet seating on the main floor of the Auditorium.

**Source:** California Masonic Memorial Temple; Heller Manus Architects; Live Nation, Turnstone Consulting, 2012

Existing conditions depending on the audience and seating configuration. The maximum number of event attendees would increase by 134 persons to 3,300 persons when there is a sold-out general admission event with standing only on the main floor of the Auditorium and fixed seating in the balcony. This represents a 4.2 percent increase over the maximum number of attendees under existing conditions; it is the highest number of attendees that could be accommodated in the Auditorium with the proposed renovation project.

Under the other possible audience and seating configurations in the main floor of the Auditorium, the total number of event attendees that could be accommodated in the Auditorium would be less...
than with the existing fixed seating (3,166 seats) in the Auditorium main floor and balcony. With an auditorium-style event (non-reserved or reserved seating in the Auditorium main floor), attendance would be about 19.9 percent less than under existing conditions. With classroom-style seating (tables or desks suitable for lectures or professional development classes) in the Auditorium main floor, attendance would be about 34.7 percent less than under existing conditions; with cabaret-style or banquet table and chair seating on the Auditorium main floor, attendance would be about 42.7 percent less than under existing conditions.

As under existing conditions, no separate events would occur in the ground-floor California Room or Exhibition Hall when a sold-out or close to sold-out event is taking place in the Auditorium, so that the total number of attendees for events at the Center at any one time does not exceed 3,300; therefore, the number of attendees shown in Table 2.3 is the total number of persons who would occupy the assembly spaces in the Masonic Center at any time.

**Number of Events**

Table 2.4 shows the estimated changes in the number of large events by type with the proposed renovation project. As shown in this table, the number of live entertainment and non-live entertainment events could increase with the proposed renovation project. Large live entertainment events would increase from the existing maximum permitted total of 54 events to an estimated 95 total events per year, an increase of up to about 41 events. The majority of the proposed live entertainment events are anticipated to be nighttime events. Of the proposed 95 live entertainment events, approximately 10 would be daytime events and approximately 85 are projected to be nighttime events. With the proposed project, large non-live entertainment events would also increase in number from the existing maximum permitted total of 176 events to 220 events year per year. Approximately 22 of the total proposed non-live entertainment events are anticipated to be nighttime events; the remaining approximately 198 events are expected to be daytime events, a portion of which could be all-day events that end after 6:00 PM.

Smaller events with 250 or fewer attendees would also continue to be held at the Center and could increase in frequency. Overall, the total number of large events (more than 250 persons) at the Masonic Center would increase to a maximum of 315 events from the existing maximum allowed of 230 events. This would represent an increase of 85 total large events, or a 37 percent increase.

After implementation of the proposed renovation project, the current venue operator (Live Nation) is expected to continue to manage assembly, entertainment, meeting, exhibition and other events at the Masonic Center under its current leasing agreement.
2. Project Description

Table 2.4: Existing and Proposed Number of Live and Non-Live Large Events (More Than 250 Attendees) per Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>Total No. of Large Events per Year</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Proposed&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Net Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Entertainment&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Live Entertainment&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Events</strong></td>
<td><strong>230</strong></td>
<td><strong>315</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- <sup>a</sup> Total annual maximum number of large (more than 250 attendees) allowed to be held at the Masonic Center under Conditional Use Authorization No. 2011.0471C, Planning Commission Motion No. 18520, as modified by the Board of Supervisors, Motion No. M12-051.
- <sup>b</sup> Proposed total maximum number of large events after completion of the proposed renovation project.
- <sup>c</sup> Totals do not equal 100 percent due to rounding.
- <sup>d</sup> Live Entertainment is defined as in Planning Code Section 790.38 to include dramatic and musical performances (including comedy shows), and/or provide amplified taped music for dancing on the premises.
- <sup>e</sup> Non-Live Entertainment includes all events other than live entertainment, such as meetings, conferences, trade shows, and special events such as weddings, banquets and private parties.

Source: California Masonic Memorial Temple; Live Nation; Turnstone Consulting, 2012

RENOVATION SCHEDULE AND COST

The project sponsor estimates that proposed interior construction and renovations to the Masonic Center would take approximately seven months. If approved, proposed renovation of the Masonic Center is anticipated to begin in early 2014.

All renovation activities would occur within the interior of the Masonic Center except for demolition debris removal, and concrete mixing and pouring to install the new stage and tiered flooring in the main floor of the Auditorium. Interior demolition and debris removal would require delivery/pick-up of approximately 20 debris boxes during the first month of project renovations, primarily for removal of the existing flooring, fixed seating and stage in the main floor of the Auditorium. There would also be approximately 10 additional debris boxes delivered/picked up at various times throughout the seven-month renovation period for drywall, flooring, seating and stage removal. Debris boxes would be staged in the 185-foot-long curbside area on the south side of California Street in front of the Masonic Center.

Interior construction of the new stage and tiered flooring in the main floor of the Auditorium would require concrete pouring for a total of five days over a three-month period, including one day in Month 2, three consecutive days in Month 3, and one day in Month 4 of the construction period. On these days, a maximum of eight concrete delivery trucks would use the California Street curbside area to deliver pre-mixed concrete, and one concrete pump truck would be staged...
in the curbside area for the entire day when concrete pouring occurs. No excavation, foundation, or below-grade construction would occur. During the proposed renovations, no events would be held in the Auditorium or the ground-floor California Room and Exhibition Hall.

The estimated cost for renovations is approximately $5.5 million.

E. INTENDED USES OF THE EIR

An EIR is an informational document that is intended to inform the public and the decision-makers of the environmental consequences of a proposed project and to present information measures and feasible alternatives to avoid or reduce the environmental effects of the proposed project. It examines the potential significant physical environmental impacts that could result from the proposed project. This EIR provides the environmental information and evaluation necessary for decision-makers to adopt and implement the proposed Nob Hill Masonic Center Renovation Project. This Draft EIR has been prepared by the City and County of San Francisco, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq. and California Code of Regulations Title 14, Sections 15000 et seq., “CEQA Guidelines”).

This EIR is a project-level EIR. That is, it analyzes implementation of the proposed project at a project-specific level. A project-level EIR is appropriate because the project involves renovations to an individual building. Before any discretionary project approvals may be granted for the project, the San Francisco Planning Commission (Planning Commission) must certify the EIR as adequate, accurate, and objective. This Draft EIR will undergo a public comment period (from April 18, 2013 to June 3, 2013) as noted on the cover of this EIR, during which time the Planning Commission will hold a public hearing on the Draft EIR. Following the close of the public comment period, the San Francisco Planning Department (Planning Department) will prepare and publish a Responses to Comments document, containing all substantive comments received on the Draft EIR and the Planning Department’s responses to those comments. It may also contain specific changes to the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR, together with the Responses to Comments document, including revisions to the Draft EIR, if any, will be considered for certification by the Planning Commission at a public hearing and certified as a Final EIR if deemed adequate, accurate, and objective. As noted, no approvals or permits may be issued prior to certification of the Final EIR.

25 In Month 2 of the construction period, there would be approximately seven concrete truck deliveries on one day; in Month 3, there would be approximately eight deliveries each day for three days; and in Month 4, there would be approximately four deliveries on one day. Daniel O’Hara, Project Manager, Turner Construction, email communication, April 23, 2012. A copy of this email is available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in Case File No. 2011.0471E.
PROJECT APPROVALS

Required approval actions for the proposed renovation project may include, but are not limited to, the following:

City and County of San Francisco

Planning Commission

- Certification of the Environmental Impact Report.
- Conditional use authorization for change of nonconforming assembly and entertainment use to conditionally permit “Other Entertainment” use and intensification of conditional use under Planning Code Sections 182(b)(1)) and 723.48, respectively, and installation of permanent food and beverage service in the Nob Hill SUD under Planning Code Section 238(d)).

Board of Supervisors

- Possible approval of amendments to the Nob Hill SUD (Section 238 of the San Francisco Planning Code) to authorize the intensification of a large nonconforming assembly and entertainment use within the Special Use District.

San Francisco Entertainment Commission

- Approval of an updated Place of Entertainment Permit under Section 1060.12 of the San Francisco Police Code.

San Francisco Police Department

- Approval for the installation and enforcement of temporary signage authorizing loading and passenger drop-off and pick-up on California Street before, during, and after large events; approvals must be obtained prior to each event.

State of California

California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control

- Issuance of a license to permit the on-site sale of alcoholic beverages (Type 47 Liquor License), with supporting food services.

---

26 An extension and continuation of the Masonic Center as a legal nonconforming commercial assembly and entertainment use under Section 185(e) of the Planning Code was approved by the Board of Supervisors on April 3, 2012.

27 This amendment to the Nob Hill SUD would not be necessary if the City and California Masonic Memorial Temple prevail at the Court of Appeal in their appeal of the writ of mandate in Case No. 510365. The Masonic Center is the only large nonconforming assembly and entertainment use in the Nob Hill SUD, such that an amendment to the Nob Hill SUD would not authorize any other use in the Special Use District, which encompasses an area of approximately 10 blocks at the crest of Nob Hill, to be intensified.
In addition to the EIR project approvals listed above, events that extend until 1:00 AM on weekends (Friday and Saturday and pre-holiday evenings) are restricted to no more than three events per year subject to prior discretionary approval by the San Francisco Police Department, San Francisco Planning Department, and the Entertainment Commission with 30 days’ advance notice. \(^{28}\)

\(^{28}\) April 2012 CU authorization, Condition No. 35.
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3. PLANS AND POLICIES

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(d), this chapter discusses potential conflicts between the renovation project and applicable local, regional, State, and Federal plans and policies. Policy conflicts do not, in and of themselves, indicate a significant environmental effect within the meaning of CEQA. To the extent that physical environmental impacts may result from such conflicts, such impacts are analyzed in this EIR in the specific topical sections in Chapter 4, Environmental Setting and Impacts, and in Section E, Evaluation of Environmental Effects, of the Notice of Preparation / Initial Study (NOP/IS) that was published on October 10, 2012 (shown in Chapter 8, Appendix A).

A. CONSISTENCY WITH APPLICABLE PLANS AND POLICIES

The following is a list of applicable adopted plans and policies against which the proposed project was reviewed for inconsistencies:

- San Francisco Planning Code
- *San Francisco General Plan*
- Accountable Planning Initiative (Planning Code Section 101.1)
- *Climate Action Plan for San Francisco: Local Actions to Reduce Greenhouse Emissions*
- San Francisco Transit First Policy (City Charter, Section 8A.115)
- *San Francisco Bicycle Plan*
- *San Francisco Better Streets Plan*
- *San Francisco Sustainability Plan*
- San Francisco Congestion Management Program
- Regional Water Quality Control Board’s *Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay Basin*
- Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s *Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan*
- Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s *Transportation 2035 Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area*
- Association of Bay Area Governments’ *Projections and Priorities 2009*

No conflicts or inconsistencies were identified except for potential inconsistencies with the San Francisco Planning Code, which are discussed below. The compatibility of the proposed project with plans and policies that do not relate to physical environmental issues will be considered by decision-makers in choosing whether to approve, modify, or disapprove the proposed project.
Any potential conflicts identified as part of the approval process would not alter the physical environmental effects of the proposed project.

B. SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING CODE

The Planning Code, which incorporates by reference the City’s Zoning Map, implements the San Francisco General Plan and governs permitted uses, density, and configuration of buildings within the City. Permits to construct new buildings (or to alter or demolish existing ones) may not be issued unless (1) the renovation project complies with the Planning Code, (2) allowable exceptions are granted pursuant to provisions of the Planning Code, or (3) amendments to the Planning Code are included as part of the project.

PLANNING CODE PROVISIONS

The project site is in a Residential, Mixed, High Density (RM-4) District, as shown on Zoning Map ZN01, and the Nob Hill Special Use District (SUD), as shown on Zoning Map SU01.

In 1958, the Masonic Center began operating as a principally permitted use in what was then a commercial zoning district. In 1978, the project site was rezoned to an RM-4 District. Pursuant to Planning Code Section 209.8(c), assembly and entertainment uses are not permitted in an RM-4 District. Pursuant to Section 238(d), the Nob Hill SUD, which was adopted in 1968, allows certain nonresidential uses (hotels, inns or hostels, certain types of private lodges, clubhouses, and recreation facilities that are not operated as for-profit businesses, and certain types of eating and drinking uses) that are not otherwise permitted in an RM-4 District. The Nob Hill SUD does not permit assembly and entertainment uses. Since the Masonic Center predates the adoption of the Nob Hill SUD in 1968 and the RM-4 District rezoning in 1978, the Masonic Center is a legal nonconforming use.

Pursuant to Section 182(b), a legal nonconforming use may be reduced in size, extent, or intensity, or changed to another use that is more widely permitted, subject to the provisions of Section 182(b)(1).

Pursuant to Section 185(b), a legal nonconforming use occupying a building of Type 1 construction (as defined in the San Francisco Building Code) expires 50 years after the completion of said building. As set forth in Section 185(e), a legal nonconforming use may be extended past its expiration date with conditional use authorization from the San Francisco Planning Commission (Planning Commission), provided that there is no enlargement or intensification of the nonconforming use. The Masonic Center was completed over 50 years ago, and on January 19, 2012, the Planning Commission approved a conditional use authorization to extend the status of the Masonic Center as a nonconforming use for an indefinite period of time.
without allowing any intensification of the use. On April 3, 2012, this conditional use authorization was upheld by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors with one modification (hereinafter referred to as the April 2012 CU authorization).

As discussed in Chapter 1, Introduction, pp. 1.2-1.4, the San Francisco Superior Court issued a Statement of Decision and a Writ of Mandate confirming that the Masonic Center is a legal nonconforming use but determined that the City improperly authorized the intensification of the legal nonconforming use at the Masonic Center in violation of Section 182(b)(1). As a result of this decision, implementation of the renovation project would require a rezoning of the property (i.e., a legislative land use amendment that would allow a legal nonconforming use to be intensified would have to be adopted by the City). The Writ of Mandate has been appealed by the City and the project sponsor. Regardless of whether a legislative land use amendment would be required to implement the renovation project, the physical impacts of the renovation project are addressed in Chapter 4, Environmental Setting and Impacts, of this EIR (see Section 4.B, Land Use and Land Use Planning; Section 4.C, Transportation and Circulation; Section 4.D, Noise; and Section 4.E, Public Services).

HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICTS

Pursuant to Section 105 of the Planning Code and as shown on Zoning Map HT01, the project site is in a 65-A Height and Bulk District, which means that building heights are limited to 65 feet. Bulk limits reduce the size of a building’s floorplates as the building increases in height. Pursuant to Section 270(a) of the Planning Code, the bulk limits in the “A” Bulk District become effective above a building height of 40 feet. Above a building height of 40 feet, the plan dimensions are limited to a maximum horizontal dimension of 110 feet and a maximum diagonal dimension of 125 feet.

The existing Masonic Center exceeds the current height and bulk limits. Since the Masonic Center was completed prior to the adoption of the current height and bulk limits, it is a legal noncomplying structure. The renovation project would not increase the height or expand the physical envelope of the existing building. For these reasons, the Masonic Center would continue to be a legal noncomplying structure with respect to the height and bulk limits for the project site.
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4. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND IMPACTS

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter of the EIR addresses the physical environmental effects of the proposed Masonic Center Renovation Project. The Planning Department distributed a Notice of Preparation / Initial Study (NOP/IS) on October 10, 2012, announcing its intent to prepare and distribute an EIR to solicit comments from the public about the scope of this EIR (the NOP/IS is shown in Chapter 8, Appendix A).

The Initial Study determined that project-specific and cumulative impacts in certain topic areas would have no impact or less-than-significant impacts, and therefore would not be evaluated in this EIR. These topics are Aesthetics; Population and Housing; Cultural and Paleontological Resources; Air Quality; Greenhouse Gas Emissions; Wind and Shadow; Recreation; Utilities and Service Systems; Public Services (Schools and Libraries); Biological Resources; Geology and Soils; Hydrology and Water Quality; Hazards and Hazardous Materials; Mineral and Energy Resources; and Agricultural and Forest Resources. Refer to the Initial Study in Appendix A for a discussion of these topics.

The Initial Study determined that the proposed project could result in potentially significant impacts in the following topic areas: Land Use and Land Use Planning; Transportation and Circulation; Noise; and Public Services (Police Protection, Fire Protection and Emergency Services). These topics are evaluated in this EIR.

FORMAT OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

This chapter contains four sections, each addressing a different environmental topic. They are Section 4.B, Land Use and Land Use Planning; Section 4.C, Transportation and Circulation; Section 4.D, Noise; and Section 4.E, Public Services. Each of these sections contains the following subsections: Introduction, Environmental Setting, Regulatory Framework, and Impacts and Mitigation Measures.

The Introduction subsection describes the types of impacts that are analyzed for the topic heading, refers the reader to the pages in the Initial Study that addresses the topic, and states the Initial Study conclusion(s) for the topic.

The Environmental Setting subsection describes the existing conditions in the project site vicinity. For the proposed project, existing conditions are generally defined as the conditions imposed by the April 2012 CU authorization, as described on pp. 1.2-1.4, and that existed at the time that the
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NOP was published. Existing conditions serve as the baseline for the analysis of potential environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed renovation project, presented under the Impacts and Mitigation Measures subsection.

The Regulatory Framework subsection describes federal, state and local regulatory requirements that are directly applicable to the environmental topic.

The Impacts and Mitigation Measures subsection describes the proposed project’s physical environmental impacts for each topic as well as any mitigation measures that could reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. This subsection begins with a listing of the significance thresholds used to assess the severity of the environmental impacts for that particular topic. These thresholds are those listed in the Planning Department’s Initial Study checklist. Certain environmental topic sections include a topic-specific Approach to Analysis, which follows the Significance Thresholds subsection. This explains the parameters, assumptions, and data used in the analysis. (The general approach used to evaluate the environmental impacts of all topics is described under “Approach to Analysis” and “Approach to Cumulative Analysis” on pp. 4.A.3-4.A.4).

Under the Impact Evaluation discussion, the project-level impact analysis for each topic begins with an impact statement that is consistent with significance thresholds identified in the Planning Department’s Initial Study Checklist (Environmental Review Guidelines, October 5, 2012). Some significance thresholds may be combined in a single impact statement, if appropriate. Each impact statement is keyed to a subject area abbreviation (e.g., LU for Land Use) and an impact number (e.g., 1, 2, 3) for a combined alpha-numeric code (e.g., Impact LU-1, Impact LU-2, Impact LU-3). When required, mitigation measures are identified to avoid, eliminate, or reduce significant adverse impacts of the renovation project. Improvement measures are identified to reduce less-than-significant effects of the proposed project. Each mitigation measure corresponds to the impact statement with an “M” in front to signify it is a mitigation measure (e.g., Mitigation Measure M-LU-1 for a mitigation measure that corresponds to Impact LU-1). Improvement measures are also numbered in a similar manner (e.g., I-LU-1). If there is more than one mitigation measure or improvement measure for the same impact statement, the mitigation or improvement measures are numbered with a lowercase letter suffix (e.g., Mitigation Measures M-LU-1a and M-LU-1b and Improvement Measures I-LU-1a and I-LU-1b).

Each impact statement describes the impact that would occur without mitigation. The level of significance of the impact is indicated in parentheses at the end of the impact statement based on the following terms:

- **No Impact** – No adverse changes (or impacts) to the environment are expected.
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- **Less-Than-Significant Impact** – Impact that does not exceed the defined significance criteria or would be eliminated or reduced to a less-than-significant level through compliance with existing local, State, and federal laws and regulations.

- **Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation** – Impact that is reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of the identified mitigation measures.

- **Significant and Unavoidable Impact with Mitigation** – Impact that exceeds the defined significance criteria and can be reduced through compliance with existing local, State, and federal laws and regulations and/or implementation of all feasible mitigation measures, but cannot be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

- **Significant and Unavoidable Impact** – Impact that exceeds the defined significance criteria and cannot be eliminated or reduced to a less-than-significant level through compliance with existing local, State, and federal laws and regulations and for which there are no feasible mitigation measures.

Cumulative impacts of the proposed project are described in a separate subsection following the complete project-level impact analysis for each topic. Cumulative impact statements are numbered consecutively for each impact statement with a combined alpha-numeric code to signify it is a cumulative impact. For example, C-LU-1 refers to the first cumulative impact for Land Use and Land Use Planning.

**APPROACH TO ANALYSIS**

Unlike most projects that are analyzed under CEQA, the Masonic Center Renovation Project does not involve new construction or a change to an existing land use. The proposed project involves renovations to an existing assembly and entertainment use inside the Masonic Center. The proposed renovations would result in an increase in the number of attendees and, due to modernization and upgrades, the Masonic Center would attract and increase the number and frequency of events in the Auditorium, and increase the number of concession areas. To evaluate these project impacts, each environmental topic in Chapter 4 of the EIR addresses impacts related to (1) the maximum increase of up to 134 additional attendees, from 3,166 to 3,300 at a sold out, general admission event with standing room, in the Auditorium; and (2) the maximum increase of up to 85 large events per year (more than 250 attendees) that would increase the frequency of events at the Masonic Center. The combined effects of both types of impacts are also analyzed for each environmental topic, under the discussion of each impact statement, as appropriate.
Large live-entertainment events are evaluated in this EIR because the potential effects of non-live entertainment events (e.g., weddings, meetings, conferences) would be similar to, or less than, impacts related to live entertainment events. Small events (250 or fewer attendees) are considered, but not evaluated separately, under each environmental topic because there would be no change in the maximum number of small events allowed per year. Under existing conditions, there are an unlimited number of small events per year. With implementation of the proposed project, there would continue to be an unlimited number of small events per year. The physical environmental effects caused by small events after implementation of the proposed project would not be measurably different from the physical environmental effects caused by small events under existing conditions.

**APPROACH TO CUMULATIVE ANALYSIS**

Cumulative impacts from the proposed project are analyzed for each environmental topic. In accordance with CEQA, cumulative impacts may be analyzed by applying a list-based approach (a list of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, including projects outside the control of the lead agency), a plan-based approach (a summary of projections in an adopted general plan or related planning document), or a reasonable combination of the two. In general, the City and County of San Francisco uses a plan-based approach that relies on local/regional growth projections (i.e., population, jobs, and number and type of residential units). For this EIR, a plan-based approach is generally used, because there are no other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects major development projects in the project vicinity (defined as a one-quarter-mile radius) that, when combined with the proposed project, could create cumulatively considerable effects. Refer also to the cumulative impacts discussion in Section 4.B, Land Use and Land Use Planning, on pp.4.B.11-4.B.13.

---

1 CEQA Guidelines, Section 15130(b)(1).
B. LAND USE AND LAND USE PLANNING

INTRODUCTION

The Initial Study determined that the proposed project would have a potentially significant impact on Land Use and Land Use Planning (see Chapter 8, Appendix A, pp. 34-37). This section examines the effects of the proposed project related to land use and land use planning, discusses the effects on existing land use that would occur if the proposed project were implemented, and discusses the cumulative land use effects of the proposed project and other proposed, planned or reasonably foreseeable development projects.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

LAND USES ON THE PROJECT SITE

The project site, on Assessor’s Block 0253, Lot 020, is in San Francisco’s Nob Hill neighborhood. The project site is occupied by the Nob Hill Masonic Center (Masonic Center or Center), a four-level assembly and entertainment venue that was completed in 1958. The Masonic Center includes a 3,166-seat Auditorium, conference/exhibition space, a 565-space underground public parking garage accessed from California Street, a small loading dock area mid-block on Pine Street, and cultural facilities and offices of the Masons of California.

LAND USES IN THE PROJECT VICINITY

The Masonic Center is located near the top of Nob Hill, a densely built mixed use area in the northeast section of the City. The Chinatown neighborhood is located to the east, the Russian Hill neighborhood is to the north, and the Downtown/Civic Center neighborhood, which includes the Tenderloin and the downtown shopping district (Union Square), is to the south.

Within the project block (Assessor’s Block 0253), the 16-story Gramercy Towers (1177 California Street) is immediately to the west of the Masonic Center, and the 4-story Nob Hill Inn and three residential apartment buildings ranging from 3 to 14 stories in height are immediately to the south on Pine Street.

Surrounding the Masonic Center are primarily mid- and high-rise residential buildings, tourist hotels with public assembly space, civic/institutional buildings, and public open space uses. Grace Cathedral, the Episcopal Cathedral of the Diocese of California, which is a City landmark, and its affiliated school, Cathedral School for Boys, as well as the Grace Cathedral public garage, are located on the block directly north of the Masonic Center.
Several residential apartment, condominium, and cooperative buildings ranging from 3 to 16 stories are west and south of the project block. The 16-story 1201 California Street Cooperative Apartments and 7-story Maria Victoria’s Apartments (1233 California Street) are west of the project block, across Jones Street. The 27-story 1200 California Street cooperative apartment building is located diagonally opposite the Gramercy Towers to the northwest, at California and Jones Streets. Two apartment buildings abut the Pine Street loading dock area: a 3-story building at 1034 Pine Street and a 4-story building at 1042 Pine Street. Other residential apartment buildings, ranging from 4 to 12 stories, interspersed with small, neighborhood-serving retail establishments, are located on Pine Street south of the project block.

Institutional uses within the project vicinity (in addition to Grace Cathedral and its school) include three existing apartment buildings currently leased by the Academy of Art University at 1055 Pine Street, 1080 Bush Street, and 1153 Bush Street and one building at 1069 Pine Street that is used for a gym, student lounge, clubhouse, and office.

Directly to the east across Taylor Street are the 12-story Huntington Hotel, a tourist hotel and City landmark; the Crocker Garage, a privately owned public parking facility; and a seven-story apartment building. Huntington Park, a public park owned and maintained by the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department, is located diagonally opposite the project site to the northeast, at California and Taylor Streets. The Pacific Union Club, a City landmark, is directly east of Huntington Park. Four other tourist hotels, two of which are City landmarks, are located within two to four blocks east and northeast of the Masonic Center: the landmark Fairmont Hotel, on Mason Street, between California and Sacramento Streets; the landmark Mark Hopkins Hotel, on the corner of California and Mason Streets; the Renaissance Stanford Court Hotel, at the corner of Mason and Powell Streets; and the Ritz Carlton Hotel, on Stockton Street, between California and Pine Streets.

**EXISTING EVENTS**

The Masonic Center has been an assembly and live-entertainment venue since it was completed in 1958. Existing events include lectures, corporate events, civic events (graduations and naturalization ceremonies), live entertainment (music concerts, comedy shows, and cultural performances), exhibitions, trade shows, meetings, banquets, and private parties. The Masonic Center currently hosts large events (more than 250 attendees) and small events (250 or fewer attendees). As discussed below, under existing conditions, the number of large events is limited to 230 per year, and there is no limit on the number of small events.

As discussed in Chapter 3, Plans and Policies, pp. 3.2-3.3, on January 12, 2012, the Planning Commission granted conditional use authorization to extend the nonconforming status of the
Masonic Center for an indefinite period of time. This conditional use authorization did not allow the nonconforming use to be intensified. In addition, this conditional use authorization included 35 conditions of approval imposing various requirements on the existing operation of the Masonic Center. A complete list of these conditions is presented in Chapter 8, Appendix B. The San Francisco Board of Supervisors considered an appeal of this conditional use authorization. One modification was made to the conditions of approval, and the January 12, 2012 conditional use authorization was upheld. (This action, taken on April 3, 2012, is hereinafter referred to in this section as the April 2012 CU authorization.) The April 2012 CU authorization includes measures that specify procedures for nearby property owners and residents to voice and resolve event-related concerns that relate to neighborhood livability and operation requirements to minimize effects on the existing Nob Hill neighborhood. Some of these measures are listed below.

- **Revocation due to Violation of Conditions.** Complaints from interested property owners, residents, or commercial lessees which are not resolved by the Project Sponsor and found to be in violation of the Planning Code and/or the specific conditions of approval for the Project shall be referred to the Commission, after which the Commission may hold a public hearing on the matter to consider revocation of this authorization. (Condition No. 19)

- **Community Liaison.** Prior to issuance of a building permit to construct the project and implement the approved use, the Project Sponsor shall appoint a community liaison officer to deal with the issues of concern to owners and occupants of nearby properties. The Project Sponsor shall provide the Zoning Administrator with written notice of the name, business address, and telephone number of the community liaison. Should the contact information change, the Zoning Administrator shall be made aware of such change. The community liaison shall report to the Zoning Administrator what issues, if any, are of concern to the community and what issues have not been resolved by the Project Sponsor. The community liaison shall make available, upon request, a list of future scheduled events which will be updated on a monthly basis. (Condition No. 23)

- **Entertainment and Assembly.** The entertainment and assembly functions shall be performed within the enclosed building only. (Condition No. 25)

- **Food and Beverage Service.** Food and beverage service is limited to service of patrons of on-site assembly and entertainment events within the Masonic Center. There shall be no operations of a restaurant, either full-service or self-service, open to members of the public who are not patrons of assembly or entertainment uses within the Masonic Center. (Condition No. 29)

---
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- **Occupancy.** No more than 3,282 patrons shall be permitted for events in the auditorium on the main floor level and mezzanine of the Masonic Center. (Condition No. 33)

- **Number of Events.** There shall be an annual maximum of 54 live entertainment events and an annual maximum of 176 events not involving live entertainment held at the Masonic Center. Notwithstanding these limitations, there shall be no limitations on the number of events that are attended by 250 or fewer patrons. (Condition No. 34)

- **Event Hours.** All events shall conclude by 11:00 PM on weeknights (non-holiday Sunday-Thursday evenings) and 11:30 PM on weekends (Friday, Saturday, and holiday evenings). Up to three events per year may extend until 1:00 AM, subject to prior consultation with and approval by the San Francisco Police Department, the San Francisco Planning Department, and the Entertainment Commission a minimum of 30 days prior to the date of such an event. (Condition No. 35)

The Masonic Center currently operates in compliance with the 35 conditions of approval imposed by the April 2012 CU authorization. Although the Center currently complies with the conditions of the April 2012 CU authorization, during events, some residents adjacent to the Masonic Center and nearby residents to the west on California Street and Pine Street may perceive event-related activities to be an annoyance and nuisance, or a detriment to the existing character of the Nob Hill neighborhood. Under existing conditions, such event-related activities include increased pedestrian activity, crowd noise, traffic noise (e.g., honking horns), traffic volumes and attendee drop-off/pick-up activity, ticket scalpers advertising to sell tickets, performer bus parking, and performer equipment unloading/loading in front of the Masonic Center on California Street. (These existing conditions are discussed later in this chapter in the Environmental Setting subsections in Section 4.C, Transportation and Circulation, pp. 4.C.1-4.C.29, and Section 4.D, Noise, pp. 4.D.4-4.D.16.)

Under existing conditions, nearby residents may experience these activities before, during, and after an event, depending on the type of event and event activity. As specified under Condition No. 34, all events are required to end at 11:00 PM on weeknights (non-holiday Sunday-Thursday evenings) and 11:30 PM on weekends (Friday, Saturday, and holiday evenings), except for a few exceptions that require prior consultation with the San Francisco Police Department and Entertainment Commission. On California Street, trucks carrying equipment are required to depart immediately after unloading, and typically require about 1.5 hours to load equipment after an event. No overnight parking of trucks or performer buses is permitted. The flow of event-related cars exiting the garage from the Pine Street loading dock typically stops within one hour after an event.
Simultaneous Events at Other Venues in the Project Vicinity

In addition to the events at the Masonic Center, events are held at a number of other venues within four blocks of the project site. The Fairmont, Mark Hopkins, and Ritz Carlton Hotels host large public assembly events in their ballrooms and meeting rooms, as does Grace Cathedral in its church facilities. Under existing conditions, events at these other venues sometimes occur simultaneously with large events held at the Masonic Center. At such times, activities related to the events, such as increased pedestrian activity, crowd noise, traffic noise (e.g., honking horns), traffic volumes and attendee drop-off/pick-up activity, ticket scalpers advertising to sell tickets, performer bus parking, and performer equipment unloading/loading in front of the Masonic Center on California Street, are heightened and may be more noticeable to residents adjacent to the Masonic Center and to nearby residents to the west on California Street and Pine Street.


EXISTING ZONING DISTRICTS

The project site is in a Residential, Mixed, High Density (RM-4) District, as shown on Zoning Map ZN01, and the Nob Hill Special Use District (SUD), as shown on Zoning Map SU01. RM-4 Districts are devoted almost exclusively to high-density apartment buildings, usually close to downtown. Buildings taller than 40 feet are common, as well as group housing and supporting nonresidential uses.

The blocks immediately north, east, south, and west of the project block are also zoned RM-4. Huntington Park, which is northeast of the project site across the intersection of California and Taylor Streets, is in a Public Use (P) District. Other zoning districts within three blocks of the project site include Residential, Mixed, Moderate Density (RM-3) Districts to the north and east, Residential-Commercial Combined, High Density (RC-4), Downtown Retail (C-3-R), and Downtown General Commercial (C-3-G) Districts to the southeast, RC-4 Districts to the south and southwest, and RM-3 Districts and the Polk Street Neighborhood Commercial District (NCD) to the west and northwest.

The Nob Hill SUD allows certain nonresidential uses (hotels, inns or hostels, certain types of private lodges, clubhouses and recreation facilities that are not operated as for-profit businesses, and certain types of eating and drinking uses) that are not otherwise permitted in an RM-4 District.
EXISTING HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICTS

Pursuant to Planning Code Section 105 and as shown on Zoning Map HT01, the project site is in a 65-A Height and Bulk District, which means that building heights are limited to 65 feet. Bulk limits reduce the size of a building’s floorplates as the building increases in height. Pursuant to Planning Code Section 270(a), the bulk limits in the “A” Bulk District become effective above a building height of 40 feet. Above a building height of 40 feet, the plan dimensions are limited to a maximum horizontal dimension of 110 feet and a maximum diagonal dimension of 125 feet.

The blocks immediately north, east, south, and west of the project block are also in 65-A Height and Bulk Districts. Huntington Park, which is northeast of the project site across the intersection of California and Taylor Streets, is in an Open Space (OS) Height and Bulk District. Pursuant to Planning Code Section 290, the height and bulk of building and structures in OS Height and Bulk Districts shall be determined by the objectives and policies of the San Francisco General Plan. Other height limits within three blocks of the project site include 200-E-2, 300-E-2, and 320-E to the east, 40-X, 80-A, 80-130-F, and 160-F to the southeast, 80-A and 80-130-T to the south and southwest.

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

Chapter 3, Plans and Policies, discusses the land use regulatory framework relevant to the proposed project, including the San Francisco General Plan and the San Francisco Planning Code.

IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS

The thresholds for determining the significance of impacts in this analysis are consistent with the environmental checklist in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, which has been adopted and modified by the San Francisco Planning Department. For the purpose of this analysis, the following applicable thresholds were used to determine whether implementing the project would result in a significant land use impact. Implementation of a proposed project would have a significant effect on land use and land use planning if the project would:

A.1 Physically divide an established community;
A.2 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;
A.3 Have a substantial impact upon the existing character of the vicinity.
IMPACT EVALUATION

Impact LU-1: The proposed project would not physically divide an established community. (No Impact)

The division of an established community would typically involve the construction of a physical barrier to neighborhood access, such as a new freeway, or the removal of a means of access, such as a bridge or a roadway. The renovation project would not construct a physical barrier to neighborhood access or remove an existing means of access; it would renovate portions of the interior of the existing Masonic Center, which would continue to operate as an assembly and entertainment venue. The established community includes a mix of hotel with assembly space, institutional, open space, parking, and residential uses. The renovation project would not result in exterior changes or introduce any land uses, such as industrial uses, that would physically disrupt the community’s established land use patterns. For these reasons, the renovation project would not physically divide an established community. There would be no impact, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Impact LU-2: The proposed project would not 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. (Less than Significant)

A conflict between a project and a land use plan, policy, or regulation is not, in and of itself, a physical environmental impact; it is simply a conflict. However, implementation of a project that conflicts with a land use plan, policy, or regulation may result in physical environmental impacts.

As discussed in Chapter 3, Plans and Policies, the proposed project would not conflict with local or regional plans. The Masonic Center was approved and has been used as an assembly and live entertainment venue since it was completed in 1958, and this use would continue with implementation of the renovation project.

Zoning regulations are adopted for the purposes of controlling development, not specifically to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect. As discussed in Chapter 3, Plans and Policies, pp. 3.2-3.3, the underlying reason that the Masonic Center does not comply with current zoning is because it was built and was an existing use prior to adoption of the Nob Hill SUD in 1968, and rezoning of the site to an RM-4 District in 1978. As such, the existing Masonic Center does not comply with a number of current zoning regulations: the height and bulk limits for the project site, the land use controls for an RM-4 District, and the land use controls for the Nob Hill SUD; however, it is a legal nonconforming use that is allowed to continue on the project site for an indefinite period per the April 2012 CU authorization.
The Superior Court issued a Statement of Decision on April 27, 2011, and a Writ of Mandate on June 28, 2011, confirming that the Masonic Center is a legal nonconforming use but determined that the City improperly authorized the intensification of the legal nonconforming use at the Masonic Center in violation of Section 182(b)(1). The June 28, 2011 Writ of Mandate has been appealed by the City and the project sponsor (the California Masonic Memorial Temple).

If the appeal is successful, then the project sponsor would seek conditional use authorization to change the Masonic Center from a legal nonconforming use to a conditionally permitted “Other Entertainment” use under Planning Code Section 182(b)(1), establish permanent food and beverage service under Planning Code Section 238(d), and intensify the legal nonconforming use at the Masonic Center under Planning Code Section 723.48. If the appeal is denied and the writ is upheld, then the project sponsor would be required to seek a legislative amendment to the Nob Hill SUD to allow the legal nonconforming use at the Masonic Center to be intensified with conditional use authorization. Under this scenario, conditional use authorization would then be required to authorize the proposed intensification and to establish permanent food and beverage service.

As discussed above, as a nonconforming use, the existing Masonic Center does not comply with a number of current zoning regulations because it was built when the site was zoned Commercial, rather than RM-4. Implementation of the renovation project would not eliminate the Masonic Center’s existing noncompliance or nonconformity with these current zoning regulations. Since zoning regulations are adopted for the purposes of regulating the location of various uses, the renovation project would not conflict with any land use plans, policies, or regulations adopted to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect. This impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Impact LU-3: The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse impact on the existing character of the vicinity. (Less than Significant)

The Masonic Center has been approved and used as an assembly and live entertainment venue since it was completed in 1958, and this use would continue with implementation of the renovation project. The exterior of the building, including its square footage, height, façades, and footprint, would not be altered as part of the renovation project. The proposed project would not alter the endomosaic window in the first-floor entrance lobby. As such, the Masonic Center would maintain its current physical appearance and would not alter the physical character of the project site or the project vicinity.

---

3 Statement of Decision Regarding Writ of Mandate, issued April 27, 2011, and Judgment Granting Peremptory Writ of Mandate, issued June 28, 2011, San Francisco Superior Court Case No. 510365. These documents are available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California, as part of Case File No. 2011.0471E.
The renovation project would alter and upgrade the main floor of the Auditorium to accommodate more flexible seating and audience configurations, add permanent food and beverage concession areas, and modernize and upgrade the ground-floor Exhibition Hall, California Room, and kitchen. The renovated Auditorium would continue to be used for assembly events, including lectures, corporate events, civic events (such as graduations and naturalization ceremonies), and live entertainment (such as music concerts, comedy shows, and cultural performances). The Exhibition Hall and California Room would continue to be used for exhibitions, trade shows, meetings, banquets, and private parties. As such, the Masonic Center would maintain its current land use character and would not alter the land use character of the project site or the project vicinity.

The existing catering kitchen on the ground level would be upgraded to a permanent commercial kitchen to allow on-site food preparation by a single operator for concessions, banquets for event attendees, and private parties. The project sponsor is also seeking a permanent license for the on-site sale of alcoholic beverages. These changes in food and beverage service would not change the land use character of the Masonic Center, because similar services are currently provided on-site by caterers using temporary permits. In addition, as under current operating conditions, only event attendees would have access to on-site food and beverage service; there would be no public restaurant or food and/or bar service available to people who are not attending events at the Masonic Center. As such, the Masonic Center would maintain its current character and would not alter the physical land use character of the project site or the project vicinity.

The proposed increase in the number of portable food and beverage concession areas, from five to eight, would increase the potential for the consumption of alcoholic beverages by attendees that could be perceived as annoying or disruptive behavior by nearby residents that that could indirectly affect land use compatibility. These potential physical effects are discussed in Section 4.D Noise and Section 4.E Public Services.

*Increased Number of Attendees*

The proposed renovations to the Auditorium would increase the number of attendees in the Auditorium by up to 134 patrons during a sold-out event, with general admission standing room on the main floor of the Auditorium and fixed seating in the balcony. Furthermore, the maximum increase of 134 patrons would only occur when there is a standing room configuration on the main floor of the Auditorium. With the proposed project, all other types of events and Auditorium configurations would have about 20 to 43 percent fewer total attendees than under existing conditions. Refer to Table 2.3, on p. 2.24.

The increase of up to a maximum of 134 additional attendees at events in the Auditorium would not alter the physical character of the project site or vicinity because this increase represents
about a 4.2 percent increase over existing attendance in the Auditorium, would occur only during sold-out general admission events, and would not result in indirect significant environmental effects on land use character in the vicinity. For these reasons, the increase in event attendees at the Masonic Center would result in less-than-significant impacts on the physical character of the project site or vicinity, and no mitigation measures are required.

**Increased Number of Events**

With the proposed increase in events, nearby residents and other neighboring uses would experience conditions similar to those described in the Environmental Setting, pp. 4.B.1-4.B.5, for 85 additional events per year. These event-related activities would be particularly noticeable during nighttime, sold-out events and when there are simultaneous events at nearby venues such as Grace Cathedral and the five hotels located within four blocks of the project site. Some adjacent uses and nearby residents could perceive that the increased number and frequency of events are disruptive or detract from the existing character of the Nob Hill neighborhood. Although the increased event-related activities in the vicinity of the Masonic Center could be considered as an annoyance to nearby residents, activities related to the increased number of events per year would be the same as occur under existing conditions during events and not direct physical land use impacts under CEQA. Project effects related to transportation, noise, and public services would not result in significant impacts, as described in Section 4.C, Transportation and Circulation, pp. 4.C.30-4.C.54; Section 4.D, Noise, pp. 4.D.20-4.D.29; and Section 4.E, Public Services, pp. 4.E.7-4.E.12, respectively. Furthermore, as under existing conditions, the proposed project would continue to implement the April 2012 CU conditions of approval to minimize effects on nearby residents, including conditions that require appointment of a community liaison officer to address issues and concerns of nearby property owners (Condition No. 23), and a process for addressing complaints from property owners, residents, or commercial lessees that are not resolved by the project sponsor and found to be in violation of the Planning Code and/or the specific conditions of approval (Condition No. 19).

For the reasons discussed above, the increased number of attendees and the increased number of events that would occur with the proposed renovation project would not have a substantial adverse effect on the existing character of the vicinity. This impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

---

4 If the proposed renovation project is approved, all of the conditions of approval imposed by the April 2012 CU authorization would continue to apply, except for Condition 34, which imposes an annual limit of 230 large events, unless modified through the approval of the proposed renovation project.
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Cumulative Impacts  

As discussed in Subsection 4.A, Introduction, p. 4.A.4, the analysis of cumulative impacts uses a plan-based approach, because there is no major new development or construction approved or proposed within the project vicinity (i.e., within a one-quarter mile radius) that, when combined with the proposed project, would result in cumulatively considerable impacts. The cumulative impact for land use and land use planning is described below under Impact C-LU-1.

Impact C-LU-1: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative land use impact. (Less than Significant)

The Academy of Art University has prepared a 2011 Institutional Master Plan (IMP), as required by Planning Code Section 304.5, which identifies 15 growth areas (referred to in the IMP as Study Areas) to accommodate growth in enrollment and programs through reuse of existing buildings through 2020; no new construction is proposed in the IMP to accommodate growth. The northern boundary of Study Area 6 is one-quarter mile southwest of the Masonic Center. The IMP identifies six buildings within Study Area 6 that could be acquired by the Academy. These buildings could accommodate approximately 550 to 600 residential rooms. None of the six buildings identified in Study Area 6 are within a one-quarter-mile radius of the Masonic Center site.

As described under existing land uses on pp. 4.B.1-4.B.2, the Academy currently leases one institutional building and three existing apartment buildings for student use within one-quarter mile of the Masonic Center site that are included in the IMP, but are not within a Study Area targeted for future growth or reuse for student housing or other institutional uses. Because these existing buildings are currently leased by the Academy, are not proposed for a change in existing use in the IMP, are outside of growth areas identified in the IMP, and are already included as part of the City’s existing and future land use projections, there would be no cumulative land use impacts in the project vicinity associated with implementation of the Academy of Arts University IMP in combination with the proposed project.

The proposed renovation project would not combine with reasonably foreseeable future projects to construct any physical barriers to neighborhood access or remove any existing means of access, either of which would result in cumulatively considerable effects that would physically divide the established community or disrupt established land use patterns in the Nob Hill.

5 The Marchese Company, Academy of Art University 2011 Institutional Master Plan, Undated, pp. 6-7. The Academy may or may not acquire building(s) or property within each Study Area; however, each Study Area contains one or more buildings that the Academy is interested in acquiring.
neighborhood. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant cumulative land use impact.

The proposed project, in combination with any reasonably foreseeable future projects, would be consistent with applicable adopted planning documents, such as the San Francisco General Plan, and is not expected to conflict with any land use plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Implementation of the proposed project would either require legislative amendments to the Nob Hill SUD (Planning Code Section 238) to authorize intensification of a legal nonconforming assembly and entertainment use within the Nob Hill SUD, or Condition Use authorizations under Planning Code Sections 182(b)(1) and 723.48 to conditionally permit an "Other Entertainment" use and intensify the use, respectively.

Because the Masonic Center is the only legal nonconforming assembly and entertainment use in the Nob Hill SUD, an amendment to the Nob Hill SUD proposed as part of the project would not authorize the intensification of any other legal assembly and entertainment use for properties within the Nob Hill SUD. If conditional use authorizations under Planning Code Sections 186(b)(1) and 723.48 are approved, these authorizations would also only apply to the Masonic Center site and would not authorize “Other Entertainment” and intensification of uses at other properties in the project vicinity.

For the reasons discussed above, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant impacts on land use that would conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations, and would have less-than-significant cumulative impacts on land use plans.

The proposed renovation project would not combine with reasonably foreseeable future projects to create physical changes that would result in a substantial adverse impact on the physical land use character of the vicinity. As discussed under Impact LU-3, p. 4.B.8–4.B.10, the increase in up to 134 attendees during a sold-out, general admissions event in the Auditorium (standing-room on the main floor of the Auditorium and seating in the balcony) would result in a less-than-significant impact on land use character and therefore would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant impact on land use character in the site vicinity.

The proposed project would increase the number and frequency of events at the Masonic Center that could be considered by some nearby residents as an annoyance or a disruption to the existing character of the Nob Hill neighborhood, such as increased traffic and circulation, pedestrian activity, and noise related to performer equipment unloading, especially when there are simultaneous events at existing nearby venues. The increase in the number of attendees per event
and frequency of events per year would result in a less-than-significant impact as discussed under Impact LU-3, and would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant impact on land use character in the site vicinity.

Simultaneous events at nearby venues already occur under existing conditions with the current operation of the Masonic Center under the April 2012 CU authorization, and are not cumulative impacts as defined by CEQA Section 15130. During simultaneous events at nearby venues, nearby residents would experience added traffic, cars circulating for available parking at nearby garages, including at the Masonic Center garage, pedestrian-related activity such as increased crowds and loud conversations, and increased demand for public services. It is unlikely that all of the proposed additional 85 large events per year would occur when there are simultaneous events at nearby venues. Project impacts related to simultaneous events at nearby venues are not cumulative impacts and are not direct physical impacts on land use. Project effects related to transportation and circulation, noise, and public services are discussed in Section 4.C, Transportation and Circulation, Section 4.D, Noise, and Section 4.E, Public Services, respectively.

For these reasons, the increase in the number and frequency of events that would result from implementation of the proposed project would have a less-than-significant cumulative land use impact on the existing character of the site vicinity.
C. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

The issue of transportation impacts was considered in the Initial Study for the proposed project (IS, pp. 48-49) and determined that further environmental review was necessary. A Transportation Impact Study (TIS) was therefore prepared by the transportation subconsultant for the proposed project, and this section summarizes and incorporates the results of that study.\(^1\) The TIS examined three scenarios. The first, existing conditions, was examined both with an event at the Masonic Center ("event") and without an event ("non-event"). The second scenario examined the existing conditions plus the proposed project, both increased attendance due to the project, and increased frequency. Finally, the third scenario examined was future year 2035 cumulative conditions with the proposed project, including again both increased attendance due to the project and the increased frequency of events.

SETTING

The transportation study area for the proposed project is the area bounded by Washington Street to the north, Sutter Street to the south, Leavenworth Street to the west, and Stockton Street to the east.

The current April 2012 Conditional Use (CU) authorization contains conditions of approval for the operation of the Masonic Center, including the maximum number of events with more than 250 persons.\(^2\) As part of the conditions of approval, events are required to end by 11:00 PM on weeknights (non-holidays, Sunday through Thursday), and by 11:30 PM on weekends (Friday, Saturday, and holidays). The number of events that extend until 1:00 AM on weekends (Friday and Saturday and pre-holiday evenings) is restricted to no more than three events per year subject to prior consultation and approval by the San Francisco Police Department, San Francisco Planning Department, and the Entertainment Commission with 30 days’ advance notice.

The conditions of approval also include requirements for traffic, parking and loading management, patron queuing, neighborhood safety and security, and trash removal. Refer to Chapter 8, Appendix B, for a list of the April 2012 CU conditions of approval. The conditions of approval include the following:

- Increased staffing inside and outside the Masonic Center garage to increase the rate of vehicle entry (Condition No. 7)

---

\(^1\) Adavant Consulting, Nob Hill Masonic Center Renovation Project Final Transportation Study, 2011.0471!, April 10, 2013 (hereinafter referred to as “TIS”). This document is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California, as part of Case File No. 2011.0471E.

\(^2\) A complete list with the conditions of approval included in the April 2012 Conditional Use Authorization is in Chapter 8, Appendix B.
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- Additional capacity at the garage entrance by conversion of the garage entrance, as described on p. 2.11 (Condition No. 7)
- Secured bicycle parking spaces inside the garage (Condition No. 5)
- Prohibition of patrons queuing on the sidewalk in front of the Masonic Center (Condition No. 28)
- A passenger drop-off zone of sufficient length, to allow trucks to depart California Street after unloading operations are completed and before the start of the performance (Condition No. 9)
- Prohibition of overnight curb parking of trucks and buses on California Street (Condition No. 10)

Conditions of approval also require development of an Event Operations Manual that consists of a traffic control plan, including on-line pre-paid parking for assembly and live entertainment events; an emergency evacuation plan; and a post-event trash pick-up program. Event personnel are directed to comply with the provisions of the operations manual (Condition No. 27).

Other assembly venues exist in close proximity to the Masonic Center, including Grace Cathedral and four nearby tourist hotels, two of which (the Fairmont and the Mark Hopkins) have ballrooms and facilities for private events. Events are not scheduled at the Center when regularly scheduled large church services are held at Grace Cathedral, which are generally Sunday morning. At other times, there may be simultaneous assembly events at the Center and other nearby venues, although the start and end times for events at the hotels are generally different from the start and end times at the Center.

ROADWAY NETWORK

Regional Access

Travel to and from the project site involves the use of regional highway transportation facilities that link San Francisco with other parts of the Bay Area, as well as Northern and Southern California. The project site is accessible by local streets with connections to and from regional freeways and highways.

**Interstate 80 (I-80) and U.S. Highway 101 (U.S. 101):** I-80 and U.S. 101 provide the primary regional access to the project area. I-80 connects San Francisco to the East Bay and points east via the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge. U.S. 101 serves San Francisco and the Peninsula/South Bay, and extends north via the Golden Gate Bridge to the North Bay. Within the northern part of San Francisco, U.S. 101 operates on surface streets (Van Ness Avenue and Lombard Street). U.S. 101 merges with I-80 to the south of the project site. Nearby eastbound access is provided via an on-ramp at Fifth/Bryant, and off-ramp at Fourth/Bryant. Nearby westbound access is provided via an on-ramp at Fourth/Harrison, and an off-ramp at Fifth/Harrison.
Interstate 280 (I-280): I-280 provides regional access from the South of Market area to southern San Francisco, the Peninsula and the South Bay. I-280 has an interchange with U.S. 101 to the southeast of the project site. Nearby access to I-280 is provided via on- and off-ramps on King Street (near Fifth Street) and at Sixth Street (at Brannan Street).

Local Access

Washington Street, located three blocks to the north of the project site, is an east-west roadway that connects The Embarcadero with Arguello Boulevard. Washington Street operates two-way between The Embarcadero and Drumm Street, one-way westbound between Drumm and Powell Streets, one-way eastbound between Powell and Gough Streets, and two-way between Gough Street and Arguello Boulevard. Between Larkin and Powell Streets, in the vicinity of the project site, Washington Street has one eastbound lane with parking on both sides. The PH Powell & Hyde cable car tracks share the lane between Hyde and Powell Streets. The San Francisco General Plan identifies Washington Street as a Major Arterial between Kearny Street and The Embarcadero, a Transit Preferential Street (transit oriented) between Hyde and Mason Streets, and a Neighborhood Pedestrian Street between Fillmore and Mason Streets. The San Francisco Better Streets Plan identifies Washington Street as a Downtown Residential Street from The Embarcadero to Front Street, as a Downtown Commercial Street from Front Street to Kearny Street, as a Commercial Throughway from Kearny Street to Jones Street, and as a Neighborhood Residential Street west of Jones Street.

Clay Street, located two blocks to the north of the project site, is an east-west roadway between Arguello Boulevard and Drumm Street. Within the vicinity of the proposed project, Clay Street is one-way eastbound with one travel lane and parallel parking on both sides of the street. Parking is prohibited on the south side between Powell and Davis Streets during the AM peak period, to provide a transit-only lane. The San Francisco General Plan identifies Clay Street as a Major Arterial and a Transit Preferential Street (transit important). The San Francisco Better Streets Plan identifies Clay Street as a Downtown Commercial Street from Drumm Street to Stockton Street, and as a Neighborhood Residential Street west of Stockton Street.

Sacramento Street, located one block to the north of the project site, runs east-west between Arguello Boulevard and Drumm Street. Sacramento Street is one-way westbound (with one to two travel lanes) between Drumm Street and Gough Street. Between Powell Street and Mason Street, the north curb lane is a bus lane between 7 AM and 7 PM every day, and the south curb lane has a “No Stopping” regulation during the 4 to 6 PM peak period. Between Mason Street and Larkin Street, the north curb lane has a bus lane in effect during the 4 to 6 PM peak period. At all other times, parallel parking and loading is permitted on both sides of the street. Between Powell and Mason Streets, Sacramento Street has an uphill grade of about 17 percent. The San Francisco General Plan identifies Sacramento Street as a Transit Preferential Street (transit important) and a Neighborhood Commercial Street. The San Francisco Better Streets Plan
identifies Sacramento Street as a Downtown Commercial Street from Drumm Street to Stockton Street, and as a Neighborhood Residential Street west of Stockton Street.

**California Street**, which borders the project site to the north, is an east-west roadway between Drumm Street and 32nd Avenue. California Street is a two-way roadway, with two travel lanes each way and parallel parking allowed on both sides of the street. The C California cable car line runs along California Street between Drumm Street and Van Ness Avenue. Bicycle Route 310 runs on California Street between Van Ness Avenue and Taylor Street. Between Powell and Mason Streets, California Street has an uphill grade of about 12 percent. The *San Francisco General Plan* identifies California Street as a Transit Preferential Street (transit oriented), part of the Citywide Pedestrian Network, and a Neighborhood Commercial Street. The San Francisco Better Streets Plan identifies California Street as a Downtown Commercial Street from Drumm Street to Grant Street, as a Neighborhood Residential Street from Grant Street to Hyde Street, as a Neighborhood Commercial Street from Hyde Street to Van Ness Avenue, and as Commercial/Residential Throughway west of Van Ness Avenue.

**Pine Street** borders a portion of the project site to the south; it is an east-west roadway that begins at Davis/Market Streets in the downtown area and extends to just west of Presidio Avenue. Pine Street is one-way, with two to three westbound lanes, and parallel parking generally allowed on both sides of the street. Parking is prohibited on the south side between Kearny and Gough Streets and on the north side between Davis and Jones Streets during the PM peak period, to provide additional travel lanes. In the *San Francisco General Plan*, Pine Street is designated as a Major Arterial, as well as a part of the Neighborhood Pedestrian Street network between Market and Kearny Streets, and between Scott and Divisadero Streets; it is also designated as a Transit Preferential Street (transit important) between Market and Sansome Streets. The San Francisco Better Streets Plan identifies Pine Street as a Downtown Commercial Street from Market Street to Stockton Street, as a Residential Throughway from Stockton Street to Leavenworth Street, as a Downtown Residential Street from Leavenworth Street to Larkin Street, and as Commercial/Residential Throughway west of Larkin Street.

**Bush Street**, located two blocks to the south of the project site, is an east-west street that extends from Presidio Avenue in the Laurel Heights neighborhood to Battery Street in the downtown area. In the vicinity of the project site, Bush Street operates one-way eastbound with three travel lanes and parallel parking generally allowed on both sides of the street. Parking is prohibited on the north side between Franklin and Battery Streets and on the south side between Grant Avenue and Battery Street during the AM peak period, to provide additional travel lanes. Parking is also prohibited on the north and south sides between Kearny and Battery Streets during the PM peak period. The *San Francisco General Plan* identifies Bush Street as a Major Arterial, as well as a part of the Neighborhood Pedestrian Street network between Divisadero and Scott Streets, and Kearny and Montgomery Streets. It is also a Transit Preferential Street (transit important) between Kearny and Montgomery Streets. The San Francisco Better Streets Plan identifies Bush
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Street as a Downtown Commercial Street from Battery Street to Stockton Street, as a Downtown Residential Street from Stockton Street to Larkin Street, and as Commercial/Residential Throughway west of Larkin Street.

**Sutter Street**, located three blocks to the south of the project site, is an east-west street that runs between Presidio Avenue in the Laurel Heights neighborhood and Market Street in the downtown area. In the vicinity of project site, Sutter Street operates one-way westbound with three travel lanes and parallel parking generally allowed on both sides of the street. Parking is prohibited on the north side between Market and Gough Streets and on the south side between Montgomery and Mason Streets during the PM peak period, to provide additional travel lanes. The *San Francisco General Plan* identifies Sutter Street as a Transit Conflict Street, as well as a part of the Neighborhood Pedestrian Street network between Market and Fillmore Streets. It is also a Transit Preferential Street (secondary transit street) between Market and Fillmore Streets. The San Francisco Better Streets Plan identifies Sutter Street as a Downtown Commercial Street from Market Street to Taylor Street, as a Downtown Residential Street from Taylor Street to Larkin Street, and as Commercial/Residential Throughway from Taylor Street to Divisadero Street.

**Stockton Street**, located three blocks to the east of the project site, is a north-south direction roadway between Market and Beach Streets. It is a southbound only street between Market and Sutter Streets. Stockton Street has three southbound travel lanes between Sutter and Market Streets, and one to two travel lanes north of Sutter Street. The Stockton tunnel runs under Bush, Pine, and California Streets between Sutter Street and Sacramento Street. The *San Francisco General Plan* identifies Stockton Street as a Transit Preferential Street (transit oriented) between Market Street and Columbus Avenue, and a Neighborhood Pedestrian Street from Market to California Streets. The San Francisco Better Streets Plan identifies Stockton Street as a Downtown Commercial Street from Market Street to Bush Street, as a Neighborhood Residential Street from Bush Street to Sacramento Street, Jackson Street to Vallejo Street, and Greenwich Street to North Point Street, and as Neighborhood Commercial Street from Sacramento Street to Jackson Street, Vallejo Street to Greenwich Street, and North Point Street to Beach Street.

**Powell Street**, located two blocks to the east of the project site, is a north-south direction roadway between Market Street and The Embarcadero. It is a two-way street with one travel lane and on-street parking on both sides of the street. The segment of Powell Street between Ellis and Market Streets is closed to vehicular traffic. The Powell-Hyde and Powell-Mason cable car lines run along Powell Street between Market Street and Jackson Street. Powell Street has a 5 to 10 percent grade between California Street and Sacramento Street, and a downhill grade of about 17 percent to the south. The *San Francisco General Plan* identifies Powell Street as a Transit Preferential Street (transit oriented) between Market Street and Jackson Street. The San Francisco Better Streets Plan identifies Powell Street as a Downtown Commercial Street from Ellis Street to Sutter Street, as a Downtown Residential Street from Sutter Street to Bush Street, and Clay Street to Washington Street, as a Neighborhood Residential Street from Bush Street to
Clay Street, and Greenwich Street to Chestnut Street, and as Neighborhood Commercial Street from Washington Street to Greenwich Street, and Chestnut Street to Jefferson Street.

**Mason Street**, located one block to the east of the project site, is a north-south roadway between Market Street and Jefferson Street. It is one-way southbound between California and Market Streets, and one-way northbound between Sacramento and Washington Streets. Between California and Sacramento Streets, Mason Street is two-way with one travel lane each way and parallel parking permitted on both sides of the street. While Mason Street is relatively flat between California Street and Sacramento Street, there are steep grades to the south and north of these streets (between 20 and 22 percent). The San Francisco Better Streets Plan identifies Mason Street as a Downtown Commercial Street from Market Street to Sutter Street, as a Downtown Residential Street from Sutter Street to Bush Street, and Washington Street to Pacific Avenue, as a Neighborhood Residential Street from Bush Street to Washington Street, Pacific Avenue to Chestnut Street, and Francisco Street to Bay Street, and as Neighborhood Commercial Street from Chestnut Street to Francisco Street, and Bay Street to Jefferson Street.

**Taylor Street**, which borders the project site to the east, is a north-south roadway that connects Market Street with The Embarcadero. It is one-way northbound between Market Street and Pine Street, with two or three travel lanes and parallel parking permitted on both sides of the street. Between Pine and California Streets, Taylor Street is one-way northbound at a steep grade (about 18 percent) with two travel lanes and perpendicular parking permitted on the west side of the street. Taylor Street north of California Street is a two-way street, with one travel lane each way and on-street parking permitted on both sides of the street. Bicycle Route 310 runs on Taylor Street between Broadway and California Street. The San Francisco Better Streets Plan identifies Taylor Street as a Downtown Commercial Street from Market Street to Turk Street, and Ellis Street to Sutter Street, as a Downtown Residential Street from Turk Street to Ellis Street, and Sutter Street to Bush Street, as a Neighborhood Residential Street from Bush Street to Chestnut Street, and Francisco Street to Bay Street, and as Neighborhood Commercial Street from Chestnut Street to Francisco Street, and Bay Street to The Embarcadero.

**Jones Street**, located to the west of the project site, is a north-south roadway between Market Street and Jefferson Street. It is one-way southbound between California and Market Streets, with two travel lanes between California and Pine Streets, at a 20 percent grade, and three travel lanes south of Pine Street. Perpendicular parking is permitted on the west side of the street between California and Pine Streets, while parallel parking is permitted on both sides of the street between Pine and Market Streets. North of California Street, Jones Street is a two-way roadway with one lane each way and parallel parking permitted on both sides of the street. The San Francisco General Plan designates Jones Street as a Secondary Arterial between Market and Pine Streets. The San Francisco Better Streets Plan identifies Jones Street as a Downtown Commercial Street from Market Street to Golden Gate Avenue, as a Downtown Residential Street from Golden Gate Avenue to Pine Street, as a Neighborhood Residential Street from Pine Street
Leavenworth Street, located two blocks to the west of the project site, is a north-south roadway between McAllister Street in the Civic Center area and Jefferson Street in Fisherman’s Wharf. It is one-way northbound between McAllister and California Streets, with three travel lanes between McAllister and Post Streets, and two travel lanes north of Post Street; north of California Street, Leavenworth Street is a two-way roadway with one lane each way. Parallel parking is generally permitted on both sides of the street. The San Francisco General Plan designates Leavenworth Street as a Secondary Arterial between Market and Pine Streets. The San Francisco Better Streets Plan identifies Leavenworth Street as a Downtown Residential Street from McAllister Street to California Street, as a Neighborhood Residential Street from California Street to North Point Street, and as Neighborhood Commercial Street from North Point Street to Jefferson Street.

INTERSECTION OPERATING CONDITIONS

Existing operational conditions were evaluated for seven intersections during the weekday and weekend late evening peak hour (the busiest hour between 6:15 and 8:15 PM) and the nighttime peak hour (the busiest hour between 10:30 PM and 12:30 AM) in the case of the Auditorium, where evening events typically start at 8 PM and end before midnight. The locations of these seven intersections relative to the project site and the study area are shown in Figure 4.C.1: Transportation Study Area and Intersections Analyzed. Pedestrian and bicycle activities were also observed along California, Jones and Taylor streets in the late evening with and without an event at the Auditorium.

- Sacramento Street and Taylor Street (4 way stop)
- Sacramento Street and Jones Street (4 way stop)
- California Street and Taylor Street (signal)
- California Street and Jones Street (signal)
- Pine Street and Taylor Street (signal)
- Pine Street and Jones Street (signal)
- California Street and Mason Street (signal)

Vehicle counts were collected at the seven study intersections on Friday, October 21, 2011 from 6:15 PM to 8:15 PM, when there was no event at the Auditorium. These traffic volumes were similar to a similar set previously collected on Wednesday, June 18, 2009. There are 49 fewer total vehicles entering the study intersections on a Friday evening than on a Wednesday evening, which represent about 1 percent of the total traffic volumes. Thus, the turning movement
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Figure 4.C.1: Study Area and Intersections Analyzed
volumes collected on a Friday evening at the study intersections are representative of any weekday conditions. Vehicle turning movement counts for weekend conditions with no Center event were collected on October 22, 2011 (for California Street / Mason Street) and on June 2, 2009 (for the other intersections). The City of San Francisco utilizes the weekday PM peak hour to analyze potential project impacts during weekday peak traffic conditions. Some land uses may warrant addition weekend mid-day or PM peak analysis, depending on the use and its location. When weekend traffic counts are taken, Saturday traffic counts are most often used as background traffic in the City, which tends to be higher on Saturdays vs. Sundays. In the City’s experience, background traffic levels on Sunday evenings are less then on Saturday evenings. Thus, the turning movement volumes collected on a Saturday evening at the study intersections are representative of any weekend conditions.

As shown in Table 4.C.1: Summary of Event Information During Data Collection Periods, prior to the beginning of the Masonic Auditorium concerts, there were about 200 additional event patrons at nearby venues on Friday October 14, 2011 and approximately 1,000 on Saturday, December 3, 2011. All the concurrent events started at least one hour prior to the beginning of the concert at the Auditorium. This level of concurrent events is not atypical for the proposed project vicinity.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Performer/Start Time</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Venue Name and Location</th>
<th>Start Time</th>
<th>Approximate Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday, October 14, 2011</td>
<td>Il Volo / 8:00 PM</td>
<td>1,825</td>
<td>Wine Auction – Cathedral School for Boys</td>
<td>6:30 PM</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Candlelight Labyrinth, Walk with Music – Grace Cathedral</td>
<td>6 PM</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday, December 3, 2011</td>
<td>Sting / 8:00 PM</td>
<td>Sold-out</td>
<td>Google Holiday Party – Mark Hopkins Hotel</td>
<td>7 PM</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dinner – Fairmont Hotel</td>
<td>6:30 PM</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

a Matt Prieshoff, Live Nation, General Manager.
b Adavant Consulting (October events) and Masons of California (December events).
c Maximum attendance is 3,166.

Source: Adavant Consulting, Turnstone Consulting – July 2012

Vehicle turning movement counts were collected on Friday, October 14, 2011 and on Saturday, December 3, 2011 at the seven study intersections before and after the Auditorium events, from 6:15 PM to 8:15 PM and from 10:30 PM to 12:30 AM, respectively.

Vehicle turning movement counts and event field data collection were not conducted during daytime periods, because daytime events at the Center are typically attended by far fewer attendees than evening live entertainment events. Furthermore, the start and end times of daytime

---

3 The Center does not book events in the Exhibition Hall or California Room when large events are scheduled in the Masonic Auditorium, thus there are no concurrent events at the Center.
events generally do not coincide with peak commute periods (4:30 to 6:30 PM). Therefore, the conducted analysis of the weekday and weekend evening peak periods before and after live entertainment events represent the “worst case” scenario.

Existing intersection operating conditions were evaluated during a non-event and event weekday and weekend during the late evening peak period (6:15 PM – 8:15 PM) for traffic associated with live entertainment events. All of the study intersections are controlled by traffic signals except the Sacramento/Jones Streets and Sacramento/Taylor Streets intersections, which are controlled by a four-way stop.

The operating characteristics of intersections are described by the Level of Service (LOS). LOS is a qualitative description of the performance of an intersection based on the average delay per vehicle. Intersection levels of service ranges from LOS A, which indicates free flow or excellent conditions with short delays, to LOS F, which indicates congested or overloaded conditions with extremely long delays. LOS A through LOS D are considered excellent to satisfactory service levels, LOS E is undesirable, and LOS F conditions are unacceptable.4

**Intersections Conditions Without a Masonic Center Event**

Intersection turning movement counts were collected for the late evening event peak period5 on non-event weekdays at the seven study intersections on Friday, October 21, 2011 and for the non-event Saturdays, June 20, 2009 and October 22, 2011.

Table 4.C.2: Existing Conditions of Intersection Level of Service – Non-Event Day – Late Evening Peak Hour presents the results of the intersection LOS analysis for the existing weekday and weekend late evening peak hour conditions.6 During the weekday and weekend late evening peak hour, all seven existing study intersections operate at LOS C or better, with average delays per vehicle of less than 25 seconds and 30 seconds, respectively. As shown in the table, vehicle delays are generally higher on weekdays than on weekends, reflecting higher traffic volumes on weekdays, which is likely due to the presence of some remnant of commuter traffic during the late evening peak hour.

---

4 Both signalized and unsignalized intersections have been evaluated using the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methodology. For signalized intersections, this methodology determines the capacity of each lane group approaching the intersection. The LOS is then based on average delay (in seconds per vehicle) for the various movements within the intersection. A combined weighted average delay and LOS are presented for the intersection. For unsignalized intersections, the average delay and LOS operating conditions are calculated by approach (e.g., northbound) and movement (e.g., northbound left-turn), for those movements that are subject to delay. As such, in the LOS summary tables, the operating conditions for unsignalized intersections are presented for the worst approach. In San Francisco, LOS E and F are considered unacceptable operating conditions for signalized intersections.

5 From 6:15 p.m. to 8:15 p.m. in the case of the Auditorium where evening events typically start at 8 p.m.

6 Detailed LOS analysis is available in Appendix D to the TIS.
Table 4.C.2: Existing Conditions of Intersection Level of Service – Non-Event Day – Late Evening Peak Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Traffic Control Device</th>
<th>Weekday</th>
<th>Weekend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delay^b</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento/Jones</td>
<td>All-way Stop</td>
<td>11.5 (WB)</td>
<td>B (WB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California/Jones</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine/Jones</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento/Taylor</td>
<td>All-way Stop</td>
<td>10.3 (WB)</td>
<td>B (WB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California/Taylor</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine/Taylor</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California/Mason</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

^a The highest 60-minute period between 6:15 PM and 8:15 PM.
^b Intersection delay presented in seconds per vehicle.
^c For unsignalized intersections, delay is presented for the worst stop-controlled approach.

Source: Adavant Consulting, LCW Consulting – July 2012

Traffic conditions on California Street are influenced by the slower travel speeds of cable cars traveling in the mixed-flow travel lanes. The C-California cable car stops on California Street at Jones Street, Taylor Street, and Mason Street within the travel lane at intersections, and during the late evening peak hour there are about six cable car trips each way; cable cars pre-empt the cross-traffic signal phase at both Jones and Mason Streets. After a cable car arrives at a stop, passengers cross the adjacent travel lanes when traveling between the cable car and nearby sidewalk. When cable cars are at the stop, depending on the volume of passengers getting on and off the cable car, vehicles may queue while waiting for passengers to clear the travel lane and the cable car to proceed. About half a dozen passengers have been observed getting on or off the cable car at the Taylor or Jones stops during the late evening.

Intersection Conditions With a Masonic Center Event

Pre-event and post-event turning movement counts were collected from 6:15 to 8:15 PM (pre-event) and from 10:30 PM to 12:30 AM^7 (post-event) on Friday, October 14, 2011, and Saturday, December 3, 2011.

Approximately 1,900 people attended the Friday concert by Il Volo (see Table 4.C.1 on p. 4.C.9), while the Saturday show by Sting was sold-out (3,166 persons). In addition, there were about 200 additional event goers in the area on Friday, October 14, 2011, and approximately 1,000 on Saturday, December 3, 2011, who attended other events in the area, all of which started at least one hour prior to the beginning of the event at the Auditorium. Table 4.C.3: Intersection Level of Service – Existing Conditions with Event – Late Evening Peak Hour Before Event presents the results of the intersection LOS analysis for the existing weekday and weekend late evening peak

---

^7 Evening events at the Auditorium typically start at 8 p.m. and end before 11 p.m.
Table 4.C.3: Intersection Level of Service – Existing Conditions – Late Evening Peak Hour Before Eventa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Traffic Control Device</th>
<th>Weekday Delayb Level of Service</th>
<th>Weekend Delayb Level of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento/Jonesc</td>
<td>All-way Stop</td>
<td>15.7 (WB) C (WB)</td>
<td>14.2 (SB) B (SB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California/Jones</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>20.1 C</td>
<td>40.7 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine/Jones</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>21.8 C</td>
<td>13.1 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento/Taylorc</td>
<td>All-way Stop</td>
<td>12.5 (NB) B (NB)</td>
<td>13.4 (NB) B (NB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California/Taylor</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>21.6 C</td>
<td>44.0 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine/Taylor</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>17.0 B</td>
<td>13.7 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California/Mason</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>28.9 C</td>
<td>42.0 D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

a The busiest 60-minute period between 6:15 PM and 8:15 PM.

b Intersection delay presented in seconds per vehicle.

c For unsignalized intersections, delay is presented for the worst stop-controlled approach.

Source: Advant Consulting, LCW Consulting – July 2012

Table 4.C.4: Intersection Level of Service - Existing Conditions – Late Evening Peak Hour After Event presents the results of the intersection LOS analysis for the existing weekday and weekend late evening peak hour conditions after an event.8

Table 4.C.4: Intersection Level of Service - Existing Conditions – Late Evening Peak Hour After Eventa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Traffic Control Device</th>
<th>Weekday Delayb Level of Service</th>
<th>Weekend Delayb Level of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento/Jonesc</td>
<td>All-way Stop</td>
<td>9.3 (WB) A (WB)</td>
<td>9.6 (WB) A (WB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California/Jones</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>10.6 B</td>
<td>10.9 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine/Jones</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>10.8 B</td>
<td>11.0 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento/Taylorc</td>
<td>All-way Stop</td>
<td>9.3 (NB) A (NB)</td>
<td>9.5 (NB) A (NB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California/Taylor</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>14.9 B</td>
<td>16.5 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine/Taylor</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>11.5 B</td>
<td>11.9 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California/Mason</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>27.3 C</td>
<td>31.5 C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

a The highest 60-minute period between 10:30 PM and 12:30 AM.

b Intersection delay presented in seconds per vehicle.

c For unsignalized intersections, delay is presented for the worst stop-controlled approach.

Source: Advant Consulting, LCW Consulting – July 2012

Table 4.C.3 indicates that under existing conditions during the late evening peak hour prior to an event, all existing study intersections operate at LOS C or better on weekdays and LOS D or better on weekends; traffic conditions are worse on weekend evenings, such as December 3, 2011, when a sold-out event occurs at the Center and larger concurrent events take place at other nearby venues, but remain at acceptable levels.

Potential effects of the concurrent events on traffic conditions in the area were minimized by the fact that concurrent events on the survey dates started in general at least one hour prior to the

8 Detailed LOS calculations are shown in Appendix D of the TIS.
typical 8:00 PM start time for concerts at the Masonic Auditorium, while the peak hour for Auditorium-generated traffic typically occurs immediately prior to the start of the concert.

Although the overall LOS values (weighted average) shown in Table 4.C.3 are LOS D or better, some individual intersection approaches, such as northbound Taylor Street at California Street, or eastbound California Street at Taylor Street and at Mason Street, operate at worse conditions, such as LOS E.

Table 4.C.4 shows better LOS values and improved average vehicle delays for after-event conditions; average delays per vehicle are less than 28 seconds and 32 seconds on weekdays and weekends, respectively, suggesting minimal influence of background traffic. Night peak hour traffic conditions after an event are likely improved due to lower background traffic and by fewer vehicles circling around the site for parking.

**TRANSIT NETWORK**

The project site is well served by public transit, with both local and regional service provided in the vicinity. The San Francisco Municipal Railway (Muni) provides local transit service. Service to and from the East Bay is provided by BART, AC Transit, and ferries; service to and from the South Bay and the Peninsula is provided by BART, SamTrans, and Caltrain; service to and from to the North Bay is provided by Golden Gate Transit buses and ferries. Figure 4.C.2: Existing Transit Network Near Proposed Project presents the transit service and stop locations in the vicinity of the proposed project.

**Local and Regional Providers**

**San Francisco Municipal Railway (Muni):** Muni provides transit service within the City and County of San Francisco, including bus (both diesel and electric trolley), light rail (Muni Metro), cable car and electric streetcar lines. Table 4.C.5: Summary of Muni Service Near Proposed Project, on p. 4.C.15, presents the weekday and weekend service frequencies, as well as the nearest stop location for lines that operate nearby within less than three blocks from the Masonic Center entrance. The 1AX/BX California, the 31AX/BX Balboa, and the 38AX/BX Geary Expresses travel westbound on Pine Street during the weekday evening peak period, but do they not stop in the project area.

Seven Muni lines run near the project site: the 1 California bus line runs westbound on Sacramento Street and eastbound on Clay Street, within a bus-only lane during the morning (Sacramento and Clay) and the evening (Sacramento) commute periods. The 27 Bryant bus line runs northbound (inbound) along Leavenworth Street, and southbound (outbound) along Hyde, and Jones streets in the project vicinity. The C California cable car line runs east-west in the center of California Street, and the PM Powell Mason and PH Powell Hyde cable car lines run...
FIGURE 4.C.2: EXISTING TRANSIT NETWORK NEAR PROPOSED PROJECT

Source: Adavant Consulting, 2012
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Table 4.C.5: Summary of Muni Service Near Proposed Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Number and Name</th>
<th>Vehicle Type</th>
<th>Service Frequency (minutes)a</th>
<th>Last Tripb</th>
<th>Nearest Stop Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 California</td>
<td>Trolley bus</td>
<td>Evening (until 6 PM) Week 4</td>
<td>12:15 AM</td>
<td>Clay/Jones (EB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sat. 8</td>
<td>1:20 AM</td>
<td>Sacto./Sproule (WB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Late Evening (6 to 9 PM) Week 15</td>
<td>12:45 AM</td>
<td>Leavenworth/Calif (NB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sat. 20</td>
<td>12:40 AM</td>
<td>Bush/Jones (SB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Bryant</td>
<td>Motor coach</td>
<td>Night (after 9 PM) Week 8</td>
<td>12:30 AM</td>
<td>Taylor/California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sat. 15</td>
<td>12:20 AM</td>
<td>Powell/California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C California</td>
<td>Cable car</td>
<td>Night (after 9 PM) Week 8</td>
<td>12:30 AM</td>
<td>Powell/California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Powell/ Hyde PM</td>
<td>Cable car</td>
<td>Sat. 8</td>
<td>12:30 AM</td>
<td>Powell/California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell/ Mason</td>
<td>Cable car</td>
<td>Night (after 9 PM) Week 8</td>
<td>12:30 AM</td>
<td>Powell/California</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

a Based on SF Muni scheduled service frequency; effective since September 2010.
b Time of departure at the beginning of the route.

Source: SFMTA, Adavant Consulting – December 2012

north-south on Powell Street, two blocks east of the project site. In the past, the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services held twice-a-month naturalization ceremonies at the Auditorium, which attracted 2,500 to 3,000 people between 9 AM and noon time. Since January 2009, the naturalization ceremonies were relocated to the Paramount Theatre of the Arts in Oakland; as a result, Muni cable car service is no longer affected by these events.

Evening hourly ridership on all lines decreases as time progresses, with a substantial drop in bus passengers after 9 PM. Cable car ridership drops to a greater extent after 10 PM. Table 4.C.6: Existing Muni Service Utilization - Weekday and Saturday Late Evening Peak Hour After 7 PM, on p. 4.C.16, summarizes the utilization on the same Muni lines during the late evening peak period (after 7 PM) for Weekdays and Saturdays. Muni assigns a maximum capacity estimate to each line based on the seated plus standing capacity of each vehicle type operating on a transit line. In addition, Muni’s Short-Range Transit Plan (SRTP) defines a maximum utilization factor to be used for planning purposes, which is 85 percent of the maximum vehicle capacity.9

As shown in Table 4.C.6, during the weekday late evening peak hour, most of the Muni lines that operate in the vicinity of the proposed project, (all except the westbound 1 California) currently operate below Muni’s maximum utilization factor (85 percent) and have available capacity at the MLP to accommodate additional passengers. The 1 California operates at 92 percent of its capacity in the westbound direction, towards the Richmond District, and passengers experience crowded conditions during the 7 to 9 PM period. The MLPs of all Muni lines shown in Table

---

9 Detailed calculations are shown in Appendix E of the TIS.
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Table 4.C.6: Existing Muni Service Utilization - Weekday and Saturday Late Evening Peak Hour After 7 PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Name and Number</th>
<th>Direction toward</th>
<th>Maximum Load Point (^a)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Ridership (^b)</th>
<th>Capacity (^c)</th>
<th>Utilization (^d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weekday</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 California</td>
<td>Financial District</td>
<td>Sacramento/Buchanan</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond District</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sacramento/Powell</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Bryant</td>
<td>Van Ness/Jackson</td>
<td>Ellis/Taylor</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission District</td>
<td>5th St/Howard</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial District</td>
<td>California/Leavenworth</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C California</td>
<td>Van Ness/California</td>
<td>California/Grant</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Powell</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Hyde/Jackson</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde</td>
<td>Fisherman’s Wharf</td>
<td>Powell/Sutter</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Powell</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Mason/Pacific</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>Fisherman’s Wharf</td>
<td>Powell/Bush</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saturday</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 California</td>
<td>Financial District</td>
<td>Sacramento/Buchanan</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond District</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sacramento/Powell</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Bryant</td>
<td>Van Ness/Jackson</td>
<td>5th/Market</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission District</td>
<td>Bryant/Division</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial District</td>
<td>California/Powell</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C California</td>
<td>Van Ness/California</td>
<td>California/Powell</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Powell</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Washington/Mason</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde</td>
<td>Fisherman’s Wharf</td>
<td>Powell/California</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Powell</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Washington/Mason</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>Fisherman’s Wharf</td>
<td>Powell/California</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
\(^a\) Location where the route has its highest number of passengers relative to capacity
\(^b\) Highest average ridership after 7 PM based on Muni’s most recent available data.
\(^c\) Calculated from the number of passengers that can be accommodate in a Muni vehicle based on the seated plus standing capacity
\(^d\) **Bold** indicates where capacity utilization is above Muni’s maximum value of 85 percent.

Source: SFMTA August-October 2011 for bus service and Summer 2007 for cable car service, Adavant Consulting – December 2012

4.C.6, with the exception of the inbound C California cable car line, are outside a three-block radius of the Masonic Center entrance. Therefore, vehicle capacity on these bus routes is even greater within the vicinity of the proposed project than at the MLP.

During the Saturday late evening peak hour, all the Muni lines that operate in the vicinity of the proposed project currently operate at an utilization factor of 52 percent or below at the MLP, and therefore have available capacity to accommodate additional passengers.

San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART): BART operates regional rail transit service in the metropolitan Bay Area. BART currently operates six lines: Pittsburg/Bay Point to Millbrae, Fremont to Daly City, Richmond to Daly City, Fremont to Richmond, Dublin/Pleasanton to San Francisco International Airport (SFIA), and Millbrae to SFIA. Within downtown San Francisco, BART operates underground below Market Street. During the weekday PM peak period (4 PM-6 PM) headways are generally 5 to 15 minutes for each line.
The two BART stations closest to the project site are Embarcadero and Powell. The Powell BART Station is located one half mile south of the project site (accessed via the 27 Bryant and the Powell/Hyde and Powell/Mason cable cars) while the Embarcadero BART Station is located three quarters of a mile east of the site (accessible by the 1 California and the C California cable car). The last two trips to the East Bay on weekdays and weekends leave the Embarcadero Station shortly after midnight; both lines provide a timed transfer to the Fremont-to-Richmond line. The last BART service to Millbrae leaves the Powell Station at approximately 1 AM on both weekdays and weekends.

**Peninsula Rail Corridor (Caltrain):** Caltrain provides rail passenger service on the Peninsula between Gilroy and San Francisco. The San Francisco terminal is located at Fourth and Townsend Streets in the South of Market area, approximately one and a half miles southeast of the project site (accessible by the 27-Bryant). Caltrain currently operates 86 trains each weekday, with a combination of express and local service. Headways during the evening peak period are approximately 10 to 20 minutes. The last trip leaves San Francisco at midnight on both weekdays and weekends.

**San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans):** SamTrans provides bus service between San Mateo County and San Francisco. SamTrans operates seven bus lines which serve San Francisco, including four routes into the downtown area. In general, SamTrans service to downtown San Francisco operates mostly during the peak commute periods along Mission Street to the Transbay Temporary Terminal, which is located within Howard, Main, Folsom, and Beale Streets, approximately one mile southeast of the project site (accessible by the 1-California and the C-California cable car). There is one late night route, Route 397, which provides hourly service between the Temporary Transbay Terminal and Palo Alto from 1 AM to 4 AM.

**Golden Gate Transit (GGT):** GGT, operated by the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway, and Transportation District, provides bus service between the North Bay (Marin and Sonoma Counties) and San Francisco. Golden Gate Transit operates 18 commuter bus routes and five basic bus routes into downtown San Francisco, several of which end at or near the Transbay Temporary Terminal. Basic bus routes operate at regular intervals of 15 to 90 minutes depending on the time and day of week. Commute bus routes operate at more frequent intervals in the mornings and evenings. GGT also operates ferry service between the North Bay and San Francisco. During the morning and evening commute periods, ferries are operated between Larkspur and San Francisco, and between Sausalito and San Francisco every 30 to 60 minutes on weekdays. The San Francisco ferry terminal is located at the Ferry Building, at The Embarcadero near Market Street. GGT service to/from San Francisco is geared towards commuters and does not offer bus or ferry service in the late evening.

**Alameda-Contra Costa Transit (AC Transit):** AC Transit is the primary bus operator for the East Bay, including Alameda and western Contra Costa Counties. AC Transit operates 26 routes
between the East Bay and San Francisco, all of which terminate at the Transbay Temporary Terminal. Most transbay service is peak-hour and peak-direction (to San Francisco during the AM peak period and from San Francisco during the PM peak period), with headways of 15 to 30 minutes per route. Regular service to the East Bay ends around midnight; AC transit route 800 provides hourly weekday and weekend service between the Van Ness Ave / Market St and the Richmond BART Station, along Telegraph and San Pablo Avenues from 1 AM until the beginning of regular Transbay service.

**Muni Transit Effectiveness Project Service Changes**

The Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP) consisted of a review of portions of San Francisco’s public transit system and was initiated by SFMTA in collaboration with the City Controller’s Office to improve reliability, reduce travel times, provide more frequent service, and update Muni bus routes and rail lines to better match current travel patterns. The TEP recommendations were unanimously endorsed for the purposes of environmental review by the SFMTA Board of Directors on October 21, 2008. They include new routes and route extensions, more service on busy routes, and elimination or consolidation of certain routes or route segments with low ridership. An Implementation Strategy was developed in 2011, and reflects an update to the findings from 2008, because some of the recommendations were implemented between December 2009 and September 2010.

In the project vicinity, the TEP would rename the 27-Bryant as 27-Folsom (since the bus would run on Folsom and Harrison Streets instead of Bryant Street). It would also decrease the headways during the weekday AM and PM peak periods from the current 15 minutes between buses to 12 minutes, while increasing the headways during the late evening period from the current 15 minutes between buses to 20 minutes. TEP also designates the 1 California route as a rapid network corridor, with planned improvements, not yet defined, to be implemented in order to improve transit service and reduce transit delay on this corridor.

**PEDESTRIAN CONDITIONS**

A qualitative evaluation of existing pedestrian conditions in the vicinity of the project site was conducted during field visits to the site during the weekday and weekend late evening periods. The sidewalk in front of the project site on California Street is ten feet wide. Pedestrian crosswalks are provided at all seven study intersections. The two intersections on California Street and the two intersections on Sacramento Street with Jones and with Taylor streets are designated as school crossings. Pedestrian signals are provided at the signalized intersections on California Street. The south east-west crosswalk at the intersection of California and Taylor streets is narrower than standard (about six feet wide) due to the steep slope on Taylor Street.

---

While California Street is relatively flat between Jones Street and Taylor Street, there are steep grades to the south of the project site, discouraging pedestrians. Jones Street has a grade of about 20 percent between California Street and Pine Street, while Taylor Street has a grade of about 18 percent between Pine Street and California Street.

Pedestrian flows in the vicinity of the project site during the late evening are low on non-event days, with higher volumes on California Street than on Sacramento Street. During the late evening period field observations, pedestrian flows on these streets were hotel and tourist patrons walking to and from nearby attractions and the cable car stops. Crosswalks and sidewalks were observed to be operating at unconstrained conditions; at normal walking speeds and with freedom to bypass other pedestrians. No conflicts between vehicle trips entering and exiting the existing garage and pedestrians were observed during non-event days.

On event days, the sidewalk in front of the Masonic Center is fully utilized by patrons accessing the Center. Under the April 2012 conditions of approval, patrons are no longer allowed to queue on the sidewalk for general admission events, rather all queuing occurs inside the Masonic Center property, including the main lobby and in the plaza fronting on California Street.

Pedestrians also congregate at the signalized intersections of California and Jones streets and California and Taylor streets while waiting to cross the streets. The high volume of pedestrians tends to slow down vehicle turning movements at these two locations, although without creating inordinate traffic congestion. Conflicts between pedestrians walking on the sidewalk and autos entering the Masonic Center garage have been observed, which can slow entering vehicles and contribute to the vehicle queue on California Street. The project sponsor currently positions uniformed security personnel wearing event badges outside the garage to control the flow of pedestrians crossing in front of the entrance during large events in order to minimize conflicts with vehicles entering the garage and creating queues on eastbound California Street.

**BICYCLE CONDITIONS**

Designated bicycle routes in the vicinity of the proposed project are presented on Figure 4.C.3: Bicycle Routes in Study Area. Bikeways are typically classified as Class I, Class II, or Class III facilities. Class I bikeways are bike paths with exclusive right-of-way for use by bicyclists. Class II bikeways are bike lanes striped within the paved areas of roadways and established for the preferential use of bicycles, while Class III bikeways are signed bike routes that allow bicycles to share the travel lane with vehicles.

---

11 Observations were conducted on a Friday and a Saturday from 6:15 p.m. to 8:15 p.m.
12 A complete list with the conditions of approval included in the April 2012 Conditional Use Authorization is included in Chapter 8, Appendix B.
13 This practice would be formalized as part of the proposed project for events with 1,250 ticket attendees or more, as described in Improvement Measures, below.
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FIGURE 4.C.3: BICYCLE ROUTES IN STUDY AREA
In the vicinity of the project site, California and Taylor Streets have been designated part of the Citywide Bicycle Routes (Route 310), which provide access between the study area and other locations within the City. Bicycle Route 310 runs on California Street between Polk and Taylor streets, and on Taylor Street between California Street and Broadway, as a signed route (Class III facility). No improvements are being proposed in the San Francisco Bicycle Plan for Route 310.

During field surveys in the project vicinity very few bicyclists were observed on weekdays or on weekends during the late evening peak hour, likely due to the steep grades on streets adjacent to the project site. No substantial safety or right-of-way issues for bicycles were observed in the immediate vicinity of the project site, except for the presence of the rail tracks and cable slots in the center lanes on California Street.

Approximately 30 off-street bicycle spaces are provided inside the Masonic Center garage. They are located at the bottom of the entrance/exit ramps by the garage operator’s office. Approximately two bicycles were observed using these spaces during events at the Auditorium.

**LOADING CONDITIONS**

**Passenger Drop-Off and Pick-Up**

On-street parking is prohibited on event days on a 185-foot long curbside area in front of the Auditorium, between the Gramercy Tower driveway and the Masonic Center garage driveway, pursuant to temporary permits issued by the SFPD permit officer at Central Station, generally for 24-hour periods. During nighttime events, the curb is then made available for taxis and other vehicles to drop off passengers safely next to the curb, without blocking traffic on California Street.

A substantial number of patrons have been observed arriving to concerts by taxi, with three or four vehicles being observed several times disembarking at the same time. Illegally parked or waiting vehicles have also been observed at the drop off zone, causing some event attendees to be unsafely dropped off on the parallel travel lane, while stopping traffic and adding to congestion.

On average, private vehicles represent almost half of all the vehicles dropping off in front of the Auditorium (47%), followed by taxi (41%) and limousines (12%). Limousines carry the largest number of drop-off passengers (2.9 passengers per vehicle), followed by private automobiles (2.1 passengers per vehicle), and taxis (2.0 passengers per vehicle). The average number of dropped-off passengers per vehicle decreased by almost 20 percent at the Saturday concert (from 2.4 to 2.0), perhaps reflecting a different type of attendance. The number of vehicles dropping off in front of the Auditorium was very similar (75 vs. 78) in both cases, with 15 percent fewer passengers on Saturday.

14 Sha Brown, ACE Parking Management, August 9, 2012.
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On event days, uniformed Auditorium personnel are stationed in front of the drop-off zone to
direct arriving vehicles to prevent automobiles from unnecessarily waiting at the curb, and to
manage the weaving maneuvers between those vehicles dropping off and those entering the
Masonic Center garage.

No-parking permits for the curbside area in front of the Auditorium are sometimes requested for
daytime events (those scheduled to end before 6 PM). During those events, the curb is used by
private vehicles, motor coaches and taxis to drop off and pick up event attendees outside of the
eastbound travel lanes on California Street.

**Pine Street Loading Dock**

The Masonic Center is served by one loading dock approximately 35 feet long and 10 feet wide
located at the back of the building adjacent to the lowest (fifth level) of the parking garage, which
is accessible from Pine Street via a narrow path with multi-family residential buildings on both
sides. The Pine Street loading dock is used for unloading and loading by caterers and other
freight companies, and the single loading space meets current demand for small to mid-size truck
deliveries. Deliveries made at the loading dock can then be moved via the freight elevator up to
the kitchen, Exhibition Hall, and California Rooms, which are located on the ground floor, one
floor below the Auditorium. The freight elevator does not reach the Auditorium floor level. The
loading dock access is generally closed to the general public, but is used after large events (1,000
persons or more) as a one-way vehicle exit from the lower two levels of the garage, which
accommodates approximately 240 public parking spaces. Currently, within an hour of ending an
event, approximately 225 vehicles exit the garage via the Pine Street loading dock.

Given physical constraints, the Pine Street dock is best suited for loading and unloading of small
to mid-size trucks, since large trucks (such as those carrying stage equipment) would have great
difficulty backing into it from Pine Street. A loading dock access analysis had previously been
conducted for the project sponsor and shows that the loading dock cannot be readily accessed by
a semi-trailer truck with a 53-foot long trailer without conflicts with the vehicles parked on Pine
Street, with the building, the fence, the curbs, and the bollards surrounding the loading dock.
Furthermore, the analysis shows that a 53-foot long trailer truck would exceed the available
loading space and the cab would extend across the sidewalk, blocking pedestrian traffic on the
north side of Pine Street.

**California Street Commercial Loading**

A three-vehicle 30-minute commercial vehicle loading/unloading zone in effect Mondays through
Saturdays, between 8:00 AM and 6:00 PM is located on the south side of California Street near
the intersection with Jones Street in front of the Gramercy Tower. This 65-foot long loading zone
is not generally used for Masonic Center loading.
Large Truck Loading For Stage Equipment

Large trucks carrying stage equipment (such as sets, instruments, props, drapery, lights, and sound systems) that are too large to be accommodated by the Pine Street loading space park curbside in front of the Masonic Center on the south side of California Street during unloading and loading operations. To use of the curbside for loading, the project sponsor obtains temporary street loading permits issued by the SFPD permit officer at the Central Station. An average concert event has one to two such large trucks, although some have none. Trucks typically unload during the day of the concert, depart, and park off-site, so that the south side of California is available for passenger unloading and performer bus parking prior to and during events. The stage equipment trucks then return to load and depart within about two or three hours after an event. Trucks and vans were observed to park in front of the Masonic Center immediately prior to the commencement of the event during both field survey dates.

As described before, there is no freight elevator connection between the Pine Street loading dock and the Auditorium on the first floor to unload, load, and transfer stage equipment; passenger elevators (which do have stops at the Auditorium level) are not large enough to accommodate stage equipment. Due to these constraints, stage equipment loading and transfers to the main floor of the Auditorium occur within the 185-foot long, temporary loading zone on event days. Catering trucks had in the past for convenience unloaded from California Street, rather than from the Pine Street loading dock, but this practice has been discontinued.

Tour Bus and Limousine Parking for the Performers

Performers’ tour buses can park in front of the Masonic Center on California Street on the day of and during a concert event, pursuant to temporary permits issued by the SFPD permit officer at Central Station.

No more than two performer tour buses are allowed to park in the California Street temporary loading zone for up to 1.5 hours before and during some live entertainment events so that the remainder of the temporary loading zone (the portion not occupied by performer buses) is available for use by taxis and other vehicles picking up and dropping off passengers and by vehicles queuing to enter the Masonic Center garage. Event bus operators are also directed to connect to electric power provided by the project sponsor, and not to run their engines or generators. Buses typically depart within about one hour after an event to travel to the performer’s next venue. An average show has one bus, meaning that some concerts have none and some have one or more. Performers, their families and crew live and work on these buses during a tour.
Limousines and similar type vehicles assigned to the use of the performers have been observed to park in front of the Masonic Center prior to and for the duration of the event. The driver stayed with the vehicle while waiting for the conclusion of the concert.

Electric “shore” power was not provided in the past for performers’ buses, such that they have needed to run their engines or generators while parked, but has been provided at recent concert events to eliminate the need for running bus engines and/or generators. Trucks do not operate their engines or generators during unloading and loading activities.

**EMERGENCY VEHICLE ACCESS**

The Masonic Center is served by the San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD) and is located within Emergency Response District 1. The nearest SFFD station is Station 41 at 1325 Leavenworth Street at Jackson Street, about four blocks northwest of the project site. In addition, Station 3 is located 1067 Post Street at Polk Street, approximately 3/4 of a mile southwest of the Masonic Center. SFPD Central Station is located at 756 Vallejo Street between Powell Street and Stockton Street, about six blocks to the southeast, approximately 3/4 of a mile northeast of the site. In addition, Live Nation provides Emergency Medical Technician personnel on-site during events with more than 1,000 attendees.15

Traffic congestion during the two events was not observed to be causing unacceptable operating conditions that could obstruct SFFD, SFPD, or other emergency vehicles to the area. Traffic congestion on California Street in the vicinity of the project site generally affected eastbound traffic, with minimal effects on westbound traffic. Given that there are no physical medians or barriers in the center of California Street, eastbound emergency vehicles could potentially travel on the opposing lane for a short distance, if necessary, if there were a blockage of all eastbound lanes.

In addition, the active management during large events by on-site event security personnel and SFPD officers of vehicle flows at the California Street passenger drop off zone and Masonic Center garage entrance can facilitate first responders vehicles and personnel access to the site in case of an emergency.

**PARKING CONDITIONS**

On- and off-street parking conditions were examined within a parking study area generally bounded by Washington Street to the north, Leavenworth Street to the west, Sutter Street to the south, and Stockton Street to the east.

---

15 Steven Vettel, Attorney for the project sponsor, Farella Braun + Martel LLP, August 31, 2012.
Off-Street Parking Conditions

Figure 4.C.4: Off-Street Parking Facilities presents the location of the four publicly available off-street parking garages in the immediate vicinity of the Masonic Center. These included the Masonic Center Garage on-site (1101 California St.), as well as the Grace Cathedral garage located across California St. (1051 Taylor St.), the Crocker garage located one half block to the east (1045 California St.), and the Fairmont Hotel garage (826 Powell St.).

The Nob Hill Masonic Center garage is located under the Auditorium building on the east side of the block and operates 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The garage consists of five floors below ground with an approximate capacity of 565 self-parking spaces. The garage main access is located on California Street, approximately 50 feet to the west of Taylor Street; there are two entry lanes and one exit lane at this location. The ticket dispenser is located on the first level allowing approximately 18 vehicles to queue off-street before reaching it.

A secondary access is available from the bottom (fifth) floor via a narrow single lane at an incline through the loading dock area, with direct connection to Pine Street. The lane is typically used for loading only and is generally closed to in or out traffic, but is used as a one-way exit after large events. There are currently about 205 monthly parkers in the garage,16 with approximately 360 spaces available for daily or hourly parkers.

Table 4.C.7: Off-Street Parking Garage Supply and Occupancy - Existing Conditions -Late Evening (6:15 to 8:15 PM) Peak Period presents the off-street supply and occupancy for the four garages near the Masonic Center based on information gathered from previous studies prepared in 2009 and field surveys conducted in October and December 2011 during events at the Auditorium. Approximately 1,900 people attended the Friday, October 14, 2011 concert by Il Volo, while the Saturday, December 3, 2011 concert by Sting was sold-out. In addition, there were about 200 additional event attendees in the area on Friday and approximately 1,000 on Saturday. Those non-Center events started at least one hour prior to the beginning of the event at the Auditorium.

Off-street parking demand counts were conducted on both dates before each event. Four garages in the immediate vicinity of the Masonic Center were surveyed for the two hours prior to the start of the concert. These included the Masonic Center Garage on-site (1111 California St.), as well as the Grace Cathedral garage located across California Street (1051 Taylor St.), the Crocker garage located one half block to the east (1045 California St.), and the Fairmont Hotel garage located about two blocks to the east (Powell St.). All four garages were surveyed from 6:15 PM to 8:15 PM, at five-minute intervals; both the number of vehicles entering each garage as well as the number of persons inside each vehicle was recorded.

FIGURE 4.C.4: OFF-STREET PARKING FACILITIES
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Source: Adavant Consulting, 2012
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### Table 4.C.7: Off-Street Parking Garage Supply and Occupancy - Existing Conditions - Late Evening (6:15 to 8:15 PM) Peak Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name/Location</th>
<th>Parking Operator</th>
<th>Approx. no. of public spaces available</th>
<th>No. of Spaces Occupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-event day&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Masonic Center</td>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>360&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>15%&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grace Cathedral</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grace Cathedral</td>
<td>AMPCO</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Crocker Priority Parking</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fairmont Hotel</td>
<td>City Park</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>855</strong></td>
<td><strong>22%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

<sup>a</sup> Estimated in part from 950 Mason St. Transportation Study, LCW Consulting, March 2009.

<sup>b</sup> Friday, October 14, 2011; concert by Il Volo; approximately 1,900 people attended the event. Concurrent events: Wine Auction at Cathedral School for Boys (start time: 6:30 PM), and Candlelight Labyrinth, Walk with Music at Grace Cathedral (start time: 6 PM).

<sup>c</sup> Saturday, December 3, 2011; concert by Sting; sold-out event. Concurrent events: Google Holiday Party at the Mark Hopkins Hotel (start time: 7 PM) and Dinner Party at the Fairmont Hotel (start time: 6:30 PM).

<sup>d</sup> The number of spaces available for parking at the Masonic Center garage depends on the number of spaces assigned to monthly parkers, which is currently 205 (565 total spaces - 205 monthly spaces=360 spaces available).

<sup>e</sup> Percent of public spaces that are occupied; excludes monthly parkers.

<sup>f</sup> Full at 6:30 PM.

**Source:** Adavant Consulting – July 2012

Overall, the combined late evening parking occupancy in the study garages is an average of 22 percent on non-event days, ranging from 10 percent at Grace Cathedral to 40 percent at the Crocker Garage. During the 1,900 attendance event, the overall public parking occupancy increased to an average of 84 percent, including the closing of the Grace Cathedral garage which became full at about 6:30 PM. As previously indicated in Table 4.C.1: Summary of Event Information During Data Collection Periods (p. 4.C.9), two large events took place the same evening at Grace Cathedral and the adjacent Cathedral School, which started at 6 PM and at 6:30 PM, respectively. These two events attracted a combined attendance of about 200 people and likely resulted in the Grace Cathedral garage being filled early in the evening (6:30 PM). All four public garages in the study area were full by 7:30 PM during the sold-out attendance event. As shown in Table 4.C.1: Summary of Event Information During Data Collection Periods (p. 4.C.9), two other events took place the same evening at nearby hotels. A dinner at the Fairmont Hotel (about 200 guests) started at 6:30 PM, while the Google Holiday Party at the Mark Hopkins Hotel (about 800 guests) started at 7 PM. As a result, all the garages were full at least half an hour before the start of the sold-out concert.
Masonic Center Garage Operation

Operation Prior to an Event

The Masonic Center garage changes its normal operation when a large event (attracting more than 200 people) takes place at the Nob Hill Masonic Center. Approximately one and a half hours prior to the beginning of the event, the automatic gate that controls access to the garage is raised for the duration and a special event parking fee is manually collected upon entering. In addition, uniformed security personnel are deployed at the garage entrance, including SFPD officers and garage personnel.

Two SFPD uniformed officers are responsible for managing traffic outside the garage during large events. As part of their traffic management work, they place temporary plastic delineators in the center of California Street in front of the project site and a barricade in front of the garage entrance to physically prevent westbound vehicles on California Street from turning left into the garage and blocking eastbound traffic or the cable car. One police officer is responsible for controlling vehicular and pedestrian traffic at the entrance to the garage, while the second officer manages traffic up the street to the west, including in front of the Gramercy Tower to the west of the Center. This second officer facilitates the flow of traffic in and out of the Gramercy Tower porte cochere, controls the drop-off area in front of the Masonic Center, and discourages westbound vehicles from making illegal U-turns in front of the Center.

Three garage employees are located near the entrance inside the garage. One employee at the top of the ramp is responsible for telling customers about the special event parking fee, providing them with a ticket and a receipt and asking about their form of payment. A second employee at the bottom of the ramp, by the raised gate, collects the cash or indicates to those paying with credit card (about 25 percent of the total) where to pull over into an adjacent area so that their transaction can be processed. A third employee, who typically collects the parking fees at the exit booth at the bottom of the ramp, approaches those paying with credit card, conducts the transaction and provides the customer with a receipt for their signature.

Once the garage reaches its event capacity, about 360 vehicles, a permanent illuminated sign by the entrance visible to eastbound traffic is lit and a portable “garage full” sign is placed on the driveway. At this point only monthly parkers are allowed to enter the garage. Those additional cars coming to the event are directed by garage staff to park at the Crocker garage on the next block down California Street between Taylor and Mason, or the Grace Cathedral garage, on Taylor Street between California and Sacramento, across from the Center.

17 According to the project sponsor, neighbors have expressed opposition to the installation of additional electronic signs at the garage entrance; Steven Vettel, Attorney, Farella Braun + Martel LLP, November 30, 2012.
Operation After an Event

At the completion of a large event, vehicles are allowed to use the secondary single-lane exit to Pine Street located at the bottom (fifth) floor through the loading dock area, in addition to the normal exit onto California Street. To this end, special event customers are encouraged to park at or near the bottom floor where more spaces are available and there is more direct access to the Pine Street exit.

On-Street Parking Conditions

On-street parking conditions were qualitatively assessed during a weekday and weekend late evening period. The project site is within the “C” Residential Parking Permit (RPP) area, which restricts on-street parking Mondays through Saturdays, to a two-hour period between the hours of 8:00 AM and 9:00 PM. The “C” residential permit area is roughly bounded by Broadway to the north, Kearny Street to the east, Sutter/Bush to the south, and Polk Street to the west.

Metered parking spaces, both standard and commercial vehicle, are found along California Street, and there are a number of commercial vehicle and passenger loading/unloading zones supporting the area hotels. A 100-foot long tourist bus parking white zone is located on the north side of California Street, in front of Grace Cathedral and across from the Masonic Center. Along Sacramento Street on-street parking is restricted on the north (right hand) lane during the 4:00 to 6:00 PM peak period to facilitate bus operations (i.e., No Standing Anytime, Tow-Away).

On-street parking is prohibited in front of the Auditorium on event days. A 185-foot long curbside area on the south side of California Street between the Gramercy Tower driveway and the Masonic garage driveway is made available for truck and motor coach parking, attendee unloading and loading, and vehicle queuing into the garage, eliminating about 10 to 12 RPP “C” parking spaces.

Overall, during the late evening the parking demand on non-event days is already over 95 percent of capacity. On-street parking is effectively at capacity when utilization reaches 90 percent, at which drivers are more likely required to circle around the block looking for available spaces. On-street parking was at capacity on event days. During field visits, some double-parking along California Street was observed.

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

Transit First Policy

In 1998, the San Francisco voters amended the City Charter (Charter Article 8A, Section 8A.115) to include a Transit-First Policy, which was first articulated as a City priority policy by the Board of Supervisors in 1973. The Transit-First Policy is a set of principles which underscore the City’s
commitment that travel by transit, bicycle, and foot be given priority over the private automobile. These principles are embodied in the policies and objectives of the Transportation Element of the General Plan. All City boards, commissions, and departments are required, by law, to implement transit-first principles in conducting City affairs.

**San Francisco General Plan**

The Transportation Element of the General Plan is composed of objectives and policies that relate to the eight aspects of the citywide transportation system: General Regional Transportation, Congestion Management, Vehicle Circulation, Transit, Pedestrian, Bicycles, Citywide Parking, and Goods Management. The Transportation Element references San Francisco’s “Transit First” Policy in its introduction, and contains objectives and policies that are directly pertinent to consideration of the proposed project, including objectives related to locating development near transit investments, encouraging transit use, and traffic signal timing to emphasize transit, pedestrian, and bicycle traffic as part of a balanced multimodal transportation system. The General Plan also emphasizes alternative transportation through the positioning of building entrances, making improvements to the pedestrian environment, and providing safe bicycle parking facilities.

**San Francisco Bicycle Plan**

The San Francisco Bicycle Plan describes a City program to provide the safe and attractive environment needed to promote bicycling as a transportation mode. The San Francisco Bicycle Plan identifies the citywide bicycle route network, and establishes the level of treatment (i.e., Class I, Class II or Class III facility) on each route. The Plan also identifies near-term improvements that could be implemented within the next five years, as well as policy goals, objectives and actions to support these improvements. It also includes long-term improvements, and minor improvements that would be implemented to facilitate bicycling in San Francisco.

**IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Any impacts of the proposed project on transportation would be due to the travel demand generated by the increased attendance permitted by proposed project (up to 3,300 attendees) and an increase in the number of large evening events. The analysis considers seven areas: traffic, transit, pedestrians, cyclists, loading, emergency vehicle access, and impacts from construction. Parking analysis is presented for informational purposes. The traffic and transit conditions have been assessed for Existing plus Project Conditions as well as cumulative year 2035 conditions.

**SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS**

The Planning Department uses the following significance criteria to determine the impacts associated with a proposed project:
C.1. The operational impact on signalized intersections is considered significant when project-related traffic causes the intersection level of service to deteriorate from LOS D or better to LOS E or F, or from LOS E to LOS F. The operational impacts on unsignalized intersections are considered potentially significant if project-related traffic causes the level of service at the worst approach to deteriorate from LOS D or better to LOS E or F and Caltrans signal warrants would be met, or would cause Caltrans signal warrants to be met when the worst approach is already operating at LOS E or F. The project may result in significant adverse impacts at intersections that operate at LOS E or F under existing conditions depending upon the magnitude of the project’s contribution to the worsening of the average delay per vehicle. In addition, the project would have a significant adverse impact if it would cause major traffic hazards or contribute considerably to cumulative traffic increases that would cause deterioration in levels of service to unacceptable levels.

C.2. The project would have a significant effect on the environment if it would 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. With the Muni and regional transit screenlines analyses, the project would have a significant effect on the transit provider if project-related transit trips would cause the capacity utilization standard to be exceeded during the peak hour.

C.3. The project would have a significant effect on the environment if it would result in substantial overcrowding on public sidewalks, create potentially hazardous conditions for pedestrians, or otherwise interfere with pedestrian accessibility to the site and adjoining areas.

C.4. The project would have a significant effect on the environment if it would create potentially hazardous conditions for bicyclists or otherwise substantially interfere with bicycle accessibility to the site and adjoining areas.

C.5. A project would have a significant effect on the environment if it would result in a loading demand during the peak hour of loading activities that could not be accommodated within proposed on-site loading facilities or within convenient on-street loading zones, and created potentially hazardous conditions or significant delays affecting traffic, transit, bicycles or pedestrians.

C.6. The project would have a significant effect on the environment if it would result in inadequate emergency access.

C.7. Construction-related impacts generally would not be considered significant due to their temporary and limited duration.

**APPROACH TO ANALYSIS**

**Travel Demand**

Project travel demand refers to the new vehicle, transit, pedestrian, bicycle, truck and bus traffic that would be generated by the proposed project. This chapter provides an estimate of the travel and demand that would be generated by an event that would attract 3,300 patrons to the Nob Hill Masonic Center, its maximum expanded attendance capacity, and compares it with the current
maximum travel demand generated by a 3,166-attendance event. In addition, the proposed project would bring an intensification of the use at the site, with more evenings when large events occur at the Auditorium.

In order to determine the visitor travel demand characteristics of the Masonic Center, field counts were conducted on Friday, October 14, 2011, during a concert by Il Volo, and on Saturday December 3, 2011, during a concert by Sting. The doors opened at about 6:30 PM, and the shows started at 8 PM. Approximately 1,900 people attended the Friday concert, while the Saturday concert was sold out (3,166 people).

The field counts included the survey of four public parking garages in the immediate vicinity of the Masonic Center (Masonic Center garage, Grace Cathedral garage, Crocker garage, and Fairmont Hotel garage), as well as turning movement counts collected at the seven nearby study intersections.

The proposed project site is located within Superdistrict 1 in the Northeast quadrant of San Francisco.18

Trip Generation

The visitor person-trip generation rate for the attendance at an event at the Masonic Auditorium would be two trips per attendee, one inbound and one outbound. Thus, a 3,300-attendee event at the Masonic Auditorium would generate 6,600 visitor person-trips, 3,300 inbound and 3,300 outbound. Based on the traffic data collected in the field, arrivals generally take place from about one and a half hours before the start of the event (6:30 PM) until fifteen minutes after the start of the event (8:15 PM).

Employee trip generation for the Masonic Auditorium has not been estimated as part of this study since it would not substantially change from the existing levels as part of the proposed project. Currently there are 51 full-time employees at the Masonic Center; with implementation of the proposed project, there would be one additional new full-time employee. On event days, there are about 75 to 100 temporary workers on site (ushers, ticket takers, security, merchandise vendors, cleaning staff, etc.) which would not change with the proposed project.19

---

18 Superdistricts are travel analysis zones established by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). These Superdistricts provide geographic subareas for planning purposes in San Francisco. Superdistrict 1 in the Northeast quadrant of the City is generally bounded by Van Ness Avenue, Townsend Street and the San Francisco Bay.

19 David Ismay, Farella Braun + Martel LLP, Attorney for Project Sponsor August 29, 2011.
Mode Split

The project-generated visitor person-trips were allocated among different travel modes in order to determine the number of auto, transit and other trips going to and from the site. The “Other” category includes mostly taxis and limousines, but also additional modes such as bicycles and motorcycles. Mode of travel assumptions for event attendees were based on the number of people and vehicles observed at the public parking garages during the two event days, plus information contained in the SF Guidelines for visitor trips to the Superdistrict 1.

Table 4.C.8: One-way Project Visitor Trip Generation by Mode of Travel summarizes the trip generation for a current maximum attendance event (3,166 attendees) and for a proposed project event (3,300 attendees) by mode of travel. About 49.5 percent of the person-trips arriving at the Auditorium would be expected to occur by automobile, 22.5 percent of the person-trips would be by transit, 24 percent of the person trips would be walking, and the remaining four percent would be by other modes, mostly taxis and limousines. Approximately 874 vehicles (821 private automobiles and 53 taxis and limousines) would be estimated to arrive at a 3,300-attendance event at the Auditorium, compared with 839 vehicles during a current sold-out (3,166 people) event, an increase of 35 vehicles. Thus, the proposed project would bring an intensification of the use at the site, with up to 41 more large live entertainment events occurring per year, with a majority of these events being concerts occurring in the evening.

Table 4.C.8: One-way Project Visitor Trip Generation by Mode of Travel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Auto</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3,166-attendance event</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person trips</td>
<td>1,572</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>3,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle trips</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3,300-attendance event</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person trips</td>
<td>1,639</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle trips</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person trips</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle trips</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

a Employee trip generation for the Masonic Center has not been estimated as part of this study since it would not measurably change from the current levels as part of the proposed project.

b Does not include those walking to the venue from nearby transit stops and public parking facilities.

c “Other” includes additional modes such as limousines, taxis, bicycles and motorcycles; taxis and limousines are estimated to represent 95 percent of the “other” trip category.


Trip Distribution / Assignment

Table 4.C.9: Project Visitor Trips Distribution presents the trip distribution patterns for the Masonic Auditorium, which was based on the information contained in the SF Guidelines for...
visitor trips to this area. Almost 60 percent of the project-generated trips would come from areas within San Francisco. This table represents total project vehicles for a proposed sold-out event attendance of 3,300. The proposed project would not generate all these trips, but only those trips caused by a higher full attendance number (over the existing sold-out event of 3,166 attendances), which would be 35 net new vehicle trips. The proposed project would also increase the number of occurrences of sold-out events over existing conditions.

In addition to the trip distribution presented in Table 4.C.9, the intersection traffic counts and observations collected on Friday October 14, and on Saturday December 3, 2011, during two concert events were used as the basis for assigning net new project-generated trips to the local streets and parking spaces in the study area on weekdays and weekends.

Temporary plastic delineators placed in the center of California Street and a barricade located in front of the Masonic Center garage entrance physically prevent westbound vehicles on California Street from turning left into the garage so they cannot block eastbound traffic or the cable car. Westbound vehicles bound for the Masonic Center garage would either approach the site via Pine or Sacramento Streets or, if traveling on California Street, would turn left on circle around the Grace Cathedral block.

Westbound left turns from California Street into the Crocker garage are not prohibited during an event. Field observations have not shown left-turning vehicles causing undue delays to westbound California Street traffic, since the vast majority of those entering the Crocker garage approach it from the west, traveling eastbound.

Parking Demand

Parking demand in the vicinity of the proposed project was determined based on field observations and counts of existing garages. The results are summarized in Table 4.C.10: Parking Demand on Event Day – Late Evening (6:15 to 8:15 PM) Peak Period.
Table 4.C.10: Parking Demand on Event Day – Late Evening (6:15 to 8:15 PM) Peak Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>1,900-attendance event (October 14, 2011)</th>
<th>Sold-out event (December 3, 2011)</th>
<th>3,300-attendance event (proposed project)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles parking at nearby garages</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>±300</td>
<td>300 to 720c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles parking outside the study area garages</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>±460</td>
<td>70 to 490c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Parking Demand</strong></td>
<td><strong>440</strong></td>
<td><strong>760</strong></td>
<td><strong>790</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

a Based on counts collected on October 14, 2012.

b Based on counts collected on December 3, 2012; maximum attendance 3,166 seats. Earlier events were also taking place nearby attracting 1,000 people and filling up the nearby garages about one hour before the start of the Auditorium event.

c The allocation of the proposed project demand to parking facilities further away from the site cannot be precisely known, it will depend of the concurrent utilization of the nearby garages. About 720 vehicles could be accommodated in the nearby public garages (including the Masonic Center garage) when no other concurrent events take place, which means that 70 other vehicles would have to be accommodated further away from the site (720+70=790); on the other hand, if only 300 vehicles are accommodated in the nearby public garages, then up to 490 other vehicles would have to be accommodated further away from the site (300+490=790).

d Estimated from Table 4.C.8: One Way Project Visitor Trip Generation by Mode of Travel; based on field counts, approximately three to seven percent of the total private vehicle trips to the project site are drop-offs.

Source: Adavant Consulting – December 2012

The proposed project demand for parking at locations further away from the site is not precisely known, as it will depend of the concurrent utilization of the nearby garages. Based on the total vehicle demand estimates, it is estimated that this off-site demand would be approximately 70 vehicles depending on the size of the event, when no other large concurrent events would take place in the area, or could be as high as 490 vehicles if large concurrent events are occurring in the area, compared to 460 vehicles under current conditions.

**Loading Demand**

One to four trucks would bring food and drink deliveries to the new commercial kitchen on a daily basis, all of which would be brought to the Pine Street loading dock entrance. The trucks that make catering deliveries are typically 30 feet long or less. All deliveries would be made after 10 AM and before 2 PM and would be scheduled so that trucks do not overlap at the dock.

The Masonic Center proposes to install a permanent sound and light system in the Auditorium, which is expected to reduce the amount of curbside unloading and loading of such equipment for individual concerts. In addition, the Masonic Center mandates that all catering loading occur from the Pine Street loading dock and proposes to convert the catering kitchen to a permanent commercial kitchen with an on-site food and beverage provider, such that loading and unloading of one-time catering equipment and supplies are expected to be reduced and none would occur.

20 Laura Lyons, Global Gourmet Catering, November 30, 2009.

21 Steven Vettel, Attorney, Farella Braun + Martel LLP, August 31, 2012.
from the California Street curb. Beside these regular deliveries, one truck would make one additional delivery of catering equipment prior to each event.

Stage equipment loading and performers’ bus parking demand during future live entertainment events would be similar to the current demand during such events. However, there will be more days when buses and/or large trucks use the California Street curb due to the increased number of annual live entertainment events at the Masonic Center as part of the proposed project.

**Cumulative Demand**

Future year 2035 Cumulative traffic volumes were developed in order to assess local cumulative developments which result in increases in traffic volumes. For the future year 2035, cumulative intersection traffic volumes for the late evening peak hour were estimated based on growth rates developed for the study area from data taken from the City and County of San Francisco Transportation Authority (SFCTA) travel demand model for the weekday PM peak hour. These 2035 cumulative traffic volumes account for growth due to cumulative development in the City and the entire Bay Area, to which the proposed project generated traffic volumes (from 1,900 to 3,300 attendees on weekdays, and from 3,166 to 3,300 attendees on weekend) were then added.

Future year 2035 Cumulative traffic volumes for the weekend late evening peak hour were developed based on the growth rates experienced at each study intersection between the existing and 2035 Cumulative conditions during the weekday PM peak hour. These rates were then applied to each existing weekend turning movement volume to obtain the 2035 Cumulative weekend traffic estimates, with the assumption that changes in weekend traffic volumes would be proportionally the same as on a weekday; the proposed project generated traffic volumes were then added to the 2035 cumulative traffic volumes derived from the model.

**IMPACT EVALUATION**

**Traffic Impacts**

**Impact TR-1:** The proposed project would not cause a substantial increase in traffic that would cause the level of service to decline from LOS D or better to LOS E or F, or from LOS E to F at seven intersections studied in the project vicinity. *(Less than Significant)*

Similar to the analysis of existing conditions, the study intersections were evaluated for the assessment of potential project impacts during non-event and event weekday and weekend conditions during the late evening peak period (6:15 PM-8:15 PM) using the HCM 2000 LOS methodology. No analysis has been performed for the late night period (from 10:30 PM to 12:30 AM), since Table 4.C.4: Intersection Levels of Service - Existing Conditions, Late Evening Peak After Event (p. 4.C.12) showed that all study intersections operate acceptably at better LOS
values and lesser average vehicle delays for after-event conditions on both weekdays and weekends.

Approximately 874 vehicles (821 by private automobile and 53 taxis/limousines/drop-offs) would arrive at a 3,300-attendance event during the late evening peak hour (See Table 4.C.8: One-way Project Visitor Trip Generation by Mode of Travel, p. 4.C.33), compared to about 839 vehicles under current conditions for a sold-out event (an increase of 35 vehicles).

Not all of the project vehicles would drive past the seven study intersections; depending on the concurrent events and the utilization of the nearby garages, approximately 60 to 490 vehicles would park at locations further away from the Masonic Center, such as the Sutter/Stockton garage. On the other hand, since the traffic assignments for the proposed project are based on actual vehicle paths measured in the field, the traffic volumes account for potential circling around the blocks looking for an available parking space on the street or at a nearby garage. In addition, the traffic volumes (Existing plus Project) include the traffic generated by two concurrent events taking place nearby (e.g., at Grace Cathedral, at the Fairmont Hotel, and at the Mark Hopkins Hotel).

Table 4.C.11: Intersection LOS Existing and Existing Plus Project Conditions Weekday Late Evening Peak Hour presents a comparison of intersection delays and LOS on a non-event day, an existing event day, and a 3,300-attendance event day with the proposed project, for the weekday late evening peak hour. Table 4.C.12: Intersection LOS Existing and Existing Plus Project Conditions Weekend Late Evening Peak Hour presents the same comparison for the weekend late evening peak hour. The traffic analysis focuses on the late evening peak period (6:15 PM to 8:15 PM) rather than the night period (10:30 PM to 12:30 AM), since delays and traffic volumes are higher during the evening period, as shown in Table 4.C.4: Intersection Level of Service, Existing Conditions, Event day, Late Evening Peak Hour After Event (p. 4.C.12).

**Pine Street Parking Garage Access**

With the proposed project, Condition No. 6, imposed by the April 2012 CU authorization would be fully implemented to allow attendee vehicles with pre-paid parking to enter the parking garage via the Pine Street loading dock for large events. Under existing conditions, vehicles are already allowed to exit the garage and would continue to do so with the proposed project as part of Condition No. 6. With the proposed project, the project sponsor estimates that a maximum of 100 vehicles (about 28 percent of the total available public parking spaces, excluding reserved monthly spaces) would enter the garage via Pine Street. This total represents less than 10 percent of the total expected peak-hour traffic on Pine Street, and would not significantly affect its future traffic operating conditions because there is substantial available capacity for additional vehicles traveling on Pine Street. As shown in Table 4.C.11 and Table 4.C.12, traffic conditions would be better on Pine Street than on California Street under existing plus project conditions.
Table 4.C.11: Intersection Level of Service, Existing and Existing plus Project Conditions, Weekday Late Evening Peak Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing No-Event Day</th>
<th>Existing 1,900-attendance Event</th>
<th>Existing plus Project 3,300-attendance Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delay (^b)</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>Delay (^c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento/Jones (^d)</td>
<td>11.5 (WB)</td>
<td>B (WB)</td>
<td>15.7 (WB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California/Jones</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine/Jones</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento/Taylor (^d)</td>
<td>10.3 (WB)</td>
<td>B (WB)</td>
<td>12.5 (NB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California/Taylor</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine/Taylor</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California/Mason</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
\(^a\) The highest 60-minute period between 6:15 PM and 8:15 PM.
\(^b\) Assumptions include two concurrent events attracting 200 patrons.
\(^c\) Intersection delay presented in seconds per vehicle.
\(^d\) For unsignalized intersections, delay is presented for the worst stop-controlled approach.

Table 4.C.12: Intersection Level of Service, Existing and Existing plus Project Conditions, Weekend Late Evening Peak Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing No-Event Day</th>
<th>Existing Sold-out 3,166-attendance Event</th>
<th>Existing plus Project 3,300-attendance Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delay (^c)</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>Delay (^c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento/Jones (^d)</td>
<td>9.7 (SB)</td>
<td>A (SB)</td>
<td>14.2 (SB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California/Jones</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine/Jones</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento/Taylor (^d)</td>
<td>9.3 (NB)</td>
<td>A (NB)</td>
<td>13.4 (NB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California/Taylor</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine/Taylor</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California/Mason</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
\(^a\) The highest 60-minute period between 6:15 PM and 8:15 PM.
\(^b\) Assumptions include two concurrent events attracting 900 patrons.
\(^c\) Intersection delay presented in seconds per vehicle.
\(^d\) For unsignalized intersections, delay is presented for the worst stop-controlled approach.

The two study intersections on Pine Street are expected to operate at LOS B or LOS C at peak hour under project conditions on weekdays and weekends, and would have sufficient capacity to accommodate several hundred additional vehicles. Since vehicles entering the parking garage via Pine Street would have pre-paid parking tickets, entrance delays and queuing would be expected to be minimal. Allowing vehicles to enter the garage via the Pine Street loading dock would also shift traffic from California Street and would result in better operating conditions on California Street.
4. Environmental Setting and Impacts  
C. Transportation and Circulation

**Increased Number of Attendees**

The proposed project would generate additional traffic from the increase in maximum attendance from 1,900 to 3,166 people on a weekday, and from 3,166 to 3,300 people on a weekend; this would result in increases in the average delay per vehicle at all the study intersections. Weekday delays would increase more, since the attendance growth would also be larger (about 1,300 people), with delay increases between 2 and 29 seconds per vehicle, with the largest increases occurring at the intersections along California Street. All the study intersections would operate at LOS D or better, with some individual intersections approaches, such as eastbound California Street at Jones, Taylor, and Mason Streets, operating at worse conditions, such as LOS E.\(^{22}\)

Weekend delays would increase between 0.2 and 7.8 seconds per vehicle, with the largest increase also occurring at the intersection on California Street (a lower change than on a weekday since the attendance growth on weekends would be less than 150 people). All the study intersections would operate at LOS D or better. Some individual intersections approaches, such as eastbound California Street at Jones, Taylor, and Mason Streets, would operate at worse conditions, such as LOS E.\(^{23}\)

**Increased Number of Events**

With the proposed project, large events would occur more frequently at the Masonic Center, resulting in more frequent increases in delays at study area intersections. However, these delays would not result in unacceptable operating conditions at study intersections.

For the reasons discussed above, the increased traffic on Pine Street to access the parking garage, and the increased number of event attendees and increased frequency of events would have less-than-significant traffic impacts. Therefore, traffic impacts would be considered less than significant, and no mitigation is necessary.

**Transit Impacts**

**Impact TR-2: The proposed project would not cause a substantial increase in transit demand that could not be accommodated by adjacent transit capacity; nor would it cause a substantial increase in delays or costs such that significant adverse impacts in transit service levels could occur. (Less than Significant)**

A 3,300-attendance event would attract approximately 742 transit trips during the peak hour after 7 PM. (See Table 4.C.8: One-way Project Visitor Trip Generation by Mode of Travel, p. 4.C.33), compared to about 712 transit trips under current conditions for an existing 3,166-attendance sold-out event (an increase of 30 transit trips). Approximately 5 of the 30 additional transit trips would use regional transit to arrive and depart from San Francisco. These additional transit trips

---

\(^{22}\) These calculations are shown in the detailed LOS calculations included in the TIS, Appendix D.

\(^{23}\) These calculations are shown in the detailed LOS calculations included in the TIS, Appendix D.
to the site would utilize the nearby Muni lines and regional transit lines, and may include transfers to other Muni bus lines and light rail lines, or other regional transit. Based on the trip distribution patterns, it is estimated that of the 742 transit trips generated by a 3,300-attendance event, 440 trips would take one of the Muni lines within the study area, while 303 trips get off transit further away and would walk the rest of the way to the Auditorium.

Table 4.C.13: Muni Service Utilization at the Maximum Load Point, Weekday and Saturday Late Evening (after 7 PM) Peak Hour presents a comparison of the Existing and Existing plus Project ridership and capacity for the late evening peak hour at the MLP for a 3,166- and a 3,300-attendance event at the Masonic Center.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Name and Number</th>
<th>Direction toward</th>
<th>Ridership</th>
<th>No-Event Day Utilization</th>
<th>Existing Sold-out event Trips</th>
<th>Utilization</th>
<th>Existing plus Project 3,300-attendance event New Trips</th>
<th>Total Trips</th>
<th>Utilization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weekday</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richmond District</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27 Bryant</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Van Ness/Jackson</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mission District</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial District</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PH</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Powell/ Hyde</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fisherman’s Wharf</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fisherman’s Wharf</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richmond District</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Van Ness/Jackson</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mission District</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial District</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Van Ness / California</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PH</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Powell/ Hyde</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fisherman’s Wharf</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Powell/ Mason</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
Bold indicates where capacity utilization is above Muni’s maximum value of 85 percent.

**Source:** Advant Consulting – December 2012
With the proposed project, the capacity utilization would increase on Muni with the addition of project-generated transit trips in some routes, such as the westbound direction for the C California cable car line and the northbound direction for the 27 Bryant line. None of these increases in utilization would cause these lines to operate above Muni’s maximum value of 85 percent at their MLP.

The 1 California westbound would also continue to operate close to its maximum capacity threshold with the proposed project and above Muni’s threshold value at the MLP, which is located at the intersection of Sacramento/Powell. However, the number of net new transit trips to and from the Masonic Center generated by the proposed project on the 1 California would be three additional riders, representing less than one percent of the total number of peak hour riders on this line for current sold-out events (933 riders), well within the daily variations of transit ridership, and would not be considered a significant impact.

Table 4.C.13 also shows that the Saturday capacity utilization would increase in some lines with the addition of project-generated transit trips. The eastbound direction for the 1 California and the northbound direction for the 27-Bryant line would continue to operate close to its maximum capacity threshold at the MLP, above Muni’s maximum value of 85 percent. However, the number of net new transit trips to and from the Masonic Center generated by the proposed project on the eastbound 1 California and northbound 27 Bryant would be minimal, seven and four additional trips, respectively, which represent about 2 percent of the total number of peak hour riders on each line during a current sold-out event evening (329 and 181 riders, respectively), well within the daily variations of transit ridership, and would not be considered a significant impact. The Saturday capacity utilization on the three cable car lines would remain virtually unchanged as a result of the proposed project.

Overall, Muni operations in the area would not generally be affected by congestion caused by the project; as shown in Table 4.C.11: Intersection Level of Service, Existing and Existing plus Project Conditions, Weekday Late Evening Peak Hour and Table 4.C.12: Intersection Level of Service, Existing and Existing plus Project Conditions, Saturday Late Evening Peak Hour (p. 4.C.38). Existing plus Project traffic conditions at the study intersections on Sacramento and Pine Streets would be LOS C or better, without interfering with those Muni lines operating on those streets, such as the 1 California. The three intersections on California Street, however, would operate closer to capacity, at LOS D, with the eastbound approaches operating in some instances at LOS E (maximum capacity), which could affect eastbound cable car operations. However, delays to C California cable car would not represent a substantial delay to these operations (typically half a headway), based on modeled traffic delay increases. Furthermore, the project sponsor currently positions uniformed security personnel at the passenger drop off zone in front of the Masonic Auditorium during large attendance events to better manage passenger activities and queuing at the Masonic Center garage entrance, including for Muni passengers and pedestrians in the project area, thereby minimizing the lane congestion that could affect
eastbound cable car service. This practice would be continued and formalized under the proposed project.

The proposed project would also increase the number of late evening events at the Masonic Center, resulting in more frequent evenings with higher utilization and conflicts with the nearby transit lines on late weekday and Saturday evenings. However, because these increases would not result in unacceptable transit operating conditions on any transit line, the more frequent higher ridership conditions would not result in significant transit demand or operational impacts. Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant, and no mitigation is necessary.

However, to further reduce the less-than-significant transit impacts of the proposed project, City decision makers may decide to impose the following additional improvement measures (beyond those identified in the April 2012 CU) as condition of approval. These transit improvement measures are as follows:

- **Improvement Measure I-TR-2a**: The project sponsor shall update project websites that provide public transit travel information to include links to transit service providers, such as BART and Muni, and transit trip planning websites, such as 511.org that provide transit system services updates in real time; and

- **Improvement Measure I-TR-2b**: The project sponsor shall offer incentives for those patrons arriving to the event by public transportation, such as providing a free water or soda.

**Pedestrian Impacts**

**Impact TR-3**: The proposed project would not result in substantial overcrowding on public sidewalks, nor create potentially hazardous conditions for pedestrians, or otherwise interfere with pedestrian accessibility to the site and adjoining areas. (*Less than Significant*)

Pedestrian trips generated by the proposed project would include walking trips to and from the Masonic Center, plus walking trips to and from the garages and the transit stops. Overall, the proposed project would add 129 new one-way pedestrian trips (32 walking trips, 30 transit trips, and 67 walking trips from the adjacent garages) being added to the surrounding streets during the late evening peak hour, a 4.2 percent increase over current event day conditions.

Project-generated pedestrians would enter and exit through the main entrance on California Street and would be dispersed throughout the study area, depending upon the origin and destination of each trip. Based on observations, the majority of the new pedestrian trips would be to and from Market Street (e.g., to the BART/Muni station) via Taylor and Mason Streets, and towards the Financial District via California Street. The 129 new pedestrian trips generated by the proposed project could be accommodated on nearby sidewalks without substantially affecting the existing pedestrian conditions.
The sidewalk in front of the Masonic Center is fully utilized on event days, and conflicts between pedestrians walking on the sidewalk and autos entering the Masonic Center garage were observed and could potentially continue to occur. To avoid such incidents, the project sponsor currently uses uniformed security personnel during large events to supplement the SFPD officer outside the garage entrance, to better control the flow of pedestrians, minimize conflicts, and increase pedestrian safety. The project sponsor is also required to keep all patron queuing for events within the Masonic Center property to manage and minimize potential pedestrian congestion on the sidewalk.

Many patrons have been observed arriving to events at the Masonic Center by taxi, with three or four vehicles observed with riders disembarking at the same time. Parking is prohibited in front of the Masonic Center prior to and during the event, to provide sufficient space for taxis and other vehicles to drop off passengers safely next to the curb, without blocking traffic on California Street. The estimated two percent increase in drop offs caused by increased capacity during sold-out events at the Auditorium would not be expected to substantially change the existing pedestrian conditions.

The proposed project would increase the amount of late evening events at the Masonic Center, resulting in more frequent evenings with additional pedestrian activity. However, because these increases in frequency and pedestrians would not result in substantial changes to existing conditions, in unacceptable operating conditions on any sidewalks, or in potentially hazardous conditions to pedestrians, the more frequent increases in pedestrian activity due to the proposed project would not cause significant pedestrian impacts. Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant, and no mitigation is necessary.

**Bicycle Impacts**

**Impact TR-4: The proposed project would not create potentially hazardous conditions for bicyclists, or otherwise substantially interfere with bicycle accessibility to the site and adjoining areas. (Less than Significant)**

The project site is within bicycling distance of office and retail buildings in downtown San Francisco and major transit hubs (Ferry Building, Transbay Terminal, BART, and Caltrain). However, it is anticipated that a very small portion of the 53 “other” trips generated by the proposed project would be bicycle trips. This is due to the steep grades in the area and the tendency for cyclists to choose an alternate mode of travel for evening events.

There is one bicycle route near the project site, along California and Taylor Streets. Although the proposed project would result in an increase of 34 vehicles in the vicinity of the project site, this increase would not be substantially different from current conditions (an increase of less than 4.5 percent) and would not adversely affect bicycle travel in the area.
Approximately 30 off-street bicycle spaces are provided inside the Masonic Center garage, and only two bicycles were observed using these spaces during observed events at the Masonic Auditorium. The 30 bicycle spaces are sufficient to accommodate any increase in bicycle travel to the Masonic Center as a result of the proposed project.

The proposed project would increase the amount of late evening events at the Masonic Center, resulting in more frequent evenings with increased bicycle trips and more evenings when there is an increase in vehicles in the vicinity. However, because these increases would not result in unacceptable bicycling conditions or in potentially hazardous conditions to bicyclists, the more frequent increases in bicycle travel and increases in vehicles in the vicinity would not result in significant impacts to bicycle facilities or travel by bicycle. Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant, and no mitigation is necessary.

However, to further reduce the less-than-significant bicycle impacts of the proposed project, City decision makers may decide to impose the following additional improvement measures (beyond those identified in the April 2012 CU) as conditions of approval. These bicycle improvement measures are as follows:

**Improvement Measure I-TR-4a** – The project sponsor shall expand project websites that provide transportation information to include bicycle route maps and indicate to patrons and employees ways of access to the site via the California/Taylor (#310) and the Sutter/Post (#16) bicycle routes; and

**Improvement Measure I-TR-4b** - The project sponsor shall install signage indicating the location of the bicycle parking spaces at the Masonic Center garage.

**Loading Impacts**

**Impact TR-5:** The loading demand of the proposed project during the peak hour of loading activities would be accommodated within the proposed on-site loading facilities or within convenient on-street loading zones, and would not create potentially hazardous traffic conditions or significant delays involving traffic, transit, bicycles, or pedestrians. *(Less than Significant)*

**Commercial Deliveries**

The Masonic Center requires that all catering unloading occur from the Pine Street loading dock and it has proposed to convert the catering kitchen to a permanent commercial kitchen with an on-site food and beverage provider. This conversion would reduce loading and unloading of one-time catering equipment and supplies to one truck trip prior to each event and would eliminate any such loading from the California Street curb. The maximum daily commercial kitchen unloading/loading demand at the Pine Street dock is estimated to be five trips (including the catering equipment truck), which represents a peak truck demand of about one vehicle per hour. The typical trucks that make catering deliveries are of the size (30 feet or less) that they can be accommodated within the Pine Street loading dock without blocking the sidewalk or travel lanes.
on Pine Street. The Pine Street loading dock also has sufficient capacity to accommodate this demand, and the use of the Pine Street loading dock by small trucks does not cause hazardous conditions or cause delays affecting traffic, transit, bicycles, or pedestrians. Therefore, the commercial delivery impacts of the proposed project would not be considered significant.

**Stage Equipment**

The in-house lighting and sound systems to be installed as part of the proposed project are expected to reduce the amount and frequency of equipment unloading and loading from California Street during non-live entertainment day events with more than 250 attendees, as compared to previous operations (with an average of 176 days under existing conditions, to be increased to an average of 220 days under the proposed project).

At the same time, there would be more days when large trucks use the California Street curb because the number of live entertainment event days at the Masonic Center would increase due to the proposed project from an average of 54 to up to 95 per year. The 76 percent increase in live entertainment event days would increase the number of days per year when the 185-foot long curb zone would need to be reserved for loading and unloading activities and when 10 to 12 parking spaces in front of the Masonic Center would be unavailable for general public parking.

As part of the proposed project, no trucks would be allowed to park at the curb in front of the Masonic Center except during unloading and loading of equipment before and after events. These trucks would be required to depart the premises at least 1½ hours before the beginning of the performance, park off-site, and not return for loading until after the conclusion of the performance. The California Street curb would provide sufficient on-street loading capacity to accommodate the stage equipment loading needs of the proposed project and would not cause hazardous conditions or cause delays affecting traffic, transit, bicycles, or pedestrians. Therefore, the truck stage equipment loading/unloading impacts of the proposed project would be less-than-significant.

**Performer Buses**

With the proposed project, there would be up to 41 additional days per year when the performers’ buses use the California Street curb because the number of live entertainment event days at the Masonic Center would increase from an average of 54 to up to 95 days per year. The California Street curb provides sufficient on-street loading capacity to accommodate two buses before and during events, and up to five buses at other times. A maximum of two performer buses are permitted to park in front of Masonic Center in the California Street loading area during the one and one-half hour period before and during events, to allow for sufficient space for a passenger
drop-off area and for vehicle queuing into the Masonic Center garage.\footnote{More than two buses are allowed to park at the 185-foot zone at other times when there is no need for passenger drop off and pick up and no truck loading or unloading is occurring.} When performers have one or two buses parked simultaneously at the curb in front of the Auditorium, the potential for inadequate curbside space on the south side of California Street would increase and vehicles attempting to dropoff attendees could cause congestion during the one and one-half hour period prior to the start of a show when audience members arrive.

There is approximately 185 feet of curb space available in front of the Auditorium on the south side of California Street, between Jones and Taylor streets, on an event day for passenger drop off and pick up activities. In those instances when one performers’ bus is parked at the curb, the available space is reduced to approximately 150 feet, which is sufficient to accommodate four or five vehicles pulling over to the curb simultaneously. When two performer’s buses are parked at the curb, the available space is reduced to about 105 feet, which is sufficient to accommodate three vehicles pulling over to the curb at the same time, increasing to four or five simultaneous vehicles when on-site staff is present to actively manage the curb operations.

Event Attendees

Multiple vehicles have been observed simultaneously dropping off and picking up attendees in front of the Auditorium before and after events, with an average drop-off vehicle arrival rate of 3.3 vehicles per 5-minute period, which would continue to be accommodated even when two performers’ buses are parked at the curb (since it typically takes less than a minute to embark/disembark). In those instances when two performers’ buses are parked at the curb, with on-site staff actively managing the curb operations by directing vehicles to move closer together, the available space would be sufficient to accommodate three vehicles pulling over to the curb simultaneously.

The project sponsor has been positioning uniformed security personnel in front of the drop off zone during high attendance events since the beginning of 2009 to direct vehicles to stop as far east as possible, to prevent automobiles from queuing to access the curb, and to manage conflicts between vehicles dropping off attendees and those vehicles entering the Masonic Center garage. With these measures in place, conflicts between performer buses and attendee unloading and loading would remain less-than-significant.

The proposed project would increase the number of late evening events at the Masonic Center, resulting in more frequent evenings when loading activities, performer bus parking, and attendee loading drop-offs and pick-ups occur at the curb. However, because loading activities, performer bus parking, and attendee drop-offs and pick-ups do not result in hazardous conditions or delays affecting traffic, transit, bicycles, or pedestrians with the management measures in place since 2009, and they continue to be actively managed through the issuance of permits and on-site
security personnel, the more frequent increases in loading activities and performer bus parking and event attendee drop-off would be less-than-significant, provided these measures continue to be implemented. Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant, and no mitigation is necessary.

However, to further reduce the less-than-significant loading impacts of the proposed project, City decision makers may decide to impose the following additional improvement measures (beyond those identified in the April 2012 CU) as conditions of approval. These loading improvement measures are as follows:

**Improvement Measure I-TR-5a** - Except during the one and one-half hour period before and during events, the on-site Masonic Center Production Manager and production staff shall direct trucks and performer buses to park as far west as possible within the 185-foot loading zone on California Street as shown in Figure 13 of the TIS to minimize conflicts with the 1177 California Street (Gramercy Tower) driveway and cross traffic onto California Street.

**Improvement Measure I-TR-5b** - The project sponsor shall prohibit the use of the California Street entrances and designate the Pine Street loading dock as the sole access for all loading and unloading to the commercial kitchen and for normal building operation supplies.

**Emergency Access Impacts**

**Impact TR-6: Construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access. (Less than Significant)**

The proposed project would not result in reconfiguration of any of the existing roadways, nor would it change any of the existing access points into the building. As a result, emergency vehicle access to the project site would remain the same as under existing conditions, including the continued management during large events by on-site event security personnel and SFPD officers of vehicle flows at the California Street passenger drop off zone and Masonic Center garage entrance.

While the proposed project would increase the number of pedestrians and vehicles in the vicinity of the site and the number of days during the year that this increase occurs, emergency access to the site would remain adequate, particularly given the acceptable levels of service anticipated at the near-by intersections. In addition, the presence of event security personnel and SFPD officers on-site would facilitate emergency vehicle and personnel access to the site. Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant, and no mitigation is necessary.
Construction Impacts

Impact TR-7: Construction-related impacts of the proposed project would not be considered significant. (Less than Significant)

The project sponsor estimates that proposed interior construction and renovations to the Masonic Center would take approximately seven months. If approved, proposed renovation of the Masonic Center would likely begin in 2014.

All renovation activities would occur within the interior of the Masonic Center except for demolition debris removal, and concrete mixing and pouring to install the new stage and tiered flooring in the main floor of the Auditorium. Interior demolition and debris removal would require delivery and pick-up of approximately 20 debris boxes during the first month of project renovations, primarily for removal of the existing flooring, fixed seating, and stage in the main floor of the Auditorium. There would also be approximately 10 debris boxes delivered and picked up at various times throughout the seven-month renovation period for drywall removal. Debris boxes would be staged in the 185-foot-long curbside area on the south side of California Street in front of the Masonic Center.

Interior construction of the new stage and tiered flooring in the main floor of the Auditorium would require concrete pouring for a total of five days over a three-month period, including one day in Month 2, three consecutive days in Month 3, and one day in Month 4. On these days, a maximum of eight concrete delivery trucks would use the California Street curbside area (one truck arriving every 40 minutes or more) to deliver premixed concrete; and one concrete pump truck would be staged in the curbside area for the entire day when concrete pouring occurs. No excavation, foundation or below-grade construction would occur. During the proposed renovations, no events would occur in the Auditorium and ground-floor California Room and Exhibition Hall.

Work would be performed during regular business hours and the construction contractors would be required to follow the most recent version of the Regulations for Working in San Francisco Streets manual (the “Blue Book”). Construction trucks would either be parked inside the Masonic Center garage or on the street at the curb in front of the Auditorium, without interrupting either lane on eastbound California Street. The California Street curb has sufficient length to simultaneously accommodate up to four 40-foot long trucks (the length of a typical concrete delivery truck). The impact of construction truck traffic on the nearby streets would be a temporary lessening of their traffic-carrying capacities, due to the slower movement and larger

---

25 In Month 2, there would be approximately seven concrete truck deliveries on one day; in Month 3, there would be approximately eight deliveries each day for three days; and in Month 4, there would be approximately four deliveries on one day. Daniel O’Hara, Project Manager, Turner Construction, Email communication, April 23, 2012.
turning radii of trucks, which may affect traffic and transit operations and cause additional conflicts with existing vehicle, transit, pedestrian, and bicycle traffic in the project vicinity.

Although the sidewalk in front of the project site could be closed for periods of time during project construction, subject to City review and approval, such as concrete pouring, these closures would be temporary in nature and alternative pedestrian circulation routes would be provided during such closures; for example, along the north side of California Street.

If it is determined that any temporary traffic lane, parking lane, or sidewalk closures would be needed, the closures would be coordinated with City staff in order to minimize the effects on local traffic and circulation. Lane and sidewalk closures are subject to review and approval by the City’s Transportation Advisory Staff Committee (TASC), which consists of representatives of City departments including SFMTA, DPW, Fire, Police, Public Health, Port, and the Taxi Commission. There are no Muni bus stops adjacent to the project site that would need relocation.

The maximum number of construction truck deliveries (eight spaced over one day) is well within the daily variations of local traffic, and would not significantly impact traffic, transit, pedestrian, or bicycling conditions. Overall, due to the limited nature and duration of construction-related impacts, the project would result in less-than-significant construction-related traffic impacts. Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant, and no mitigation is necessary.

Parking Discussion

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 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, and from month to month. 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 Section 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.”

The transportation analysis accounts for potential secondary effects, such as cars circling and looking for a parking space near the Masonic Center, because they are based on actual field traffic counts collected during actual events. Moreover, the secondary effects of drivers attending other concurrent events are also accounted for since the transportation data collection efforts were conducted when other events, attracting up to 1,000 people were taking place in the vicinity of the Auditorium. 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.

The proposed project would not add to the parking currently available; the Masonic Center garage provides approximately 360 parking spaces during an event. In addition, a combined total of another 360 spaces are available on an event evening at the Grace Cathedral, Crocker, and Fairmont Hotel garages, bringing the total number of spaces available in the vicinity of the Center to approximately 720. About 10 to 12 parking spaces in residential parking zone “C” located in front of the Auditorium are eliminated prior to and during an event, to provide for a loading/unloading passenger zone.

Parking demand is shown in Table 4.C.14: Off-Street Public Parking Garage Supply and Occupancy - Late Evening (6:15 to 8:15 PM) Peak Period. The proposed project would generate a total parking demand for 790 spaces during a 3,300-attendance event, compared to a demand for approximately 760 spaces under current conditions during a 3,166-attendance event (an increase of 30 spaces).

As shown in Tables 4.C.10: Parking Demand on Event Day – Late Evening (6:15 to 8:15 PM) Peak Period (p. 4.C.35) and Table 4.C.14: Off-Street Public Parking Garage Supply and

26 Taking into account the typical occupancy of those garages on a non-event day, when no concurrent events take place in the area.
Table 4.C.14: Off-Street Public Parking Garage Supply and Occupancy - Late Evening (6:15 to 8:15 PM) Peak Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Parking Spaces</th>
<th>Without Concurrent Events</th>
<th>With Concurrent Events&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total parking spaces available</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>855</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spaces occupied on a No-Event Day</td>
<td>186 (22%)</td>
<td>186 (22%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking demand for a 3,166-attendance event</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles parked at nearby garages</td>
<td>760&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>760&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles parked outside the study area garages</td>
<td>40&lt;sup&gt;c d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>460&lt;sup&gt;c d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking demand for proposed project (3,300 attendance)</td>
<td>790&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>790&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles parked at nearby garages</td>
<td>720&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>300&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles parked outside the study area garages</td>
<td>70&lt;sup&gt;c d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>490&lt;sup&gt;c d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
<sup>a</sup> Concurrent events attracting 200 to 900 attendees took place at the time the parking data was collected.
<sup>b</sup> See Table 4.C.7: Off-Street Parking Garage Supply and Occupancy - Existing Conditions - Late Evening (6:15 to 8:15 PM) Peak Period
<sup>c</sup> See Table 4.C.10: Parking Demand on Event Day – Late Evening (6:15 to 8:15 PM) Peak Period.
<sup>d</sup> Some of these vehicles might park outside the area to avoid the $30 (Masonic Center garage) to $60 (Crocker garage) parking rates charged during events; the parking rate at the Sutter/Stockton public garage (1,865 spaces, located five blocks away) is $1.00 per hour from 6 PM until 9 AM.


Occupancy - Late Evening (6:15 to 8:15 PM) Peak Period (above), there is sufficient capacity in the vicinity of the Auditorium to accommodate up to 720 vehicles, which represents over 90 percent of the project demand when no other large concurrent events take place in the area. The proposed project demand for parking at locations further away from the site is not precisely known, but it is estimated that it could be up to 100 vehicles, some of which might be used by drivers to avoid the $30 (Masonic Center garage) to $60 (Crocker garage) parking rates charged during events. For example, the parking rate at the 1,865-space Sutter/Stockton public garage, which has excess parking capacity in the evenings, is $1.00 per hour from 6 PM until 9 AM, resulting in an approximate total parking cost of about $5.00 for an event. The Sutter/Stockton garage is located approximately five blocks southeast and downhill from the Masonic Center.

However, when there are concurrent events of up to 1,000 attendees occurring in the vicinity of the Auditorium, such as December 3, 2011, parking availability is substantially reduced. (See Table 4.C.14, “With Concurrent Events” column). In this type of instance, because the lack of on- or off-street parking availability, close to 500 vehicles would then have to park further away from the site, such as at the Sutter/Stockton garage.

On-street parking is prohibited in front of the Auditorium on event days, temporarily eliminating spaces for approximately 10 to 12 vehicles. These spaces are subject to residential parking permit “C” regulations. Thus, the more frequent events planned as part of the proposed project would

reduce the on-street parking availability of those 10 to 12 parking spaces to residents and visitors more often than under the current conditions.

As part of the April 2012 CU conditions of approval, the project sponsor has already implemented parking operations measures to minimize the traffic queues on California Street in front of the Masonic Center and improving the flow of traffic at the nearby intersections. These measures include:

- Increasing the number of entrance lanes into the garage from one to two;
- Moving fixed price ticket sellers at Masonic Center garage further inside the building;
- Adding staff inside the garage to increase the vehicle entry rate;
- Positioning uniformed security personnel (including SFPD personnel at large events) outside the garage to direct vehicles, as well as control the pedestrians crossing in front of the entrance;
- Place temporary plastic delineators in the center of California Street in front of the project site and a barricade in front of the garage entrance to physically prevent westbound vehicles on California Street from turning left into the garage;
- Positioning uniformed security personnel in front of the Masonic Center to discourage double parking on California Street;
- Facilitating and encouraging pre-purchased parking.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Impact C-TR-1: The proposed project would not contribute considerably to future cumulative traffic increases that would cause levels of service to deteriorate to unacceptable levels at seven intersections. (Less than Significant)

2035 Traffic Impacts

Table 4.C.15: Existing, Existing plus Project and 2035 Cumulative Conditions Intersection Level of Service - Weekday Late Evening Peak Hour presents a comparison of intersection delays and LOS on a non-event day, a 3,300-attendance event day, and a day with a 3,300-attendance event with 2035 cumulative conditions during the Friday late evening peak hour. Table 4.C.16: Existing, Existing plus Project and 2035 Cumulative Conditions Intersection Level of Service - Weekend Late Evening Peak Hour compares the same three conditions during the weekend late evening peak hour. The traffic analysis focuses on the late evening peak period (6:15 PM to 8:15 PM) rather than the night period (10:30 PM to 12:30 AM) since delays and traffic volumes are higher during the former.
### Table 4.C.15: Existing, Existing plus Project and 2035 Cumulative Conditions Intersection Level of Service -Weekday Late Evening Peak Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing 1,900-attendance Event</th>
<th>Existing plus Project 3,300-attendance Event</th>
<th>2035 Cumulative 3,300-attendance Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delay(^b) Level of Service</td>
<td>Delay(^b) Level of Service</td>
<td>Delay(^b) Level of Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento/Jones(^c)</td>
<td>15.7 (WB) C (WB)</td>
<td>22.6 (WB) C (WB)</td>
<td>24.2 (WB) C (WB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California/Jones</td>
<td>20.1 C</td>
<td>48.9 D</td>
<td>53.1 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine/Jones</td>
<td>21.8 C</td>
<td>23.3 C</td>
<td>28.9 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento/Taylor(^c)</td>
<td>12.5 (NB) B (NB)</td>
<td>15.2 (NB) C (NB)</td>
<td>15.6 (NB) C (NB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California/Taylor</td>
<td>21.6 B</td>
<td>47.9 D</td>
<td>50.9 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine/Taylor</td>
<td>17.0 B</td>
<td>18.5 B</td>
<td>20.0 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California/Mason</td>
<td>28.9 C</td>
<td>52.3 D</td>
<td>54.6 D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

\(^a\) The highest 60-minute period between 6:15 PM and 8:15 PM.

\(^b\) Intersection delay presented in seconds per vehicle.

\(^c\) For unsignalized intersections, delay is presented for the worst stop-controlled approach.

*Source: Adavant Consulting, LCW Consulting – August 2012*

### Table 4.C.16: Existing, Existing plus Project and 2035 Cumulative Conditions Intersection Level of Service -Weekend Late Evening Peak Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing Sold-out Event</th>
<th>Existing plus Project 3,300-attendance Event</th>
<th>2035 Cumulative 3,300-attendance Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delay(^b) Level of Service</td>
<td>Delay(^b) Level of Service</td>
<td>Delay(^b) Level of Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento/Jones(^c)</td>
<td>14.2 (SB) B (SB)</td>
<td>14.6 (SB) B (SB)</td>
<td>15.3 (SB) C (SB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California/Jones</td>
<td>40.7 D</td>
<td>45.7 D</td>
<td>47.4 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine/Jones</td>
<td>13.1 B</td>
<td>13.3 B</td>
<td>13.6 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento/Taylor(^c)</td>
<td>13.4 (NB) B (NB)</td>
<td>13.8 (NB) B (NB)</td>
<td>14.0 (NB) B (NB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California/Taylor</td>
<td>44.0 D</td>
<td>48.4 D</td>
<td>51.4 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine/Taylor</td>
<td>13.7 B</td>
<td>13.9 B</td>
<td>14.1 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California/Mason</td>
<td>42.0 D</td>
<td>49.8 D</td>
<td>53.4 D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

\(^a\) The highest 60-minute period between 6:15 PM and 8:15 PM.

\(^b\) Intersection delay presented in seconds per vehicle.

\(^c\) For unsignalized intersections, delay is presented for the worst stop-controlled approach.

*Source: Adavant Consulting, LCW Consulting – August 2012*

The cumulative growth background traffic for the study intersections between today and 2035 would be minimal, resulting in small increases in the average delay per vehicle at all the study intersections on weekdays and weekends. All the study intersections would continue to operate at LOS D or better on both days, with some individual intersections approaches, such as on eastbound California Street at Jones, Taylor and Mason, operating at worse conditions such as LOS E or F.

Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant, and no mitigation is necessary.
Impact C-TR-2: The proposed project would not contribute considerably to cumulative increases in transit ridership that would cause the levels of service to deteriorate to unacceptable levels. (Less than Significant)

Since the number of net new transit trips to/from the Masonic Center generated by the maximum capacity would represent less than three percent of the total number of peak hour riders on the transit system, well within the daily variations of transit ridership, the proposed project would not be considered a significant cumulative transit impact to transit conditions in 2035. The increase in five riders utilizing the regional transit lines to arrive/depart from San Francisco would also fall within the normal variations of daily transit ridership and would not be considered a significant cumulative transit demand impact for the regional transit lines.

Since 2035 Cumulative traffic conditions at the study intersections on Sacramento and Pine Streets would be LOS C or better, traffic conditions with the proposed project as forecast for 2035 would not interfere with those Muni lines operating on adjacent streets, such as the 1 California. The three intersections on California Street would operate closer to capacity, at LOS D, with the eastbound approaches operating in some instances at LOS E (maximum capacity), which could affect eastbound cable car operations. To this end, the project sponsor currently positions uniformed security personnel at the passenger drop off zone in front of the Auditorium to better manage passenger activities and queuing at the Masonic Center garage entrance, thereby minimizing the lane congestion that could affect eastbound cable car service.

Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant, and no mitigation is necessary.

Impact C-TR-3: The construction impacts of the proposed project would not result in a considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact when combined with other nearby proposed projects. (No Impact)

The construction of the proposed project is not expected to overlap with the construction of other projects proposed nearby. The only reasonably foreseeable nearby cumulative project would be the proposed Academy of Art purchase of nearby buildings, described in Section 4.A., Land Use. Since the land uses in these buildings are already part of the existing setting of the project vicinity and would not change if the Academy of Art purchased the buildings, they are not considered cumulative development projects in the analysis of cumulative land use impacts. Therefore, there would be no cumulative construction impact on nearby transportation, and no mitigation measures are necessary.
D. NOISE

The topic of Noise was addressed in the Initial Study (see Chapter 8, Appendix A, pp. 49-50) and is analyzed in this section of the EIR because the Initial Study determined that noise impacts would be potentially significant.

This section of the EIR discusses noise, including acoustic and vibration. The Environmental Setting discussion explains how sound and vibration are characterized and describes the existing baseline noise environment in the vicinity of the Masonic Center site. The Regulatory Framework discussion summarizes relevant noise-related regulations and standards. The Impacts and Mitigation Measures discussion addresses the changes in noise levels and vibration/groundborne noise that would occur if the proposed project is implemented, and identifies measures to reduce or avoid project impacts. The Impacts discussion also considers whether the proposed project in combination with other reasonably foreseeable development projects would contribute to cumulative environmental impacts related to noise. This section also based on and incorporates the results of the Environmental Background Noise Study.¹

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

FUNDAMENTALS OF ENVIRONMENTAL NOISE

Sound is characterized by various parameters that describe the rate of oscillation (frequency) of sound waves, the distance between successive troughs or crests in the wave, the speed that it travels, and the pressure level or energy content of a given sound. The sound pressure level has become the most common descriptor used to characterize the loudness of an ambient sound, and the decibel (dB) scale is used to quantify sound intensity. Because sound can vary in intensity by over one million times within the range of human hearing, a logarithmic loudness scale is used to keep sound intensity numbers at a convenient and manageable level. Since the human ear is not equally sensitive to all sound frequencies within the entire spectrum, human response is factored into sound descriptions in a process called “A-weighting,” expressed as “dBA.” The dBA, or A-weighted decibel, refers to a scale of noise measurement that approximates the range of sensitivity of the human ear to sounds of different frequencies. On this scale, the normal range of human hearing extends from about 0 dBA to about 140 dBA. Except in carefully controlled laboratory experiments, a change of only 1 dBA in sound level cannot be perceived. Outside of the laboratory, a 3 dBA change is considered a just-noticeable difference. A 10 dBA increase in sound level is subjectively heard as approximately a doubling in loudness. The noise levels

¹ Charles M. Salter Associates, Inc., Nob Hill Masonic Center Final Environmental Background Noise Study, December 11, 2012 (hereinafter “Final Environmental Background Noise Study”), p. 8. This document is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California, as part of Case File No. 2011.0471E.
presented herein are expressed in terms of dBA, unless otherwise indicated. Table 4.D.1: Typical Sound Levels Measured in the Environment, shows some representative noise sources and their corresponding noise levels in dBA.

Table 4.D.1: Typical Sound Levels Measured in the Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples of Common, Easily Recognized Sounds</th>
<th>Decibels (dBA) at 50 feet</th>
<th>Subjective Evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Near Jet Engine</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold of Pain (Discomfort)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Deafening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold of Feeling – Hard Rock Band</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerating Motorcycle (at a few feet away)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loud Horn (at 10 feet away)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noisy Urban Street</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Very Loud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noisy Factory</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Cafeteria with Untreated Surfaces</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Loud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Freeway Auto Traffic</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Office</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Radio Music in Apartment</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Faint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Residence Without Stereo Playing</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Whisper</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rustle of Leaves in Wind</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Very Faint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Breathing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold of Audibility</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Continuous exposure above 85 dBA is likely to degrade the hearing of most people. Range of speech is 50 to 70 dBA.


Planning for acceptable noise exposure must take into account the types of activities and corresponding noise sensitivity in a specified location for a generalized land use type. Some general guidelines are as follows: sleep disturbance can occur at levels above 35 dBA; interference with human speech begins at about 60 dBA; and hearing damage can result from prolonged exposure to noise levels in excess of 85 to 90 dBA.²

Attenuation of Noise

Distance from a source affects how noise levels attenuate (decrease). Transportation noise sources that tend to be arranged linearly, such as roadway traffic, attenuate at a rate of 3.0 dBA to

² U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), Information on Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety, March 1974, Appendices C and D. A copy of this document is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California, as part of Case File No. 2011.0471E.
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4.5 dBA per doubling of distance from the source.\(^3\) Point sources of noise, including stationary, fixed, and idle mobile sources like idling vehicles or construction equipment, attenuate at a rate of 6.0 dBA to 7.5 dBA per doubling of distance from the source.

Significant attenuation of noise levels can also be accomplished by “shielding” or providing a barrier, which may be in the form of an intervening structure or terrain. The amount of noise level reduction provided by a barrier close to a source is dependent on the potential for reflection of noise around the barrier and the frequency spectra of the noise. Atmospheric conditions such as wind speeds, wind direction, humidity, and temperature gradients also affect noise propagation at greater distances.

**Noise Descriptors**

Time variations in noise exposure are typically expressed in terms of a steady-state energy level (the equivalent noise level or “L\(_{eq}\)” ) that represents the acoustical energy of a given measurement. L\(_{eq}\) is used to describe noise over a specified period of time, in terms of a single numerical value. The L\(_{eq}\) is the constant sound level that would contain the same acoustic energy as the varying sound level, during the same time period (i.e., the average noise exposure level for the given time period). Because community receptors are more sensitive to unwanted noise intrusion during the evening and at night, for planning purposes, an increment of 10 dBA is added to nighttime (10:00 PM to 7:00 AM) noise levels to form a 24-hour noise descriptor called the day-night noise level (L\(_{dn}\) ). The maximum noise level (L\(_{max}\) ) is the maximum instantaneous noise level measured during the measurement period of interest. The L\(_{max,90}\) is the noise measurement descriptor used to describe existing ambient noise levels in comparison to the proposed project. The L\(_{eq}\), L\(_{max}\), and the other statistical descriptors for noise that are used here are defined in terms of dBA using the A-weighted sound pressure level (also called sound level or noise level) scale described above.

**Health Effects of Environmental Noise**

The World Health Organization (WHO) is perhaps the best source of current knowledge regarding health impacts because European nations have continued to study noise and its health effects, while the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) all but eliminated its noise investigation and control program in the 1970s.\(^4\) According to WHO, sleep disturbance can occur when continuous indoor noise levels exceed 30 dBA or when intermittent interior noise levels

---

\(^3\) The additional 1.5 dBA of attenuation is from ground-effect attenuation that occurs above soft absorptive ground (such as normal earth and most ground with vegetation). Over hard ground (such as concrete, stone, and very hard-packed earth) these effects do not occur. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, *The Noise Guidebook*, 1985, p. 24.

\(^4\) The *San Francisco General Plan* Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Community Noise are from this era.
reach 45 dBA, particularly if background noise is low. With a bedroom window slightly open (a reduction from outside to inside of 15 dBA), the WHO criteria suggest that exterior continuous (ambient) nighttime noise levels should be 45 dBA or below, and short-term events should not generate noise in excess of 60 dBA. WHO also notes that maintaining noise levels within the recommended levels during the first part of the night is believed to be effective for the ability to fall asleep.\(^5\)

Other potential health effects of noise identified by WHO include decreased performance for complex cognitive tasks, such as reading, attention span, problem solving, and memorization; physiological effects such as hypertension and heart disease (after many years of constant exposure, often by workers, to high noise levels); and hearing impairment (again, generally after long-term occupational exposure, although possible due to shorter-term exposure to very high noise levels, for example, exposure several times a year to concert noise at 100 dBA). Finally, noise can cause annoyance and can trigger emotional reactions like anger, depression, and anxiety. WHO reports that during daytime hours, few people are seriously annoyed by activities with noise levels below 55 dBA, or moderately annoyed by activities with noise levels below 50 dBA. The importance of noise to receptors depends on both time and context. For example, long-term high noise levels from heavy traffic volumes can make conversation at a normal voice level difficult or impossible, while short-term peak noise levels occurring at night can disturb sleep.

**EXISTING NOISE ENVIRONMENT**

**Existing Ambient Noise Sources**\(^6\)

Environmental noise in dense urban settings with a mix of land uses is primarily dependent on proximity to vehicular traffic and transit on the adjacent roadways. As is the case in most dense urban settings, ambient noise in the project area is generated mostly by roadway traffic (autos, trucks, buses), by the San Francisco Municipal Railway (Muni) cable car line on California Street immediately adjacent to project site and on Powell Street two blocks east of project site, and by multiple Muni bus lines operating along Pine Street and Bush Street to the south (the 1 California AX/BX, 31 Balboa AX/BX, and 38 Geary AX/BX Expresses) and along Sacramento and Clay streets to the north (the 1 California). Delivery and garbage trucks making trips to neighboring residential, hotel and institutional buildings also generate noise. To a lesser extent, noise from outdoor activities (e.g., loading activities and people talking) associated with events at the


\(^6\) Ambient noise is generally defined as the level of the total existing background noise in an area. Except for instantaneous noise measurements, existing noise sources were measured and reported for ambient noise levels that exceed existing ambient noise levels 90 percent of the time for each hour that noise measurements were conducted measured as L\(_{90}\).
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Masonic Auditorium and/or other nearby venues such as Grace Cathedral and the Fairmont and Mark Hopkins Hotels, as well as sirens from emergency vehicles, also contribute to the existing noise environment.

In addition to traffic, cable car and mechanical noise, there are other intermittent sources of noise in the site vicinity, such as traffic traveling over steel plates on California Street (covered access to cable car infrastructure), truck back-up beepers, trucks loading and unloading materials, street sweepers and garbage collection trucks, car doors slamming, and engines revving during deliveries and pick-ups. The steep grade of roadways surrounding the project site also contributes to increased vehicle noise. Due to the slope of the roadway, cable car operators on California Street must limit their speed and ring a bell for safety reasons, increasing noise levels generated as they pass the site. At the intersection of California and Taylor Streets, vehicles also regularly rev their engines, squeal tires, and honk horns due to the significant grade and reduced visibility of cars approaching California Street from the south.

The San Francisco General Plan includes a map of background noise levels throughout the City. The map, which is based on noise modeling conducted by the San Francisco Department of Public Health of baseline traffic from the San Francisco County Transportation Authority travel demand model, shows the range of day-night noise (L_{dn}) values that occurs along every street in San Francisco. It indicates that three roadway segments adjacent to the project site – California, Taylor, and Pine Streets – have noise levels above 70 dBA (L_{dn}), which is the highest range of day-night noise (L_{dn}) values.7

Existing On-Site Noise Sources

On-site noise sources generated during events held at the Masonic Center are described below in the discussion of “Existing Ambient Noise Levels” on pp. 4.D.7-4.D.13. Other existing on-site noise sources include fixed-source mechanical ventilation systems, and daily, early morning solid waste collection and compost pick-up at the Pine Street loading dock.

The April 2012 Conditional Use (CU) authorization specified operational procedures to reduce existing noise levels during events at the Masonic Center. The Masonic Center currently operates under the noise-related conditions of approval imposed by the April 2012 CU Authorization listed below. These conditions are expected to apply after implementation of the proposed project, unless modified through approval of the proposed renovation project.

- **Loading Noise.** To minimize noise during loading and unloading operations on California Street, the Project Sponsor shall install prior to loading and unloading

---

activities a resilient surface material, such as rubber or vinyl, on truck ramps, pavement, sidewalk and the ramp and incorporate transition strips between different surfaces and shall direct that truck engines be turned off except when moving the vehicle or functions that require engine power are occurring, such as lowering or raising of hydraulic ramps. (Condition No.11)

- **Loading and Unloading Activities.** Personnel conducting loading and unloading activities on California Street shall be instructed to minimize the volume of conversation and prohibit the playing of amplified music outside the building during loading and unloading, particularly during nighttime hours. (Condition No. 12)

- **On-Site Electric Power for Event Buses.** The Project Sponsor shall provide electric power on the south side of California Street for event buses in order to ensure the quiet and clean powering of these vehicles and shall direct that all performer buses parking at this zone connect to this electric power and not run their engines or generators. (Condition No. 14)

- **Noise Control.** The premises shall be adequately soundproofed or insulated for noise and operated so that incidental noise shall not be audible beyond the premises and fixed-source equipment noise shall not exceed the decibel levels specified in the San Francisco Noise Control Ordinance. (Condition No. 22)

- **Entertainment and Assembly.** The entertainment and assembly functions shall be performed within the enclosed building only. The building shall be adequately soundproofed or insulated for noise and operated so that incidental noise shall not be audible beyond the premises or in other sections of the building and fixed-source equipment noise shall not exceed the decibel levels specified in the San Francisco Noise Control Ordinance. Bass and vibrations shall also be contained within the enclosed structure. The Project Sponsor shall obtain all necessary approvals from the Entertainment Commission and also comply with all of the conditions imposed by the Entertainment Commission. (Condition No. 25)

**Ambient Noise Measurements**

A survey of existing ambient noise levels was conducted at and in the vicinity of the project site over two time periods. Noise measurements were conducted during the following two periods: (1) Thursday, October 13, 2011, through Sunday October 23, 2011, and Thursday, December 1, 2011, through Monday, December 5, 2011. During these two measurement periods, additional on-site measurements, monitoring, and field observations were conducted during three live–entertainment music concert events held in the Auditorium to assess existing noise during live entertainment events: Il Volo – Friday, October 14, 2011, and Sting – Friday, December 2, 2011, and Saturday, December 3, 2011. 9

---

8 Ambient noise is defined as the noise generated by all typical and regularly occurring activities in an area (e.g., vehicle traffic, cable car pass-bys, and aircraft flyovers). For the proposed project, ambient refers to all existing noise except for that which is generated by large events and associated exterior activities (e.g., loading, patron noise including vehicles) that occur at the Masonic Center.

9 Final Environmental Background Noise Study, p. 6.
Long-term noise monitors, which record noise for 24 or more consecutive hours, were placed at nine locations in and around the project site to collect noise measurements. These measurements were conducted to establish existing ambient noise levels at the project site and its vicinity with and without events at the Masonic Center. The noise measurements also account for ambient noise levels related to events held simultaneously at the Masonic Center Auditorium and nearby venues. The noise measurement locations are listed below and shown in Figure 4.D.1: Long-Term Noise Measurement Locations:

- Location 1: Masonic Center Accessible and Pedestrian Ramps
- Location 2: Gramercy Towers, 1177 California Street
- Location 3: Northeast corner of California and Jones Street
- Location 4: Grace Cathedral, Midblock on California Street
- Location 5: Grace Cathedral Garage Entrance, Taylor Street
- Location 6: Huntington Park, southwest corner
- Location 7: Southeast corner of California and Taylor Streets
- Location 8: Northeast corner of Taylor and Pine Streets
- Location 9: Masonic Center Pine Street Loading Dock

The noise monitors at Locations 1, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 9 were programmed to record audio files when noise levels exceeded a certain level to confirm the source of elevated ambient noise levels and to determine if recorded noise levels were generated by event-related activities at the Masonic Center and/or other venues, or extraneous noise sources such as cable cars, car horns, and emergency vehicle sirens.

**Existing Ambient Noise Levels**

Existing ambient noise levels for conditions without and with events at the Masonic auditorium are described below. Also described are noise levels generated by simultaneous events held at nearby venues in combination with events at the Center.

**Existing Non-Event Ambient Noise Levels**

Based on observations and continuous 24-hour noise monitoring, noise levels at the project site and in its vicinity were determined to be influenced primarily by vehicular traffic on local roadways and cable cars operating along California Street.\(^\text{10}\) On non-event days, the highest maximum instantaneous (single event) noise level (L\(_{\text{max}}\)) at Location 1 on California Street was approximately 82 dBA generated by track noise during cable car passbys. At Location 9, the Pine

\(^{10}\) *Final Environmental Background Noise Study*, p. 8.
Street loading dock area, the maximum instantaneous, single event noise level was approximately 87 dBA generated by fire truck passbys on Pine Street; general traffic volumes produced a maximum noise level of 66 dBA at Location 9.\textsuperscript{11} The maximum instantaneous noise level measurements on non-event days generally confirm that existing ambient noise levels at the project site and in its vicinity are influenced primarily by cable cars operating on California Street, and by bus and other vehicular traffic on local roadways. These results also are consistent with the estimated background noise levels [in excess of 70 dBA (L_{eq})] for the California and Pine Streets roadway segments nearest the project site, as indicated on the City’s Background Noise Levels Map and described above on p. 4.D.5.

Existing Event-Related Ambient Noise Levels

To assess event-related noise, 24-hour noise measurements were conducted and monitored continuously during two typical, large nighttime live music concert events held at the Masonic Center Auditorium to quantify typical noise levels.\textsuperscript{12} These concerts were held on Friday, October 14, 2011 (Il Volo), and Friday, December 2, 2011, and Saturday, December 3, 2011 (Sting). The Il Volo concert had an attendance of approximately 1,825 patrons (about 60 percent of existing seated capacity in the Auditorium) and both of the Sting concerts were sold-out events with maximum seated attendance in the Auditorium of approximately 3,166 persons. During the December 3\textsuperscript{rd} Sting concert, there were two simultaneous evening events held at nearby venues, in particular a corporate holiday party held at the Mark Hopkins Hotel with 800 attendees. As such, event-related noise associated with the December 3\textsuperscript{rd} Sting concert represents the upper bound of existing ambient noise levels measured for live-entertainment concert events at the Masonic Center Auditorium.

Noise levels associated with each of these live-entertainment events were studied in the 24-hour on-site noise measurements. The following types of noise-generating event-related activities were observed:

- Equipment loading/unloading at California Street curbside loading zone and Pine Street loading dock
- Tour bus operations
- Event attendees milling/congregating at front sidewalk and portico of Masonic Center
- Event attendees conversing when walking to the event on surrounding sidewalks, event attendees being dropped off and picked up, attendees and general public driving to/from the event
- Attendees and the general public parking in Masonic Center garage and

\textsuperscript{11} Final Environmental Background Noise Study, p. 10.
\textsuperscript{12} Noise data for the December 3\textsuperscript{rd} event includes event-related noise from simultaneous events being held at the Fairmont, Mark Hopkins, and Stanford Court Hotels.
• Scalpers advertising to sell tickets

In addition to the 24-hour continuous noise measurements, during the October 14, 2011 and December 3, 2011 events, on-site field observations were conducted and on-site noise data was collected with handheld noise monitors at Location 1, directly in front of the Masonic Center at the southwest corner of the project site at the foot of the accessible/pedestrian ramp on California Street, and Location 9, at the Pine Street loading dock area. Hand-held measurements at the fence along the Gramercy Towers property line were also conducted. These two locations were chosen based on their proximity to the closest noise-sensitive receptors at Gramercy Towers, and residents that abut or are within the block of the Pine Street loading dock. The on-site field observations and measurement data focused on existing event-related noise attributable to performer bus operations and equipment unloading/loading in the California Street loading zone and loading activities at the Pine Street loading dock area. Noise monitors on the project site were programmed to provide continuous 24-hour measurements of ambient noise levels on non-concert days before and after the event; therefore, the full range of concert-related noise at Location 1 and Location 9 are included in the noise data. Table 4.D.2: Measured Event-Related Single-Event Noise at Location 1 and Location 9 by Source presents the maximum noise levels for various activities recorded by these measurements.

At Location 1 (Masonic Center California Street loading zone), noise sources associated with event-related attendee and performer equipment unloading/loading activities range between 65 dBA and 86 dBA. Noise sources related to truck unloading/loading activities in the California Street loading zone include occurrences of truck back-up beepers, tailgates being lowered, and equipment being rolled onto the sidewalk to access the accessible/pedestrian ramp. Also at Location 1, noise sources related to attendee and pedestrian activity during events, such as voices being raised to hail cabs and car doors being slammed, range between 68 dBA and 79 dBA. The highest single-event measurement of 86 dBA was measured at Location 1 for tailgate lifting at the accessible/pedestrian ramp; however, the hand-held measurement at the fence along the Gramercy Towers property line was measured at 70 dBA, which is below the Lmax noise levels of 82 dBA generated by general traffic and cable car passbys on California Street under existing conditions for non-event related activities. The noise measurements at Location 1 indicate that, at under existing conditions, event-related activities are within the range of existing ambient noise levels during non-event days that affect nearby residential noise receptors at Gramercy Towers.

At Location 9 (Pine Street loading dock), noise sources associated with the Pine Street loading dock/secondary garage exit include noise sources such as air brakes from a catering truck (80 dBA), event patron cars exiting the garage (66 dBA), the garage ramp banging against the loading dock structure (70 dBA), and staging materials inside of the truck prior to unloading.
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Table 4.D.2: Measured Event-Related Single-Event Noise at Location 1 and Location 9 by Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noise Measurement Location</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Maximum Noise Level (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - California Street/Accessible and Pedestrian Ramp</td>
<td>Sound equipment (medium) truck arriving</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tailgate lowering</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Truck door opening</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tailgate lifting</td>
<td>86 (70 dBA at fence along Gramercy Towers property line)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masonic Center workers/staff talking</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rolling equipment on sidewalk</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rolling equipment down ramp</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loading onto tailgate</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loading onto truck</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ratcheting down equipment</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Truck door closing</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Truck pulling away</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Truck back-up beeper</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hailing a cab</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Car door slams</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patrons entering limo (loud talking)</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - Pine Street Loading Dock Area</td>
<td>Event patron vehicles exiting garage</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ramp banging against loading dock structure</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lowering ramp for deliveries</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catering truck (medium) backing in</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Air brakes from catering truck</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Truck door rolling up</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clattering inside truck</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Charles M. Salter Associates, Inc., Nob Hill Masonic Center Final Environmental Background Noise Study, December 2012, Table 1 and Table 2, p. 10.

(78 dBA). At Location 9, maximum noise levels associated with loading/unloading activities are louder than typical non-event noise levels. This is primarily related to the fact that the Pine Street loading dock is set back between two residential buildings and is shielded from noise levels associated with vehicular traffic on Pine Street and has lower ambient noise levels in the loading dock area. As a result, noise levels generated during scheduled events are more noticeable to residents that abut or are immediately adjacent to the loading dock area. Noise levels experienced by other residents along Pine Street on the project block and in the project area would be expected to be similar to noise levels generated by general traffic on Pine Street and in the vicinity, which range between 60 to 66 dBA.
Noise measurement data and on-site field observations on the two event days indicate that, under existing conditions, concert noise is not audible from outside of the Auditorium. Event-related activities were also not measurable at any of the other noise measurement locations (Locations 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8) due to the significant decrease of noise levels over distance and acoustical shielding provided by surrounding and intervening buildings.

Table 4.D.3, on the following page, summarizes the noise data collected at the nine noise measurement locations, and shows the highest hourly increase over existing ambient noise levels for each location for two live-entertainment music concerts (Il Volo and Sting) at the Masonic Center. For the two live-entertainment events, noise measurement data accounted for noise levels generated by activities that occurred prior to, during, and after each scheduled event. All of the data present the range of measured noise levels over a 24-hour period.

For all of the measurement locations, the lower range of noise measurement values, approximately 43 to 58 dBA, generally corresponds to the early morning hours between 1:00 AM and 5:00 AM. The higher measurement values, which range from 60 to 65 dBA, generally correspond to the late afternoon and evening hours between 4:00 PM to 12:00 AM, with the highest values occurring during pre-concert activity between about 7:00 PM to 8:00 PM.

Long-term 24-hour noise measurements taken at each of the nine monitoring sites indicate that under existing conditions, noise level increases during events at the Masonic Center do not exceed the existing ambient noise levels by more than 8 dBA as required by San Francisco Noise Ordinance; refer to the Regulatory Framework discussion on pp. 4.D.16-4.D.19 for further discussion of this requirement. As shown Table 4.D.3, the highest increase in existing L90 (dBA) noise levels during events at the Masonic Auditorium was approximately 6 dBA. This measurement occurred at 11:00 PM at the northwest corner of the Masonic Center site at the accessible/pedestrian ramp on California Street (Location 1) that is used to unload and load equipment before and after performances. The ramp is adjacent to the residential property line of the Gramercy Towers.

The distance of these activities from the noise monitor was much closer than the property line and nearest façade of the Gramercy Towers; noise levels are approximately 20 dBA lower at the residential façade of the Gramercy Towers, approximately 100 feet away from the measurement location. Conversely, ambient noise levels are dominated by vehicle traffic, which is considered a line source where noise levels decrease with distance at a much slower rate than occurs with attendee and loading/unloading activities. Under existing conditions, ambient vehicle traffic noise levels decrease by approximately 6 dBA at the nearest residential façade of the Gramercy Towers, approximately 130 feet away from the centerline of California Street. Therefore, existing ambient noise levels mask event-related loading/unloading activity from the Masonic Center by up to an additional 14 dBA at the nearest residential façade of the Gramercy Towers.
### Table 4.D.3: Highest Hourly Event-Related Noise Increase Over Existing Ambient Noise Levels by Noise Measurement Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement Location(^a)</th>
<th>Description of Noise Measurement Location</th>
<th>Existing Range of Hourly Noise Levels (L_{90}) (dBA)</th>
<th>Highest Hourly Increase over Existing Ambient Noise (L_{90}) (dBA)</th>
<th>Predominant Noise Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location 1</td>
<td>Masonic Center Accessible and Pedestrian Ramps</td>
<td>Non-Event(^b) 47-60 Event 1 (Il Volo) 45-62 Event 2 (Sting)(^c) 45-63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Performer equipment unloading/loading; traffic, cable car passbys/bell ringing; pedestrian voices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 2</td>
<td>Gramercy Towers, 1177 California Street</td>
<td>48-65 Event 1 46-65 Event 2 (Sting) 47-64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Performer equipment unloading/loading; traffic, cable car passbys/bell ringing; pedestrian voices; traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 3</td>
<td>Northeast corner of California and Jones Street</td>
<td>47-64 Event 1 45-64 Event 2 (Sting) 46-63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Traffic, pedestrian voices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 4</td>
<td>Grace Cathedral, Midblock on California Street</td>
<td>48-60 Event 1 47-63 Event 2 (Sting) 46-61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Traffic, pedestrian voices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 5</td>
<td>Grace Cathedral Garage Entrance, Taylor Street</td>
<td>47-60 Event 1 46-58 Event 2 (Sting) 46-57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Traffic, garage activity, pedestrian voices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 6</td>
<td>Huntington Park, southwest corner</td>
<td>47-60 Event 1 46-61 Event 2 (Sting) 46-59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Traffic, pedestrian voices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 7</td>
<td>Southeast corner of California and Taylor Streets</td>
<td>49-62 Event 1 47-64 Event 2 (Sting) 48-65</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Traffic, pedestrian voices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 8</td>
<td>Northeast corner of Taylor and Pine Streets</td>
<td>49-64 Event 1 50-66 Event 2 (Sting) 46-64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Traffic, pedestrian voices; ticket scalpers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 9</td>
<td>Masonic Center Pine Street Loading Dock</td>
<td>43-56 Event 1 43-57 Event 2 (Sting) 42-56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Catering unloading/loading; traffic; vehicles exiting garage from Pine Street loading dock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- dBA = A-weighted decibels; \(L_{90}\) = noise level that is exceeded 90 percent of the time of each hour
- \(^a\) See Figure 4.D.1, p. 4.D.8, for noise measurement locations.
- \(^b\) Noise levels for all non-event days at each location have been averaged together and reported as a range.
- \(^c\) Noise data for simultaneous events that occurred at the Fairmont, Mark Hopkins, and Renaissance Stanford Court Hotels were collected.

**Source:** Charles M. Salter Associates, Inc., *Nob Hill Masonic Center Final Environmental Background Noise Study*, December, 2012, Tables 3-11, pp. 13-22
VIBRATION/GROUNDBORNE NOISE

Vibration is an oscillatory motion through a solid medium in which the motion’s amplitude can be described in terms of displacement, velocity, or acceleration. Several different methods are used to quantify vibration. The peak particle velocity (PPV) is defined as the maximum instantaneous peak of the vibration signal. Typically, groundborne vibration generated by man-made activities, such as live-entertainment events at the Masonic Center, attenuates rapidly with distance from the source of the vibration. Under existing conditions, predominant noise sources from nearby bus transit, cable car passbys, and vehicular traffic exceed groundbourne vibration levels that currently occur during events within the Auditorium. As such, perceptible vibration from events held at the Masonic Auditorium was not observed in the vicinity of the project site.

EXISTING SENSITIVE RECEPTORS

Noise-sensitive land uses or receptors are those where noise exposure would result in adverse effects (i.e., decreased performance in cognitive tasks, annoyance, sleep disturbance, or hearing impairment) on individuals and to uses where quiet is an essential element of their intended purpose. Residences are of primary concern because of the potential for increased and prolonged exposure of individuals to both interior and exterior noise. Other noise-sensitive land uses are schools, preschools, hospitals, places of worship, hotels and motels, libraries, senior care centers, nursing homes, retirement residences, and other places where low interior noise levels are essential to the use.

Similar to noise-sensitive receptors, vibration-sensitive land uses or receptors include residential, hospital, educational uses, and places of worship, because people in these uses can experience annoyance from groundborne vibration. Vibration-sensitive uses also include fragile buildings, in particular those that are considered historical, because groundborne vibration can result in structural damage. Certain workplaces may also contain vibration-sensitive equipment (e.g., electron microscopes or micro-electronics production equipment). Residential uses and historic buildings, including the Pacific Union Club, Fairmont Hotel, and Mark Hopkins Hotel, all of which are designated City landmarks, are in the vicinity of the Masonic Center site.

Land uses within and near the project site are described in detail in Section 4.A, Land Use and Land Use Planning, and include residential uses, places of worship, hotels, and schools. As listed below, there are residential uses, places of worship, tourist hotels, and private schools/pre-schools in the project vicinity. There are no hospitals or convalescent homes in the project vicinity. Nearby recreational uses in the project vicinity, such as Huntington Park, are not considered to be noise sensitive because it is an area of active recreation where quiet is not essential to serve recreational purposes. Nearby land uses within a 1,000-foot radius of the Masonic Center that are sensitive noise receptors are as follows:
Residential Uses
- Gramercy Towers (1177 California Street)
- 1200 California Street
- 1201 California Street
- Maria Victoria Apartments (1233 California Street)
- 1240 California Street
- 1241 California Street
- The Courtyard (1255 California Street)
- 1260 California Street
- 1034 Pine Street
- 1042 Pine Street

Places of Worship
- Grace Cathedral (1100 California Street)

Tourist Hotels and Transient Hotels
- Nob Hill Inn (1000 Pine Street)
- Huntington Hotel (1075 California Street)
- Renaissance Stanford Court Hotel (905 California Street)
- Fairmont Hotel (950 Mason Street)
- Mark Hopkins Hotel (999 California Street)

Schools/Pre-schools
- Grace Cathedral School for Boys (1275 Sacramento Street)
- Grace Cathedral Pre-School (1275 Sacramento Street)

As shown in Table 4.D.3, the highest increase above existing ambient noise levels (including noise generated by simultaneous events at nearby venues) during nighttime live entertainment events experienced by nearby residents and other sensitive noise receptors is 2 dBA to 6 dBA. This increase is due to event-related activities, such as performer bus parking and performer equipment unloading/loading in front of the Masonic Center in the loading zone on California Street, pedestrian activity and conversation volumes, attendee drop-off/pick-up activity, cable cars and vehicular traffic (e.g., honking horns) in the immediate vicinity of the Masonic Center. Under existing conditions, these changes in noise level above 3dBA could be noticeable and be perceived as an annoyance to some adjacent residents such as those at Gramercy Towers and by residents adjacent to the Pine Street loading dock area; however, these noise levels do not exceed existing noise requirements of the San Francisco Noise Ordinance for entertainment uses; refer to the Regulatory Framework discussion below.
Under existing conditions, traffic related noise during sold out-events with simultaneous events at nearby venues results in a less than 1 dBA increase in existing ambient noise levels, which is imperceptible.\(^{13}\)

Potential effects of the concurrent events on traffic conditions in the area are minimized by the fact that concurrent events tend to start at least one hour prior to the typical 8:00 PM start time for concerts at the Masonic Auditorium.

**REGULATORY FRAMEWORK**

**Federal**

**U.S. Environmental Protection Agency**

The USEPA Office of Noise Abatement and Control was originally established to coordinate federal noise control activities, and the Office of Noise Abatement and Control issued the Federal Noise Control Act of 1972, which set programs and guidelines to identify and address the effects of noise on public health and welfare, and the environment. Although the primary responsibility of regulating noise was later transferred to state and local governments in 1982, the USEPA provided guidelines for noise levels that would be considered safe for community exposure without the risk of adverse health or welfare effects. The USEPA found that to prevent hearing loss over the lifetime of a receptor, the yearly average \( L_{eq} \) should not exceed 70 dBA, and the \( L_{dn} \) should not exceed 55 dBA in outdoor activity areas or 45 dBA indoors to prevent interference and annoyance.\(^{14}\)

**Federal Transit Administration – Vibration**

To address the human response to groundborne vibration, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has guidelines for maximum-acceptable vibration criteria for different types of land uses.\(^{15}\) These guidelines recommend vibration levels (\( L_v \)) from 72 VdB\(^{16}\) to 80 VdB for residential uses and buildings where people normally sleep; and 75 VdB to 80 VdB for institutional land uses.

---

\(^{13}\) Masonic Center Nob Hill Masonic Center Renovation Project Transportation Project, Transportation Impact Study, Final Report, February 22, 2013. A copy of this study is available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2011.0471E.

\(^{14}\) USEPA, Information on Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety, March 1974, p. 4. A copy of this document is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California, as part of Case File No. 2008.1084E.


\(^{16}\) Vibration velocity level is reported in decibels relative to a level of \( \text{1x}10^{-6} \) inches per second and is denoted as VdB.
with primarily daytime operations (e.g., schools, churches, clinics, offices). The higher vibration levels in these ranges apply to infrequent events (less than 30 per day) and the lower levels apply to frequent vibration events (more than 70 per day). According to FTA guidelines, a vibration level of 65 VdB is the threshold of perceptibility for humans and 80 VdB is the level for a significant impact to occur.

State

California Department of Transportation – Vibration

For the protection of buildings from groundborne vibration, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) recommends a limit of 0.5 inch per second peak particle velocity (in/sec PPV) for new residential buildings and 0.25 in/sec PPV for older or historically significant buildings. To avoid human annoyance, Caltrans recommends that vibration levels at sensitive land uses be limited to 0.04 in/sec PPV for transient vibration and 0.01 in/sec PPV for continuous vibration.

Local

San Francisco Noise Ordinance

The San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Noise Ordinance) regulates both construction noise and stationary-source noise within the City, including noise from transportation, construction, mechanical equipment, entertainment, and human or animal behavior. Found in Article 29, “Regulation of Noise,” of the San Francisco Police Code, the Noise Ordinance addresses noise from construction equipment, nighttime construction work, stationary mechanical equipment, and waste processing activities. The purpose of the Noise Ordinance is stated in Section 2900, as most recently amended in 2008:

Sec. 2900, Declaration of Policy

(a) Building on decades of scientific research, the World Health Organization and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency have determined that persistent exposure to elevated levels of community noise is responsible for public health problems including, but not limited to: compromised speech, persistent annoyance, sleep disturbance, physiological and psychological stress, heart disease, high blood pressure, colitis, ulcers, depression, and feelings of helplessness.

(b) The General Plan for San Francisco identifies noise as a serious environmental pollutant that must be managed and mitigated through the planning and development process. But given our dense urban environment, San Francisco has a significant challenge in protecting public health from the adverse effects of community noise arising from diverse sources such as transportation, construction, mechanical equipment, entertainment, and human and animal behavior.

(c) In order to protect public health, it is hereby declared to be the policy of San Francisco to prohibit unwanted, excessive, and avoidable noise. It shall be the policy of San Francisco to maintain noise levels in areas with existing healthful and acceptable levels of noise and to reduce noise levels, through all practicable means, in those areas of San Francisco where noise levels are above acceptable levels as defined by the World Health Organization’s Guidelines on Community Noise.

(d) It shall be the goal of the noise task force described in this Article to determine if there are additional adverse and avoidable noise sources not covered in this statute that warrant regulation and to report to the Board of Supervisors and recommend amendments to this Article over the next three years. In addition, the noise task force shall develop interdepartmental mechanisms for the efficient disposition and any enforcement required in response to noise complaints.

Sections 2904, 2907, 2908, 2909, and 2910 of the Noise Ordinance are all applicable to the proposed project and are described below.

**Section 2904, Waste Disposal Services**

Section 2904 of the Noise Ordinance limits the noise level produced by garbage trucks’ waste disposal activities to 75 dBA when measured at a distance of 50 feet from the equipment. The maximum noise level does not apply to the noise associated with crushing, compacting, dropping, or moving garbage on the truck, but only to the truck’s mechanical processing system. For purposes of this EIR, it is assumed that noise limits specified under Section 2907 for Construction Equipments would apply to construction-related debris removal and disposal which is more conservative than the noise requirements described above for waste disposal activities for loading, dropping and moving construction-related debris.

**Section 2907, Construction Equipment, and Section 2908, Construction Work at Night**

Sections 2907 and 2908 of the Noise Ordinance establish noise levels for construction equipment. Section 2907(a) limits noise levels from construction equipment as specified under the ordinance to 80 dBA $L_{eq}$ at 100 feet (or other equivalent distances) from construction equipment between 7 AM and 8 PM. According to Section 2908, construction work at night (from 8 PM to 7 AM) may not exceed the ambient level by 5 dBA at the nearest property plane unless the Director of
Public Works or the Director of Building Inspection grants a special permit before such work begins.19

Section 2909, Noise Limits

This section of the Noise Ordinance regulates noise from mechanical equipment and other similar sources. (As stated in the ordinance, “No person shall produce or allow to be produced by any machine, or device, music or entertainment, or any combination of same . . .”) This would include all equipment – e.g., electrical equipment (transformers, emergency generators) as well as mechanical equipment – that is installed on commercial/industrial and residential properties. A machine or device, music or entertainment or any combination of same, operating on commercial or industrial property must not produce a noise level more than 8 dBA above the ambient noise level at the property plane.

Section 2909 also states in subsection (b) that no noise or music associated with a licensed Place of Entertainment or licensed Limited Live Performance Locale shall exceed the low frequency ambient noise level defined in Section 2901(f) by more than 8 dBC.

Section 2909 also states in subsection (d) that no fixed (permanent) noise source (as defined by the Noise Ordinance) may cause the noise level inside any sleeping or living room in a dwelling unit on residential property to exceed 45 dBA between 10 PM and 7 AM or 55 dBA between 7 AM and 10 PM when windows are open, except where building ventilation is achieved through mechanical systems that allow windows to remain closed.

Section 2910, Variances

Section 2910 of the Noise Ordinance empowers the Directors of Public Health, Public Works, and Building Inspection and the Entertainment Commission, and the Chief of Police to grant variances to noise regulations, over which they have jurisdiction pursuant to Section 2916. All administrative decisions granting or denying variances may be appealed to the San Francisco Board of Appeals.

IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS

The thresholds for determining the significance of impacts in this analysis are consistent with the environmental checklist in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, which has been adopted

19 The provisions of Section 2907(a) also include requirements to attenuate noise for impact tools and equipment such as pavement breakers and jackhammers. The provisions would not apply to the proposed project renovations, as interior construction activities would not require use of such impact tools and equipment.
and modified by the San Francisco Planning Department. For the purpose of this analysis, the following applicable thresholds were used to determine whether implementing the project would result in a significant impact on noise. Implementation of a proposed project would have a significant noise impact if the project were to:

C.1 Expose people to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the San Francisco General Plan or San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the Police Code);

C.2 Expose people to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels;

C.3 Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project;

C.4 Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project;

C.5 For a project located within an area covered by 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), expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels;

C.6 For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels; or

C.7 Be substantially affected by existing noise levels.

The project site is not located within an area covered by an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport; nor is it within the vicinity of a private airstrip. The proposed project would not expose people residing or working in the area to excessive airport or airstrip noise; therefore, significance thresholds C.5 and C.6 do not apply to the proposed renovation project. The proposed project is limited to renovations to existing assembly and entertainment uses at the Masonic Center. The proposed project would not introduce new noise sensitive receptors to the project site that would be substantially affected by existing noise levels; therefore, significance threshold C.7 is not applicable to the proposed project. These issues (Criteria C.5, C.6, and C.7) are not discussed further in this EIR.

**APPROACH TO ANALYSIS**

Temporary, construction-related noise impacts associated with the proposed project are analyzed in this EIR in a manner consistent with analyses of other development projects within San Francisco. Proposed construction activities for renovation of the Masonic Center would be required to comply with the San Francisco Noise Ordinance, which prohibits construction activities between 8:00 PM and 7:00 AM and limits noise from any individual piece of construction equipment. If construction activities using non-impact equipment would exceed these standards, mitigation measures would be required.
As under existing conditions, the proposed project would be required to implement the April 2012 CU conditions of approval. One element of Condition No. 6, that has not yet been initiated, would be implemented with the proposed project and, for large events, attendee vehicles with pre-paid parking would be able to enter the parking garage before events from Pine Street via the loading dock ramp. Under existing conditions, vehicles can exit the garage after large events and would continue to do so as part of Condition No. 6.

Operational noise issues evaluated in this section include potential increases to existing ambient noise levels of the proposed project generated by: (1) proposed renovations to the Auditorium that would increase the maximum number of attendees at large events from 3,166 to 3,300 attendees, a maximum increase of 134; (2) the proposed increase in the number and frequency of annual number of large events from 230 to 315, an increase of 85 events per year; and (3) project noise levels in combination with simultaneous events at nearby venues. The analysis addresses noise effects of vehicles entering the garage before large events through the Pine Street loading dock. The project’s compliance with the Noise Ordinance during project construction and operation is also evaluated. Based on the Final Environmental Background Noise Study, the analysis is based on noise levels measured for the two live concert events described on pp. 4.D.9-4.D.13 under the heading “Existing Event-Related Ambient Noise Levels,” as the attendance at these events would be similar to the number of attendees (from 1,814 up to a maximum of 3,300 patrons) that would be accommodated in the proposed Auditorium renovations; refer to Table 2.3: Existing and Proposed Number of Attendees per Large Events (More Than 250 Attendees), by Auditorium Configuration, in Chapter 2, Project Description, p. 2.24.

IMPACT EVALUATION

Impact NO-1: Construction of the proposed project would not generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the San Francisco Noise Ordinance and would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the proposed project. (Less than Significant)

Proposed project renovations would be completed in approximately seven months. Renovations at the Masonic Center would not involve exterior demolition, excavation, earthmoving, or pile-driving activities that are typically the noisiest construction activities. Except for demolition debris removal and concrete mixing/pouring trucks to install the new stage and tiered flooring in the main floor of the Auditorium, proposed renovation activities would occur within the interior of the Masonic Center in the main floor and balcony of the Auditorium, and in the California Room, Exhibition Hall, and kitchen facility located on the ground.20 The use of stationary

---

20 Construction information was provided by Daniel O’Hara, Project Manager, Turner Construction, Email communication, April 23, 2012. A copy of this email is available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in Case File No. 2011.0471E.
equipment, such as generators and compressors during construction is not anticipated; however, if stationary equipment is required, this equipment would be located inside the Masonic Center Garage.

Proposed renovation activities would generate noise from construction truck traffic and construction equipment for concrete mixing/pouring. Interior demolition and debris removal would require delivery/pick-up of approximately 20 debris boxes during the first month of project renovations, primarily for removal of the existing flooring, fixed seating and stage in the main floor of the Auditorium. There would also be approximately 10 debris boxes delivered/picked up at various times throughout the seven-month renovation period for drywall removal. Debris boxes would be staged in the 185-foot-long curbside area on the south side of California Street in front of the Masonic Center. Noise levels associated with debris box delivery, loading and pick-up activities can vary significantly based on weight of material, type of truck, and driver operations. Interior construction of the new stage and tiered flooring in the main floor of the Auditorium would require concrete pouring for a total of five days over a three-month period. On each of these days, a maximum of eight concrete trucks would deliver pre-mixed concrete to the 185-foot-long California Street curbside area. Pre-mixed concrete delivery trucks would not be at the site at the same time. Multiple concrete deliveries would occur on five different days that pre-mix concrete delivery would occur.

On each day that concrete deliveries are required, there would be between four to eight deliveries. One truck would arrive at the California Street loading zone area and deliver pre-mixed concrete for approximately 40 minutes, then depart. The second concrete truck would be staged at an off-site location, and then marshalled to the California Street loading zone by the construction contractor. The remaining trucks would follow the same procedure, one at a time.  

A maximum of two trucks would deliver foam and rebar on the same days as the deliveries of premixed concrete. One concrete pump truck would be staged in the curbside area for the entire day when concrete pouring occurs. Deliveries and the concrete pump would be located in the curbside area in front of the Masonic Center. Typically, concrete mixers and pumps generate approximately 85 dBA and 82 dBA at a distance of 50 feet, respectively.

Construction truck-trips, including debris and concrete mixer and pump truck trips, as well as construction worker vehicle trips, would not increase existing ambient noise levels that are generated by existing vehicular traffic in the vicinity of the Masonic Center.

21 Craig T. Jones, Vice President and General Manager, Turner Construction, telephone communication, February 25, 2013. A copy of this telephone communication is available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in Case File No. 2011.0471E.

22 FHWA, 2006b, Federal Highway Administration Roadway Construction Noise Model User’s Guide, Table 1, p. 3. A copy of this information is available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2011.0471E.
Proposed interior renovation and construction activities would not be expected to increase ambient noise levels during the seven-month construction period. Proposed renovations and improvements would occur primarily on the ground level and in the Auditorium, and would include interior demolition/removal; interior construction of walls, flooring, and stage platform; acoustical work; plumbing upgrades/replacements; electrical work; drywall framing; heating and ventilation upgrades/replacement; electrical work; millwork; new doors; ceiling replacement; carpeting; interior painting; and minor repairs in the areas affected by the renovations. Interior construction noise generated is not expected to be audible to adjacent noise-sensitive receptors because noise from interior construction would be reduced due to the intervening presence of exterior walls.

Exterior construction activities would generate noise from construction truck traffic, debris removal, and concrete mixing/pouring. Debris boxes would be staged in the 185-foot-long curbside loading area on the south side of California Street in front of the Masonic Center. Noise levels associated with debris box delivery, loading and pick-up activities can vary significantly based on weight of material, type of truck, and driver operations. Construction of the new stage and tiered flooring in the main floor inside of the Auditorium would require concrete pouring for a total of five days over a three-month period. On each of these days, a maximum of eight concrete trucks would deliver pre-mixed concrete to the 185-foot-long curbside area on the south side of California Street in front of the Masonic Center. As described on p. 4.D.23, concrete trucks would not arrive simultaneously and would be at the site for approximately 40 minutes per delivery on each of the five days that concrete pouring occurs; deliveries would occur in the curbside loading area. One concrete pump truck would be staged in the curbside area for the entire day on each of the five days that concrete pouring occurs. Typically, concrete mixers and pumps generate approximately 85 dBA and 82 dBA\textsuperscript{23} at a distance of 50 feet, respectively.

Two trucks would deliver foam and rebar during Month 2 of construction activities, three trucks during Month 3, and two trucks during Month 4 during the seven-month construction period; these deliveries would occur in the curbside loading area in front of the Center.

Compliance with requirements of the San Francisco Noise Ordinance, Section 2907 would reduce exterior construction noise impacts to a less-than-significant level on noise sensitive receptors, including noise effects on adjacent and nearby residential uses to the west on California Street and to the south along Pine Street. Residents in nearby buildings can also close windows, which typically reduces daytime interior noise levels to an acceptable level (i.e., 45 dBA). As such, the proposed exterior and interior construction activities would not generate noise levels that would be greater than existing ambient noise levels.

\textsuperscript{23} FHWA, 2006b, \textit{Federal Highway Administration Roadway Construction Noise Model User’s Guide}, Table 1, p. 3. A copy of this information is available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2011.0471E.
Therefore, exterior construction noise impacts would be less than significant due to the temporary and short duration of construction noise activities, and because interior construction activities are not expected to be audible outside of the Masonic Center. Additionally, all construction and renovation activities would be required to comply with the San Francisco Noise Ordinance, Section 2907.

To ensure that potential construction-related noise effects of demolition debris removal, while less than significant, are reduced to the maximum amount feasible, City decision makers may decide to impose the following Improvement Measure I-NO-1 as a condition of approval to reduce temporary noise generated by loading and removal of debris boxes that would be staged at the loading zone in front of the Masonic Center on California Street.

**Improvement Measure I-NO-1 – Construction Debris Box Delivery, Loading and Removal.**

The project sponsor shall require the construction contractor to fully incorporate the following requirements into all of the contractor and subcontractor agreement documents to be implemented by the construction contractor:

- Provide well maintained vehicles to deliver and pick-up debris boxes on-site
- Schedule delivery and pick-up of debris boxes during periods of higher ambient noise levels – after 9AM and no later than scheduled construction hours as required by the San Francisco Noise Ordinance.
- Pick-up of debris boxes is prohibited in the evening hours after 6:00 PM.
- Train/educate personnel to load debris boxes as quietly as possible.
- As feasible, locate debris boxes within the 185-foot loading area in front of the Masonic Center as far away as possible from noise-sensitive receptors, such as the Gramercy Towers.

**Impact NO-2: The proposed project would not expose people or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the San Francisco Noise Ordinance and would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the proposed project. (Less than Significant)**

The proposed project would implement noise reduction measures required by the April 2012 Conditional Use authorization listed on pp. 4.D.5-4.D.6. The proposed increase in the number of attendees and the increase in the number of large events each year would not result in a substantial permanent increase in existing ambient noise levels, as discussed below.

**Increased Number of Attendees**

The proposed renovations to the Auditorium would increase the maximum number of attendees in the Auditorium from 3,166 to 3,300, by up to 134 patrons during a sold-out event with standing room on the main floor of the Auditorium. This would represent about a 4 percent increase in the
number of patrons at a sold-out event. The increase in attendance would increase noise by less than 1 dBA in the vicinity of the Masonic Center at any of the measurement locations, or approximately 0.18 dBA. This increase is specific to a sold-out event with a maximum number of increased number of people attending events at the Auditorium. The increase in noise levels due to the increased number of attendees with the proposed project would be barely perceptible at any of the nine noise measurement locations in the vicinity of the Masonic Center.

An increase of 134 attendees to a concert would not increase hourly ambient noise levels measured at each of the nine noise measurement locations above 8 dBA permitted by the Noise Ordinance. Therefore, as under the existing conditions, the proposed project would comply with Section 2909 of the Noise Ordinance for a licensed Place of Entertainment.

Approximately 874 vehicles (821 private automobiles and 53 taxis and limousines) trips would be arrive at a maximum sold-out event in the Auditorium (3,330 attendees) as compared to 839 vehicles under existing conditions for a sold-out (3,166 attendees) event, an increase of 35 vehicles. Noise-related impacts from increased vehicular traffic in the vicinity of the Masonic Center during nighttime evening events with maximum attendance would increase by less than 1 dBA and would be imperceptible and negligible in the context of existing ambient noise levels.

For these reasons, noise impacts that would result from the increase in the number of attendees would be less than significant because the addition of 134 attendees would result in imperceptible increases in noise levels, would not expose people to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the Noise Ordinance, and would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity substantially above levels existing without the proposed project.

*Increased Number of Events*

The proposed project would increase the number of large events at the Masonic Center by 85 events per year, from an existing maximum total of 230 events per year under the April 2012 CU to 315 events. An increase of 85 additional events per year would result in event noise levels similar to those presented for the live-entertainment music concert events presented in Table 4.D.2, p. 4.D.11, since most events with the proposed project would have attendance less than or similar to events under existing conditions. (Except for sold-out general admission events, future events in the renovated Auditorium are estimated to have about 20 to 43 percent fewer attendees than under existing conditions (see Table 2.3 on p. 2.24)).

Compliance with the Noise Ordinance is evaluated on a per event basis. As discussed above, increased noise levels from the increase of up to 134 patrons with the proposed project would be imperceptible, and would not result in a violation or exceedance of the noise limit requirements of
the San Francisco Noise Ordinance. However, because of the increased frequency of large events with the proposed project, nearby residents would be subject to increased, more frequent noise levels of 2dBA to 6dBA related to event activities such as tour bus operations and unloading, approximately 85 more times a year than under existing conditions; the increase would be due to event-related activities such as higher pedestrian activity and conversation volumes, traffic (e.g., honking horns) in the immediate vicinity of the Masonic Center, attendee drop-off/pick-ups, vehicles exiting the garage from the Pine Street loading dock ramp (discussed below), performer bus parking, and performer equipment unloading/loading in front of the Masonic Center in the loading zone on California Street during large events.

The proposed increased number of portable food and beverage concession areas that serve alcoholic beverages could increase the potential for incidents of crowd noise after events. As under existing conditions, the project would implement the April 2012 Conditions related to minimize potential crowd noise related to the sale of Alcohol (Condition No. 30); refer also to Section 4.E Public Services for other measures to prevent and monitor behavior of event attendees on p. 4.E.3.

Although the increased frequency of noise levels associated with large events would be noticeable and could be perceived as an annoyance to some adjacent residents such as those at Gramercy Towers and by residents adjacent to the Pine Street loading dock area, none of these occurrences would individually exceed the noise requirements of the San Francisco Noise Ordinance or result in a substantial increase in existing ambient noise levels.

Therefore, noise impacts that would result from the increased frequency of large events per year would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are necessary because the addition of up to 85 large events would not expose people to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the Noise Ordinance and would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

_Pine Street Parking Garage Access_

After completion of the proposed renovation project, Condition No. 6, imposed by the April 2012 CU authorization would be fully implemented to allow attendee vehicles with pre-paid parking to enter the parking garage through the Pine Street loading dock for large events. Under existing conditions, vehicles are already allowed to exit the garage and would continue to do so with the proposed project as part of Condition No. 6. During large events, up to approximately 100 vehicles with pre-paid parking would be allowed to enter the parking garage for approximately one hour before the event (7 to 8:00 PM) with the project. Vehicles would also exit the parking garage for approximately one hour after a large event (11 PM to 12 AM), as occurs under existing conditions.
Noise levels were measured at Location 9 (Pine Street loading dock) for vehicles exiting the garage after the sold-out Sting concert on December 3, 2011. Noise levels generated by vehicles entering the garage before events are expected to be similar to noise levels generated by vehicles exiting the garage during the sold-out Sting concert. As with the vehicles exiting the garage under existing conditions, single event noise related to vehicles entering the garage would primarily be due to the ramp banging against the dock. See Table 4.D.4. Based on the measured hourly $L_{eq}$ noise levels between 11 PM and 12 AM, noise levels generated by vehicles exiting the garage were increased by 4 dBA over existing ambient noise levels. Assuming noise levels similar to those measured when vehicles were exiting the garage, vehicles entering the garage, generally between 7 PM and 8 PM, from Pine Street would not generate noise levels along the ramp that would exceed standards established by the San Francisco Noise Ordinance or result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels. Since vehicles entering the garage via Pine Street would have pre-paid parking tickets, entrance delays would be expected to be minimal, which would limit the increase in noise due to vehicles queuing to enter the garage via the Pine Street loading dock. Ambient noise levels during the period that vehicles would enter the garage from Pine Street are higher due to higher traffic volumes on Pine Street in the early evening; as such, noise from vehicles entering the garage would be less noticeable to residents adjacent to the Pine Street loading dock than noise from vehicles exiting the garage after events during late nighttime hours.

For the reasons discussed above, noise impacts of vehicles entering the garage from the Pine Street loading dock before large events would be less than significant. Similarly, increased noise due to the added frequency of vehicles entering and exiting the garage from the Pine Street loading dock by up to 85 more times a year with the proposed project would not exceed the San Francisco Noise Ordinance and would result in a less-than-significant noise impact.

Implementation of Improvement Measure I-NO-2b for service and maintenance of the dock ramp would further reduce the less-than-significant impacts of vehicles entering and exiting the garage through the Pine Street loading dock. Nonetheless, increased noise due to vehicles entering/exiting the garage from the Pine Street loading dock would be noticeable and could be perceived as an annoyance to adjacent and nearby residents.

Outdoor Open-Space Areas

With the proposed project, the front portico, lower terrace on California Street, and the upper terrace facing Taylor Street would be used on occasion during daytime events only for refreshment and break areas. Portable tables and chairs would be temporarily placed at these locations during daytime events and patrons would be able to bring food and non-alcoholic beverages purchased on-site onto these open space areas. Each of these outdoor spaces would be available for event patrons attending daytime events at the Masonic Center up until 7:00 PM, with
the exception of the portico (to enter the main lobby) and the lower terrace that is used for smoking during nighttime events. No amplified music, public address systems, or other types of audio equipment would be used in these outdoor areas.

Noise levels generated by anticipated activities such as eating and face-to-face conversations would not be audible at adjacent noise sensitive receptors. Smoking, eating activities, and face-to-face conversations typically generate noise levels in the range of 60 dBA at a distance of 5 feet depending on volume and tone. Although additional noise would be generated by patrons eating, conversing and socializing on the front portico, lower terrace along California Street and the upper terrace along Taylor Street, the existing ambient noise levels at these terraces are predominantly influenced by traffic noise. The 360-sq.-ft. terrace behind the endomosaic window is not proposed for use during daytime events as an outdoor break or refreshment area due to its limited size.

As discussed above on pp. 4.D.5 and 4.D.9, the City’s Background Noise Level map indicates that the ambient noise levels of the roadway segments nearest the project site are in excess of 70 dBA and the general traffic generates noise levels of approximately 74 dBA on California Street while cable car passbys generate noise levels of approximately 82 dBA. Therefore, noise generated at these outdoor locations on the project site would be approximately 14 dBA quieter than existing general traffic noise, resulting in noise levels that would be inaudible at the nearest adjacent residential noise sensitive receptors (Gramercy Towers) and at other noise-sensitive receptor locations, across California Street (Grace Cathedral), and across Taylor Street (Huntington Hotel). Therefore, noise impacts associated with use of outdoor areas during daytime events would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

For the reasons discussed above, the increase of up to 134 attendees per event, and the increase of 85 large events per year, and the new use of outdoor areas for refreshment and break areas would not result in a substantial increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the proposed project because the proposed renovation project would comply with the San Francisco Noise Ordinance, and would result in minimal or less than perceptible increases in noise levels. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant environmental impacts on noise and no mitigation is required.

To further reduce and ensure that the effects of less-than-significant event-related noise on sensitive receptors, especially those at the Gramercy Towers and residences near the Pine Street loading dock area, City decision makers may decide to impose the following Improvement Measure I-NO-2a and Improvement Measure I-NO-2b as conditions of approval.
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**Improvement Measure I-NO-2a – Appointment of a Noise Control Officer(s).**
- The project sponsor shall appoint a “Noise Control Officer(s)” to monitor loading/unloading procedures as well as perform crowd control and monitor exterior terraces for excessive noise and compliance with the Conditions of Approval.

**Improvement Measure I-NO-2b – Service and Maintenance of the Pine Street Loading Dock.**
- The project sponsor shall be required to service and maintain the Pine Street loading dock ramp to prevent it from banging against the building structure when vehicles enter the garage before events and exit the garage after events.

**Impact NO-3: The proposed project would not expose people to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.** *(Less than Significant)*

**Project Construction/Renovation Activities**

The proposed renovation project would not involve construction activities such as demolition and pile driving that are typically associated with the generation of groundborne vibration and noise levels; therefore, the proposed project would not result in groundborne vibration impacts. The proposed project also would not result in groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels that would affect nearby off-site historic architectural resources that include the Fairmont Hotel, Mark Hopkins Hotel, and Pacific Union Club, which are designated City Landmark structures or other structures.

Project-related construction truck trips could increase incidents of perceptible vibration from mobile sources along construction routes used to access the site, primarily Jones and California Streets. Vibration from on-road mobile sources over steep grades or rough surfaces tend to occur for only brief periods, is intermittent, and would not lead to excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels. Therefore, the duration of construction-related activities that could create perceptible vibration would be intermittent, limited and temporary. For these reasons, impacts related to construction-related groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels would be less than significant. Therefore, no mitigation measures would be required.

**Project Operation**

The proposed renovations would include installation of a new sound system. Specific information regarding the design and installation of the new sound system is unavailable at this time. The existing sound system is not audible outside of the Auditorium for non-live and live entertainment events. As under existing conditions, the proposed new sound system would be required to comply with the San Francisco Noise Ordinance. For places of entertainment as defined in the Noise Ordinance (Section 2909 (b)), the low-frequency ambient noise level (dBC) cannot be exceeded by more than 8 dBC. Since under existing conditions, live-entertainment events, including live music concerts, are inaudible at the exterior of the Center and to
surrounding properties, the low-frequency ambient noise level are not expected to exceed 8 dBC. As under existing conditions, the proposed project would implement Condition No. 22 of the April 2012 CU, which requires that the Auditorium be adequately soundproofed and operated so that noise is not audible outside of the Masonic Center, and that fixed-source equipment, such as sound-systems, comply with the Noise Ordinance.

The proposed new sound system would not be expected to result in noise levels or create groundborne vibration or noise levels that would be audible at the exterior of the building because the new system would be required to comply with the Noise Ordinance, and proposed project would implement Condition No. 22 of the April 2012 CU authorization. For these reasons, impacts on groundborne vibration/noise levels would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

To ensure that less-than-significant effects of groundborne vibration or noise levels generated by the new sound system would remain inaudible outside of the venue, City decision makers may decide to impose the following Improvement Measure I-NO-3 as a condition of approval.

**Improvement Measure I-NO-3 – Installation of New Sound System.**

- Once the preliminary sound system design is completed, an acoustical engineer shall review the preliminary design specifications prior to installation to confirm that noise levels inside the auditorium will remain inaudible at the exterior of the Center and specify any needed modifications to the preliminary design necessary to assure noise is inaudible at the exterior. The project sponsor in consultation with the acoustical engineer shall be responsible for ensuring the sound system installed adheres to the recommendations of the acoustical engineer.

- Following installation of the new system, an acoustical engineer shall test the system to determine if any adjustments are necessary to assure noise levels inside the auditorium will remain inaudible at the exterior.

**Cumulative Impacts**

**Impact C-NO-1: The proposed project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to noise impacts related to construction renovation activities. (No Impact)**

As discussed in Section 4.A, Introduction, p. 4.A.4, there are no present or reasonably foreseeable projects within a one-quarter-mile radius of the Masonic Center that, in combination with the proposed project, would create cumulative impacts during renovations of the existing Masonic Center. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant impact on noise during construction and cumulative construction-related noise would be less than significant.

---

24 Crowd noise and loading/unloading activities do not generate significant low-frequency noise.
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Impact C-NO-2: Operation of the proposed project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. *(Less than Significant)*

As described above under Impact NO-2, the increase of 134 additional event attendees and the increase of 85 large events per year would be similar to existing conditions, and would result in less than significant noise impacts. The increase in traffic-related noise due to the proposed increased number of attendees and large events at the Auditorium would be less than significant and would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant permanent increase in noise for cumulative traffic conditions forecast for 2035. Therefore, the proposed project’s contribution to cumulatively significant noise impacts with operation of the proposed project would be less than significant.

Impact C-NO-3: The proposed project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. *(No Impact)*

As discussed in Section 4.A, Introduction, p. 4.A.4, there are no present or reasonably foreseeable projects within a one-quarter-mile radius of the Masonic Center that, in combination with the proposed project, would create cumulative impacts during renovation or operation of the existing Masonic Center. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant impact related to groundborne vibration or noise levels and cumulative construction-related groundborne vibration or noise levels would be less than significant.
E. PUBLIC SERVICES

INTRODUCTION

The topic of Public Services was addressed in the Initial Study (see Chapter 8, Appendix A, pp. 86-89). Police protection, fire protection, and emergency services are analyzed in this section of the EIR because the Initial Study determined that impacts related to these services could be potentially significant. School and library public services and recreation park services are not included in the analysis because the Initial Study determined that potential impacts related to these services would be less than significant (see p. 88 of the Initial Study).

In this section of the EIR, the Environmental Setting discussion describes the existing baseline conditions of police protection and fire protection and emergency services serving the project site. The Impacts addresses the changes in demand for these services that would occur if the proposed project is implemented and whether new or expanded services or facilities would be needed as a result. The Impacts discussion also considers whether the proposed project in combination with other reasonably foreseeable development projects would contribute to cumulative environmental impacts related to these public services.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

POLICE

The San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), headquartered in the Hall of Justice at 850 Bryant Street, provides public safety services in the City and County of San Francisco. The SFPD consists of four bureaus and ten districts (two areas divided into five districts each) located throughout the City. The project site, located in the Nob Hill neighborhood, is within the SFPD’s Central District, which consists of the Financial District, Chinatown, North Beach, and Fisherman’s Wharf, and is served by the Central Police Station located at 766 Vallejo Street, about one-half mile north of the project site. The Central Police Station is staffed 24 hours per day. Central District personnel include district command staff, administrative officers, and patrol officers. Currently, there are about 125 sworn officers. Sergeant Joe Fischer, San Francisco Police Department, personal communication with Turnstone Consulting, November 7, 2012. A copy of this record is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California, as part of Case File No. 2011.0471E.


2 Sergeant Joe Fischer, San Francisco Police Department, personal communication with Turnstone Consulting, November 7, 2012. A copy of this record is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California, as part of Case File No. 2011.0471E.
and the most densely populated neighborhoods of the City, receives an average of 1,401 calls for service per week, which are dispatched from the City of San Francisco Emergency Communication Division.\(^3\)

The SFPD does not have an adopted standard for the ratio of officers to population or developed acreage, and bases staffing levels on the number of service calls and crime incidents.\(^4\) The SFPD had 2,283 sworn police officers as of 2011.

The SFPD compiles data on Crime Maps for reported crimes by address location within a specified radius, by date and time of day.\(^5\) Data is currently available starting from July 12, 2012. During the period of July, 12, 2012 to December 31, 2012, the Masonic Center held approximately 38 events, 19 of which were nighttime live entertainment events (music concerts and comedy shows). According to the SFPD Crime Maps data, there were 49 crimes reported during this period within 500 feet of the Masonic Center, the area roughly bound by Sacramento to Pine Streets, half a block east of Taylor Street to Cushman Street; and slightly west of Jones Street near 1200 and 1205 California Street. Five of the crimes occurred during the period of 4:00 PM (about 4 hours prior to door opening for evening events) to 3:00 AM (4 hours after the event which typically end by 11:30 PM) on the same days that nighttime live entertainment events were held at the Masonic Center. The incidents included three noise nuisance complaints reported within the 1100 block of California Street: one at midnight, the second at 1:59 AM, and the third at 12:25 AM. These complaints were most likely related to crowds departing from the Center after an event and equipment being loaded in the California Street loading zone adjacent to Gramercy Towers at 1177 California Street. (Refer to Section 4.D, Noise, pp. 4.D.4-4.D.16, for a discussion of existing noise conditions.) The remaining two crimes were reported at times before an event commenced (4:21 PM) or after an event had already started (9:18 PM).

Of the 19 evening live entertainment events held at the Center, 14 had no crimes reported to the SFPD within a 500 foot radius of the Masonic Center site. Five of these events – three comedy shows on July 18 and July 20 (8:00 and 10:30 PM shows) and two live-music concerts on September 29 and November 18, 2012 – were sold-out, nighttime live-entertainment events with approximately 3,000 attendees.

**EXISTING EVENTS**

Under existing conditions, the Masonic Center currently operates and complies with conditions imposed by the April 2012 conditional use authorization (hereinafter referred to as the April 2012

---


\(^4\) The San Francisco City Charter, Section 4.127, states that the City is to maintain a staffing level of a minimum of 1,971 sworn officers.

CU authorization) related to police protection services. These conditions would continue to apply with the proposed project, unless modified by approval requirements of the proposed project. The April 2012 CU conditions of approval related to police services are listed below.

- **Event Operations Manual.** The Project Sponsor shall maintain, update over time, provide to event personnel, and make available to the Planning Department an event Operations Manual to include a security plan to ensure neighborhood safety before, during and after performances, including in Huntington Park and near Grace Cathedral. (Condition No. 27)

- **Sale of Alcohol.** Following the conclusion of the last intermission of an event, or one hour prior to the conclusion of an event with no intermission, a maximum of three concession stands may serve alcoholic beverages. One hour prior to the conclusion of an event, no patron approaching a line for a concession stand after the placement of the line marker will be served an alcoholic beverage, with the intent that alcohol service will conclude 45 minutes prior to the end of an event. There shall be no minimum purchase of alcohol required, and a maximum of two alcoholic beverages may be served per order. (Condition No. 30)

- **Police Department Review.** If an event has presented a pattern of safety and security problems in previous concert seasons or at other venues, the project sponsor shall consult with the Police Department to determine whether the project sponsor can provide adequate safety through utilization of its security personnel, contracted private security, and/or on duty or off-duty police officers. If the Chief of Police reasonably determines the event’s historic pattern establishes that safety and security issues cannot be adequately handled at the venue regardless of the project sponsor’s security plan, the Chief of Police may order that the event shall not be held. (Condition No. 31)

- **Hiring Off-Duty Police Officers for Events.** The Project Sponsor shall comply with Administrative Code Section 10-B, and, if off-duty officers are hired, a minimum of two off-duty officers will be hired for events with 1,250 or more presold tickets; if SFPD determines that more than two officers are required, the project sponsor shall provide the additional officers. (Condition No. 32)

Live Nation also has a security plan on file with the San Francisco Entertainment Commission in its Place of Entertainment permit file, as required by the Police Code. Pursuant to that plan, during a typical live entertainment event, Live Nation and Avatar Foods, the Center’s food and beverage vendor, employs approximately 68 on-site security personnel, including ushers/ticket takers, security guards, and identification checkers (for alcoholic beverage service).6

Under existing conditions, some adjacent and nearby residents may interpret that live entertainment nighttime events at the Masonic Center place more demand on police protection services due to event-related pedestrian activity, the presence of different types of audience

---

attendees from outside of the Nob Hill neighborhood, and the potential for crowd rowdiness and incidents of public intoxication in the vicinity, particularly Huntington Park. This interpretation by some adjacent and nearby residents also may occur when there are nearby simultaneous events at nearby venues, when there is the potential for incidents that require police protection services due to heightened activity in the vicinity of the Masonic Center.

The SFPD’s most recent crime reporting data indicate that, under existing conditions, the five incidents reported before, during, and after events at the Auditorium indicate that the SFPD are able to provide adequate police protection services during live-entertainment nighttime events days in combination with the security procedures required by the April 2012 CU authorization.

**FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES**

The San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD) is responsible for protecting life and property throughout San Francisco from fires, natural disasters, and hazardous materials incidents. The SFFD also provides emergency medical services in the City, including basic life support and advanced life support services. In addition, several privately operated ambulance companies are authorized to provide basic and advanced life support services. Water supply for fire suppression in San Francisco is provided mainly from the potable supply but is augmented on the east side of San Francisco in the project vicinity by an auxiliary water supply system.

As of 2011, the SFFD has a staff of 1,533 uniformed members and 127 civilians. The daily operational strength is a minimum of approximately 295 staff members citywide. The SFFD operates 48 stations throughout the City. The department’s resources include 42 engine companies, 19 truck companies, 2 heavy rescue squads, 2 fireboats, and multiple special purpose units. The SFFD has two main divisions: Division 2 (four battalions), and Division 3 (five battalions).

The Masonic Center is located within the Division 2 service area, which encompasses an area extending from Downtown and Financial Districts to the northwest boundaries of the City. The

---

7 The mission of the Fire Department is stated on the City and County of San Francisco Fire Department website, available online at http://www.sf-fire.org/, accessed November 6, 2012. The mission statement also includes fire prevention education and goals for the work environment.


9 Rhab Boughn, Compliance and Public Records Officer, San Francisco Fire Department, personal communication with Turnstone Consulting, November 7, 2012. A copy of this record is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California, as part of Case File No. 2011.0471E.
Masonic Center is in the First Alarm area\textsuperscript{10} for Station 41, located at 1325 Leavenworth Street, approximately 0.29 mile west of the Masonic Auditorium. This station is responsible for arriving first in the event of an emergency. As with current building conditions and operating procedures, the proposed renovation project would be required to comply with the life-safety construction standards of the Uniform Building Code and the requirements of the San Francisco Fire Code (Section 12.202(e)(1)) to establish procedures in case of a fire or other emergencies.

Fire stations are strategically located to allow personnel to reach emergencies in the surrounding area quickly. In San Francisco, response times are calculated from the time the dispatch is received and acknowledged at the station to the time the responding unit informs dispatch that it is at the scene. The State of California target response time goal for Code 3 (life-threatening fire and medical emergencies) calls is 5 minutes. Code 3 calls are the highest response priority.\textsuperscript{11}

San Francisco’s objective is to respond to the scene of high-priority medical emergencies (Code 3 calls) within 6.5 minutes of receiving a 911 call, 90 percent of the time. The 6.5-minute goal includes 2 minutes for dispatch and 4.5 minutes for the fire engine or ambulance to arrive. This standard was adopted in 2004 by the San Francisco Emergency Medical Services Agency under the Department of Public Health. A 2009 report by the San Francisco Fire Commission noted that the response time for Emergency Medical Care (called Advanced Life Support by the San Francisco Fire Department) is 4 minutes 40 seconds,\textsuperscript{12} which indicates that SFFD is meeting both the City and State standards.

Under existing conditions, nearby residents have expressed concerns about fire protection and emergency services being impeded by increased pedestrian activity and traffic congestion during events at the Auditorium, particularly when simultaneous events are held at nearby venues. As noted above, measurement of the performance of the SFFD, even during simultaneous events on Nob Hill, shows that the SFFD is meeting its performance objectives.

In addition to what is required in the April 2012 CU authorization, the current Operations Manual prepared by Live Nation (Condition No. 27) includes on-site Emergency Medical Technician (EMT) services for all events over 1,250 attendees. A designated on-site medical office is currently located in the first-floor main lobby. Live Nation currently contracts with Rock Med,

\textsuperscript{10} The First Alarm area is the geographic area in which a station is responsible for arriving first in the case of an emergency.

\textsuperscript{11} Office of the Controller, City and County of San Francisco, A Review of the San Francisco Fire-EMS System, April 2004, Appendix B. A copy of this document is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California, as part of Case File No. 2011.0471E.

\textsuperscript{12} This is the 90th percentile response time, the amount of time 9 out of 10 emergency medical teams arrive, which is the industry standard measurement. Fire Commission Response to Grand Jury Report, September 18, 2009. Available online at http://www.sf-fire.org/index.aspx?page=827. Accessed November 6, 2012.
an on-site medical service staffed by trained emergency medical technicians (EMT), for events with over 1,250 attendees to provide on-site emergency medical services. The Operations Manual for the Center also specifies procedures for emergency evacuations during events.13

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

Police

A Place of Entertainment Permit would be required under Section 1060 et seq. of the San Francisco Police Code. The permit is reviewed, approved, and issued by the San Francisco Entertainment Commission, which regulates, promotes and enhances entertainment in the City. Under Section 1060.5, the project sponsor is required to institute a Security Plan subject to approval by the Entertainment Commission. Under Section 1060.12, the project sponsor would be required to ensure that events at the Masonic Center are soundproofed in a manner that would eliminate event-related noise or reduce it to a reasonable level. See the Regulatory Framework discussion in Section 4.D, Noise, pp. 4.D.16-4.D.20.

The Police Department would be required to approve the installation and enforcement of temporary signage authorizing loading and passenger drop-off and pick-up on California Street before, during, and after each large event.

Fire and Emergency Medical Services

State

*California Fire Code*

State fire regulations are set forth in Sections 13000 et seq. of the California Health and Safety Code, which include regulations concerning building standards for life safety (as also set forth in the California Building Code), fire protection and notification systems, fire protection devices (such as extinguishers and smoke alarms, high-rise building and child care facility standards), and fire suppression training.

Local

*San Francisco Fire Code*

The San Francisco Fire Code incorporates by reference the 2010 California Fire Code (Title 24, Cal. Code Regs, Part 9), with certain local amendments. The San Francisco Fire Code was

13 Live Nation, *Operations Manual Nob Hill Masonic* (Undated). This document is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California, as part of Case File No. 2011.0471E.
revised in 2010 to regulate and govern the safeguarding of life and property from fire and explosion hazards arising from the storage, handling, and use of hazardous substances, materials, and devices, and from conditions hazardous to life or property in the occupancy of buildings and premises; to provide for the issuance of permits, inspections, and other SFFD services; and to assess and collect fees for those permits, inspections, and services. The SFFD reviews building plans to ensure that fire and life safety are provided and maintained in the buildings that fall under its jurisdiction, including assembly occupancies of 50 or more occupants.

In coordination with the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection, the SFFD conducts plan checks to ensure that all structures, occupancies, and systems listed above are designed in accordance with the San Francisco Building Code, including interior building renovations such as those proposed for the Masonic Center.

IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS

The thresholds for determining the significance of impacts in this analysis are consistent with the environmental checklist in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, which has been adopted and modified by the San Francisco Planning Department. For the purpose of this analysis, the following applicable threshold was used to determine whether implementing the project would result in a significant impact to public services. Implementation of a proposed project would have a significant effect on public services if the project would:

L.1 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, or other services.

IMPACT EVALUATION

Impact PS-1: The proposed project would not increase demand for public services to the extent that new facilities would have to be constructed or existing facilities altered in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for police protection services. (Less than Significant)

Police

Impacts on police protection services are considered significant if an increase in population would result in inadequate staffing levels (as measured by the ability of the SFPD to respond to call loads) or if increased demand for services would require the construction or expansion of
new or altered facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. The proposed project would not add residential units nor alter the population of San Francisco. However, the proposed project would increase the maximum number of event attendees within the Auditorium from 3,166 up to a maximum of 3,300, an increase of 134 attendees per event, and would increase the maximum number of large events (more than 250 attendees) from 230 events to an estimated 315 maximum events, an increase of about 85 large events.

The increased number of portable food and beverage concession areas that serve alcoholic beverages could increase the number of incidents related to consumption of alcoholic beverages, requiring police or emergency medical services. As under existing conditions, the proposed project would continue to implement the conditions listed on p. 4.E.3 to minimize potential incidents that require increased police protection services.

### Increased Event Attendees

The proposed project would increase the number of large events at the site and could cause a slight increase in the demand for police services. The increase in the number of attendees at large events by up to 134 patrons is about a 4.2 percent increase over maximum attendance under existing conditions. The increase of up to 134 patrons would occur only when there are sold-out, general admissions events (standing room on the main floor of the Auditorium and fixed seating in the balcony); all other Auditorium configurations for large events would have about 1,814 to 2,537 to attendees, about 20 to 43 percent fewer than the 3,166 attendees currently accommodated in the existing Masonic Auditorium (refer to Table 2.3: Existing and Proposed Number of Attendees per Event, by Auditorium Configuration, in Chapter 2, Project Description, p. 2.24). According to the SFPD, current staffing levels are adequate to meet the needs of the proposed project.  

As under existing conditions, the April 2012 conditions of approval that address security and police services and Place of Entertainment permit requirements, including maintenance by the project sponsor of a Security Plan (as described on p. 2.15), are expected to continue with implementation of the proposed project, and would minimize the need for increased police services during events held at the Masonic.

Therefore, the increase of up to 134 attendees at large events with implementation of the proposed project would not require the construction or expansion of new or altered police

---

14 Sergeant Joe Fischer, San Francisco Police Department, personal communication with Turnstone Consulting, November 7, 2012. A copy of this record is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California, as part of Case File No. 2011.0471E.
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protection facilities, or affect existing service ratios or response times, and would have a less-than-significant impact on police services. No mitigation measures would be necessary.

**Increased Number of Events**

As stated above, SFPD indicates that current staffing levels are adequate to meet the needs of the proposed project, including the increased number and frequency of events. An increase in the number of large events would require the Masonic Auditorium to hire off-duty officers more frequently to ensure public safety (Condition No. 32). The primary use of off-duty officers has been to assist with traffic, as there is no history of public intoxication or disorderly behavior associated with events at the Masonic Auditorium that would result in a high level of increased police calls and crime report incidents.\(^{15}\) This would be expected to continue with implementation of the proposed project.

Although the proposed addition of 85 large events per year could increase the total number and frequency of potential incidents that require police services, individual events at the Masonic Center are not expected to generate crime activity that could not be accommodated by the current SFPD staffing levels and by the Masonic Center private security staff and its procedure to hire off-duty officers during large events (Condition No. 32). As under existing conditions, the proposed project, events held at the Masonic Center would be subject to Police Department review to ensure that adequate security is provided during events (Condition No. 30).

Therefore, the increase of up to 85 large events per year would not require the construction or expansion of new or altered facilities, or affect existing service ratios or response times, and would have a less-than-significant impact on police services. Thus, no mitigation measures are necessary.

In conclusion, the proposed project would have less-than-significant impacts on police services because the SFPD indicates that increased service demand by the proposed project can be accommodated by existing SFPD staffing levels and service levels and, as under existing conditions, the proposed project would continue to implement the Operations Manual and Place of Entertainment Permit security plan included in the April 2012 CU conditions of approval. Therefore, the increased number of attendees and frequency of events that would result from implementation of the proposed project would not require construction or alteration of existing SFPD facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives. Thus, the proposed project’s impacts on police protection services would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

---

\(^{15}\) Sergeant Joe Fischer, San Francisco Police Department, personal communication with Turnstone Consulting, November 7, 2012.
Fire and Emergency Services

*Increased Event Attendees*

The increase in the maximum number of event attendees by up to 134 persons could contribute to increased pedestrian activity and local traffic congestion that would interfere with the Fire Department’s ability to access and provide fire and emergency services to the Masonic Center and surrounding uses.

As discussed in Section 4.C, Transportation and Circulation, pp. 4.C.36-4.C.39, traffic in the project vicinity would continue to operate at acceptable levels, as under existing conditions, and emergency access to the site would remain adequate. Therefore, the increased number of attendees would have a less-than-significant impact on access by the Fire Department to provide fire protection and emergency services.

*Increased Number of Events*

The increase in the number of large events by 85 events per year would increase the number of pedestrians and traffic congestion in the vicinity of the site, and the number of days during the year that this increase occurs; however, the increased frequency in the number of events would not affect the SFPD’s ability to provide fire protection and emergency services for individual events at the Auditorium.

The proposed project would contribute to existing local pedestrian activity and traffic in the project vicinity when there are simultaneous events or functions at nearby venues that could affect access by the SFPD for fire protection and emergency services at the Masonic Center site and vicinity. Section 4.C, Transportation and Circulation, discusses the traffic effects of the proposed project when simultaneous events occur in the project vicinity, and concludes that traffic congestion would remain at acceptable levels and that emergency vehicular access would be adequate, as under existing conditions. Therefore, the proposed increased number of events would have a less-than-significant impact on access by the Fire Department to provide fire protection and emergency services, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

The SFFD would review building plans for the renovation to ensure that adequate fire and life safety measures are provided. SFPD’s review of the plans would include emergency access and egress; sprinkler systems; fire-rated design, construction, and materials; restrictions on occupant loads; emergency lighting; smoke alarms; and mechanical smoke control and emergency notification systems.

While the increased number of large events with the proposed renovation project could result in additional demand for emergency and fire protection services, the SFFD does not anticipate that
the incremental change in demand would degrade service levels below adopted performance objectives, nor would it require new fire protection service facilities or emergency medical response services beyond those now provided and planned for, because the proposed project would not add considerably to the existing duties of the SFPD in this area.\textsuperscript{16}

Furthermore, it is expected that the April 2012 CU conditions would continue to be implemented with the proposed project, and that Live Nation would continue to implement its ongoing contract with Rock Med to provide on-site EMT services for all events over 1,250 attendees which would reduce any potential demand for increased emergency medical services by the SFPD.

In conclusion, the proposed project would have less-than-significant impacts on fire protection and emergency services because the SFFD indicates that increased service demand by the project would not be substantial and can be accommodated by existing SFFD staffing and service levels, the proposed renovations would comply with Building Code requirements for fire and life safety standards and, as under existing conditions, the proposed project would continue to provide on-site EMT services for events with over 1,250 attendees. Therefore, the increased number of attendees and frequency of events that would result from implementation of the proposed project would not require construction or alteration of existing fire facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives. Thus, the proposed project’s impacts on fire protection and emergency services would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Cumulative Impacts

Impact C-PS-1: The proposed project, in combination with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant impact on police and fire protection and emergency services. (Less than Significant)

As stated in the cumulative discussion in Section 4.B, Land Use and Land Use Planning, pp. 4.B.10-4.B.13, there are no past, present, or reasonably foreseeable projects within a one-quarter-mile radius of the project site. Thus, there are no cumulative projects that would contribute to a significant impact on police and fire protection and emergency services. Both the SFPD and SFFD consider cumulative and incremental service needs on a citywide basis.

\textsuperscript{16} Rhab Boughn, Compliance and Public Records Officer, San Francisco Fire Department, personal communication with Turnstone Consulting, November 7, 2012. A copy of this record is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California, as part of Case File No. 2011.0471E.
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Police

The proposed project would add to the demand for police services in the Central District; however, the SFPD has not identified a citywide service gap, including its ability to serve the proposed project and existing surrounding uses. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant contribution to cumulative impacts on police services, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Fire and Emergency Medical Services

The proposed project would add to the demand for fire response and emergency medical services in the project’s service area; however, the SFFD has not identified a citywide service gap, including its ability to serve the proposed project and existing surrounding uses. The incremental increase in demand for fire services and emergency medical response services as a result of the proposed project and reasonably foreseeable projects would not be beyond levels anticipated and planned for by the SFFD. Thus, the cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts of the proposed project on fire and emergency medical response services would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant contribution to cumulative impacts on fire protection and emergency services and no mitigation measures are necessary.
5. OTHER CEQA ISSUES

A. GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

As required by Section 15126.2(d) of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR must consider the ways in which the proposed project could directly or indirectly foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing. Growth-inducing impacts can result from the elimination of obstacles to growth; through increased stimulation of economic activity that would, in turn, generate increased employment or demand for housing and public services; or as a result of policies or measures that encourage premature or unplanned growth. Examples of projects likely to have substantial or adverse growth-inducing effects include expansion of infrastructure systems beyond what is needed to serve current demand in the project vicinity, and development of new residential uses in areas that are currently sparsely developed or undeveloped. The following discussion considers how implementation of the proposed project could potentially affect growth nearby or elsewhere in San Francisco or the region.

As discussed in Chapter 2, Project Description, pp. 2.16-2.26, the proposed project would result in interior renovations to the ground floor and the Auditorium of the Masonic Center, the addition of permanent food and beverage service, an increase in the maximum number of attendees for events in the Auditorium, and an increase in the number and frequency of large events (more than 250 attendees) per year.

As discussed in the Notice of Preparation/Initial Study (NOP/IS), under Population and Housing, pp. 44-46 (see Chapter 8, Appendix A), the proposed project would not include the construction of housing and, therefore, would not directly induce population growth. With implementation of the proposed project, there would be a net increase of one full-time employee (from 51 to 52), and the number of temporary, event-related workers (including ushers, ticket takers, security, food service staff, concessionaries, merchandise vendors, stagehands, and cleaning staff) would remain about the same (typically 75 to 100 depending on the event). The increase of one full-time employee would not result in an increase in the demand for housing that could not be accommodated by the projected growth of San Francisco’s housing supply between 2010 and 2030. The existing full-time and temporary employees likely already reside in San Francisco or elsewhere in the region and would not generate an increase in the demand for housing. The increased number of event attendees and the increased number of annual events would increase business activity at nearby restaurants, hotels, and bars. This increase in business patronage would not require new construction or induce physical growth-inducing impacts.
The proposed project is located in an urban area that is already served by the City’s municipal infrastructure and public services. No expansion to municipal infrastructure or public services beyond what is already planned or under construction would be required to accommodate the proposed project. Furthermore, the proposed project would not result in the development of new infrastructure or public services that would induce growth elsewhere in the City or the region.

For the reasons discussed above, the proposed project would not result in significant growth-inducing impacts.

**B. SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS**

In accordance with Section 21067 of CEQA and with Sections 15126(b) and 15126.2(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, the purpose of this section is to identify significant environmental impacts that cannot be eliminated or reduced to less-than-significant levels by implementation of mitigation measures included in the proposed project or identified in Chapter 4, Environmental Setting and Impacts. As discussed in Chapter 4, Environmental Setting and Impacts, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts (see Section 4.B, Land Use and Land Use Planning, pp. 4.B.6-4.B.13; Section 4.C, Transportation and Circulation, pp. 4.C.30-4.C.52; Section 4.D, Noise, pp. 4.D.19-4.D.29; and Section 4.E, Public Services, pp. 4.E.7-4.E.11).

The findings of significant impacts are subject to final determination by the San Francisco Planning Commission as part of the certification process for this EIR. If necessary, this chapter will be revised in the Final EIR to reflect the findings of the Planning Commission.

**C. SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE CHANGES**

In accordance with Section 21100 (b)(2)(B) of CEQA, and Section 15126.2(c) of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR must identify any significant irreversible environmental changes that could result from implementation of the proposed project. These changes include (1) uses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project that may be irreversible since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or non-use thereafter unlikely and (2) project-related accidents that cause irreversible environmental damage.

The project site is currently occupied by the Masonic Center, an assembly and entertainment use. The proposed project would intensify the existing assembly and entertainment use, thus committing future generations to the same land use for the life of the project. Implementation of the proposed project would result in the irreversible commitment of energy resources, primarily in the form of fossil fuels, for construction equipment and automobiles during demolition and construction activities at, and the ongoing occupancy and use of, the project site. As discussed in the NOP/IS (see Chapter 8, Appendix A) under Greenhouse Gas Emissions, p. 74, Table 9, and
Mineral and Energy Resources, pp. 105-107, the proposed project would not use energy in a wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary manner, and would comply with the energy standards required by Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations (the Building Code). Other nonrenewable or slowly renewable resources that would be consumed during construction and demolition activities on, and the ongoing occupancy and use of, the project site include concrete, lumber, metals, water. As discussed in the NOP/IS, under Greenhouse Gas Emissions, pp. 67-78, the proposed project would comply with the applicable provisions of the San Francisco Building Code and the San Francisco Environment Code regarding the conservation of natural resources and the reduction of solid waste, thus ensuring that these resources would not be consumed in a wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary manner.

No significant irreversible environmental damage, such as an accidental spill or explosion of hazardous materials, would occur with implementation of the proposed project. Compliance with Federal, State and local regulations identified in the NOP/IS, under Hazards and Hazardous Materials, pp. 99-105, would reduce the possibility that hazardous substances from the demolition, construction, and operation of proposed project would cause significant and irreversible environmental damage.

For the reasons discussed above, the proposed project would not result in any significant irreversible environmental impacts.

**D. AREAS OF KNOWN CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED**

The NOP/IS for this project was published on October 10, 2012, announcing the intent to prepare and distribute an EIR. Individuals and agencies that received these notices included owners of properties within 300 feet of the project site and potentially interested parties, including regional and state agencies. Based on the public comments on the NOP/IS, potential areas of controversy for the proposed project include:

- Traffic impacts during performances at the Masonic Center;
- Noise impacts on adjacent residents related to performer truck loading before and after events at the Masonic Center on California Street; and
- Noise impacts on adjacent residents related to increased vehicular traffic and pedestrian activity on California Street and in the vicinity (e.g., honking horns and loud conversations) before and after events at the Masonic Center on California Street.

As discussed in Chapter 1, Introduction, pp. 1.2-1.4, the San Francisco Superior Court has issued a Statement of Decision and a Writ of Mandate regarding the intensification of a legal
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nonconforming use. The discretionary approvals related to this matter are not environmental issues; they will be considered by the City decision-makers during their deliberations on the proposed project.
6. ALTERNATIVES

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes alternatives to the proposed Masonic Center Renovation Project. It also evaluates the environmental impacts associated with each alternative relative to existing conditions and to the environmental impacts of the proposed project. As determined in Chapter 4, Environmental Setting and Impacts, the proposed project would have no significant impacts; this Alternatives chapter therefore discusses the feasibility of each alternative to meet the project sponsor’s objectives, while still avoiding or substantially reducing less-than-significant impacts, in comparison to the impacts of the proposed project. This chapter identifies one of the alternatives as an environmentally superior alternative, which is the alternative that would result in the least adverse effect on the physical environment.

The analysis of alternatives is of benefit to decision-makers because it provides more complete information about the potential impacts of land use decisions and, consequently, a better understanding of the interrelationships among all of the environmental topics under evaluation. Decision-makers must consider approval of an alternative if the alternative would substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental impacts identified for the proposed project and the alternative is determined to be feasible.

RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a) requires that an EIR evaluate “a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.” An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a proposed project. Rather, it must consider a range of potentially feasible alternatives governed by the “rule of reason” in order to foster informed decision-making and public participation (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)).

CEQA Guidelines Sections 15126.6(f)(1) and (f)(3) state that “among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries (projects with a regionally significant impact should consider the regional context), and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site (or the site is already owned by the proponent)” and that an EIR “need not consider an alternative whose effect cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative.” The final determination of feasibility will be
made by project decision-makers based on substantial evidence in the record, which includes, but is not limited to, information presented in the EIR, comments received on the Draft EIR, and responses to those comments.

Except for the No Project Alternative, the alternatives discussed in this chapter considers different attendance, live-entertainment event frequency, and audience configurations on the main floor of the Auditorium that could reduce the less-than-significant impacts identified with implementation of the proposed project described in Chapter 4 of this EIR: Land Use and Land Use Planning, Transportation and Circulation, Noise, and Public Services (Police Protection and Fire Protection and Emergency Services).

Three alternatives are evaluated in this chapter:

- Alternative A: No Project
- Alternative B: No Major Auditorium Renovations
- Alternative C: Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas

The major differences between the total number and types of events among the alternatives as compared to existing conditions and the proposed project are shown in Table 6.1 below.

**Table 6.1: Comparison of Existing Conditions, Proposed Project and Alternatives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>Alternative A No Project</th>
<th>Alternative B No Major Auditorium Renovations</th>
<th>Alternative C Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Number of Large Events per Year&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Entertainment&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>79&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Live Entertainment&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>230</strong></td>
<td><strong>315</strong></td>
<td><strong>230</strong></td>
<td><strong>315</strong></td>
<td><strong>299</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Auditorium Attendance</td>
<td>3,166</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>3,166</td>
<td>3,166</td>
<td>3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concession Areas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

- <sup>a</sup> Events with more than 250 attendees.
- <sup>b</sup> Live Entertainment is defined in Planning Code Section 790.38 to include dramatic and musical performances (including comedy shows), and/or events that provide amplified taped music for dancing on the premises.
- <sup>c</sup> Of the 79 annual total limit of large live entertainment events, a maximum of 54 live music or electronic dance music events would be allowed within the 79 event limit.
- <sup>d</sup> Non-Live Entertainment includes all events other than those defined as live entertainment, such as meetings, conferences, trade shows, and special events like weddings, banquets and private parties.

Source: Turnstone Consulting, 2013
B. ALTERNATIVE A: NO PROJECT

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e) requires that, among the project alternatives, a “no project” alternative be evaluated. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) requires that the no project alternative analysis “discuss the existing conditions…as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and policies and consistent with the available infrastructure and community services.” As noted in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, an EIR on “a development project on identifiable property,” typically analyzes a no project alternative, i.e., “the circumstance under which the project does not proceed. Such a discussion would compare the environmental effects of the property remaining in its existing state against environmental effects that would occur if the project is approved. If disapproval of the project under consideration would result in predictable actions by others, such as the proposal of some other project, this ‘no project’ consequence should be discussed.”

DESCRIPTION

Under Alternative A: No Project, the existing conditions at the Masonic Center site would not change and existing event operations would remain, except that Condition 6 of the April 2012 CU authorization would be fully implemented, and cars would be allowed to enter the parking garage through the Pine Street loading dock as would occur with the proposed project. The existing Masonic Center in its current condition would be retained and would not undergo any renovations. The existing Auditorium, including renovations to the main-floor Auditorium and balcony concourses, and second-floor balcony lobby also would not be renovated. Renovations would not occur in the ground-floor California Room and Exhibition Hall. The existing ground-floor catering kitchen would remain and would not be upgraded to a commercial kitchen. During events, there would continue to be up to five portable concession areas during events in the main entrance lobby, concourse area in the main floor Auditorium, and main floor balcony. A new stage and new sound and lighting systems would not be installed in the Auditorium.

With the No Project Alternative, the existing 12,860 gross sq. ft. of accessible and private outdoor open space would not be used during daytime events for occasional outdoor refreshment and break areas. Existing parking facilities at the Masonic Center garage and loading operations would not change.

The total seated capacity in the Auditorium would remain at 3,166 persons. As required by Condition No. 34 of the April 2012 CU authorization, the annual maximum number of large events (more than 250 attendees) would continue to be limited to 54 events, and the maximum number of large non-live events would be limited to 176 events, for a maximum total of 230 large events per year. As under existing conditions, the No Project Alternative would have no
limitations on events with 250 or fewer attendees, which would be in addition to large events. The No Project Alternative would fully implement all of the conditions of approval imposed by the April 2012 CU authorization.

**IMPACTS**

**Land Use and Land Use Planning**

If the No Project Alternative were implemented, none of the impacts associated with the proposed project, as described in Chapter 4, would occur. Existing land use conditions on the project site would not change. The existing Masonic Center would continue to operate as an assembly, entertainment and cultural use, and would not divide an established community, as under existing conditions. As under existing conditions, nearby and adjacent residents would continue to experience event-related traffic, noise, crowd and pedestrian activity, and performer unloading/loading during concert events that may be perceived as annoyances and disruptions to the existing land use character of the Nob Hill neighborhood in the project vicinity. These effects, which would be similar to the proposed project, are indirect effects on land use character that are addressed under Chapter 4 of the EIR, Section 4.C, Transportation and Circulation, 4.D, Noise, and 4.E, Public Services, and were determined to be less than significant for the proposed project.

The Masonic Center would continue to operate as a legal nonconforming use that is allowed to continue on the project site for an indefinite period per the April 2012 CU authorization. No additional project approvals would be required by the City with the No Project Alternative. The existing conditions of approval imposed by the April 2012 CU authorization would continue to be required for operation of the proposed project. The project sponsor would still be required to fulfill requirements of the April 28, 20011 Statement of Decision and Writ of Mandate, as applicable.

Therefore, compared to the proposed project, which would have less-than-significant land use impacts as described in Section 4.B, Land Use and Land Use Planning, the No Project Alternative would not have any impacts related to land use as existing conditions would remain the same.

**Transportation and Circulation**

Since the No Project Alternative would retain the existing total annual number and type of large events, and the maximum event attendance at the Masonic Auditorium (3,166 people) would remain the same, travel demand under this Alternative would be similar to existing conditions. Therefore, the existing transportation and circulation conditions described in Section 4.C, Transportation and Circulation, would characterize transportation effects of this alternative.
As under existing conditions, nearby and adjacent residents would continue to experience traffic, transit, pedestrian and bicycle conditions, as well as passenger and performer unloading/loading before and after concert events. The frequency and intensity of these conditions would be diminished compared to those with the proposed project (which were determined to be less than significant) because there would be no increase in the number of large events or the maximum attendance. Cumulative transportation conditions in 2035 would also be less intense than those described in Section 4.C, Transportation and Circulation for the proposed project, which were determined to be less than significant.

The No Project alternative would include full implementation of Condition No. 6 imposed by the April 2012 CU authorization, which would allow vehicles with pre-paid parking for events to enter the parking garage from Pine Street via the loading dock ramp before large events. Under current existing conditions, vehicles only exit the garage via Pine Street.\(^1\)

Transportation improvement measures that may be imposed by decision makers for the proposed project would not occur with the No Project Alternative. These measures include providing orientation to employees about alternative modes of travel to private vehicle, regular updates of the project website about public transit travel, providing incentives for those patrons arriving to the event by public transportation, and the installation of signage indicating the location of the bicycle parking spaces at the Masonic Center garage.

**Noise**

Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no renovation or construction activities on the project site and, consequently, no new sources of construction-related noise or vibration. Potential noise impacts and improvement measures identified for the proposed project in Section 4.D, Noise (I-NO-1: Construction and Debris Box Removal, p. 4.D.24) would not be applicable.

Under the No Project Alternative, noise effects of vehicles entering and exiting the garage on Pine Street before and after large events would be similar to those described for the proposed project (less than significant), but would occur less frequently than with the proposed project, as there would be 85 fewer large events.

---

\(^1\) Condition No. 6 (refer to Appendix B) requires that the project sponsor allow patrons with pre-paid parking to enter and exit the parking garage through the Pine Street loading dock before and after large events. Under current existing conditions, vehicles only exit the garage, but would be allowed to enter after completion of the renovation project. The No Project Alternative would require full implementation of Condition 6 as part of the existing April 2012 CU authorization without the proposed project.
6. Alternatives

As with the proposed project, ambient noise levels with the No Project Alternative would not exceed the requirements of the San Francisco Noise Ordinance. Nearby and adjacent residents would continue to experience event-related noise which could be considered disruptive and an annoyance.

Noise improvement measures that may be imposed by decision makers for the proposed project would not occur with the No Project Alternative. Improvement measures identified for the proposed project in Section 4.D to provide on-site staff to monitor unloading/loading operations and crowd noise (I-NO-2a: Appointment of a Noise Control Officers); and to service and maintain the Pine Street loading dock ramp to reduce noise effects of cars entering and exiting the garage (I-NO-2b: Service and Maintenance of the Pine Street Loading Dock) would not be applicable with the No Project Alternative. Therefore, in comparison to the proposed project, which would have less-than-significant noise impacts, as described in Section 4.D, Noise, the No Project Alternative would not have any impacts related to noise, except for less-than-significant noise-related impacts of vehicle entry to the existing parking garage via the Pine Street loading dock before events.

Public Services

The project site is currently adequately served by existing police protection, fire protection, and emergency services. Therefore, compared to the proposed project, which would have less-than-significant public services impacts as described in Section 4.E, Public Services, the No Project Alternative would not have any impacts related to public services.

CONCLUSION

With the No Project Alternative, existing conditions on the project site would remain, plus the added condition of vehicles entering the garage via Pine Street before large events. The Masonic Center would operate under the conditions imposed by the April 2012 CU authorization. Unlike the proposed project, the No Project Alternative would not increase the number of attendees at large events by up to 134 patrons. As required by the April 2012 CU authorization, there would be no increase in the total number of large events. As under existing conditions, total events would remain at 230 per year, of which 54 would be large live-entertainment events, and the number of small events with 250 or fewer attendees would continue to be unlimited.

For topics that were addressed in the Initial Study and found to have no impacts or less-than-significant impacts, including public services (library and schools), biological resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, hazards and hazardous materials, mineral and energy resources or agricultural and forest resources, these topic areas would have no impacts for the No Project Alternative in comparison to the proposed project.
6. Alternatives

The No Project Alternative would not satisfy the project objectives to increase revenue-generating uses and the capacity of the Masonic Center; to modernize and renovate the 55-year-old facility to provide a state-of-the-art venue that provides amenities and a flexible range of configurations that would accommodate contemporary performers, artists, organizations, institutions, corporations and individuals suitable for the Nob Hill neighborhood setting; and to attract and retain a full-time professional management company to operate and promote events at the Center. The No Project Alternative also would not provide improved nearby meeting and assembly spaces to support the economic viability of the five nearby Nob Hill hotels.

C. ALTERNATIVE B: NO MAJOR AUDITORIUM RENOVATIONS

DESCRIPTION

The intent of Alternative B: No Major Auditorium Renovations is to provide an alternative that would not increase the total number of attendees; however, it would increase the maximum number of large events from 230 to 315 per year, as with the proposed project.

The No Major Auditorium Renovations Alternative would not change the existing fixed seating (3,166 total) in the Auditorium. This alternative would not remove the existing stage and would not replace the existing fixed seating with tiered seating on the main floor of the Auditorium to accommodate more flexible audience configurations for different types of venues, as would occur with the proposed project. As under existing conditions, there would continue to be a total of 1,860 fixed seats in the main floor of the Auditorium, and a total of 1,306 fixed seats in the second-floor balcony that would accommodate a total of 3,166 patrons in the Masonic Center Auditorium. The No Major Auditorium Renovations Alternative would include installation of new lighting and sound systems in the Auditorium.

There would be no standing room for audiences on the main floor of the Auditorium, as the existing fixed seating would remain and there would not be renovations for tiered flooring to accommodate flexible configurations on the main floor of the Auditorium. As with the proposed project, this alternative would renovate the ground-floor California Room and Exhibition Hall, upgrade the existing ground-floor catering kitchen to a commercial kitchen, and provide up to three additional portable food and beverage concession areas, for a total of up to eight depending on the type of event. Similar to the proposed project, occasional daytime, outdoor seating would be provided with the No Major Auditorium Renovations Alternative.

The No Major Auditorium Renovations Alternative would increase the total number of annual events from 230 to 315, as with the proposed project. As with the proposed project, the existing conditions of approval imposed by the April 2012 CU authorization would be implemented for all events at the Masonic Center.
6. Alternatives

IMPACTS

Land Use and Land Use Planning

As with the proposed project, the No Major Auditorium Renovations Alternative would not construct a physical barrier to neighborhood access or remove an existing means of access. For these reasons, this alternative would not physically divide an established community. Like the proposed project, this alternative would have no land use impact, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

As with the proposed project, the implementation of the No Major Auditorium Renovations Alternative would require the same approvals as under the proposed project. Since zoning regulations are adopted for the purposes of regulating the location of various uses, this alternative would not conflict with any land use plans, policies, or regulations adopted to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect. Like the proposed project, this alternative would have less-than-significant land use impacts, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

The No Major Auditorium Renovations Alternative would have no impacts related to the increased number of attendees, as compared to the proposed project which would have less-than-significant impacts on land use and land use planning. As with the proposed project, the No Major Auditorium Renovations Alternative would increase the maximum number of large events from 230 to 315 per year. As a result, similar to the proposed project, during the additional 85 events per year, there would be increased incidents of higher pedestrian activity, crowd noise, traffic noise (e.g., honking horns), traffic volumes, attendee drop-off/pick-up activity, and performer equipment unloading/loading activity in front of the Masonic Center on California Street. Some adjacent and nearby residents could perceive that the increased number of days with these event-related activities are disruptive or detract from the existing character of the Nob Hill neighborhood. As with the proposed project, event-related impacts associated with pedestrian activity, crowd noise, traffic noise, traffic volumes and performer equipment unloading/loading would be less than significant. Although the increased event-related activities in the vicinity of the Masonic Center could be considered to be an annoyance to nearby residents, these event-related activities would be the same as those that occur under existing conditions and, as with the proposed project, are not direct physical land use impacts under CEQA.

Therefore, as with the proposed project, the increase in the number and frequency of events would not have a substantial adverse effect on the existing land use character of the vicinity with implementation of the No Major Auditorium Renovations Alternative. The interior renovations to the Masonic Center would not change the physical land use character of the project site or the project vicinity. Like the proposed project, this alternative would have less-than-significant land use impacts, and no mitigation measures are necessary.
Transportation and Circulation

The No Major Auditorium Renovations Alternative would retain the existing maximum event attendance at the Masonic Auditorium (3,166 people), while increasing the total number of annual large live and non-live events to the same number as with the proposed project, 95 and 220, respectively, a total of 315 events per year. As a result, the travel demand for a maximum attendance event under the No Major Auditorium Renovations Alternative would be similar to existing conditions. Therefore, the existing transportation and circulation conditions described in Section 4.C, Transportation and Circulation, would characterize transportation effects of this alternative.

As under existing conditions, nearby and adjacent residents would continue to experience traffic, transit, pedestrian and bicycle conditions, as well as passenger and performer unloading/loading before and after concert events in a similar manner as they occur today. As such, the frequency of these conditions would be the same as the proposed project but with fewer attendees than under the proposed project, which were determined to have less-than-significant impacts. Cumulative transportation conditions in 2035 would be as frequent but less intense than those presented in the Transportation Study for the proposed project, which were determined to be less than significant.

As with the proposed project, the existing parking and traffic conditions of approval imposed by the April 2012 CU authorization would be implemented for events at the Masonic Center under the No Major Auditorium Renovations Alternative. Under this alternative, the transportation effects of vehicular access (entry/exit) to the parking garage from the Pine Street loading dock for vehicles with pre-paid tickets before and after large events (Condition No. 6) would be similar to the less-than-significant impacts described for the proposed project.

Noise

Under the No Major Auditorium Renovations Alternative, noise from construction-related activities would be similar to, but less than, noise with the proposed project because renovations would occur only in the ground-floor California Room and Exhibition Hall, and existing commercial kitchen. Similar to the proposed project, the building construction activities associated with this alternative would be limited to the interior of the existing Masonic Center. However, noise effects related to concrete delivery and concrete pumping would not occur because the existing stage and fixed seating in the Auditorium would not be removed. Also, there would less noise impact related to construction debris removal and pick-up in the California Street loading zone because there would be no major renovations to the Auditorium.
As under the proposed project, construction activities would temporarily and intermittently increase noise in the project vicinity to levels that could be considered an annoyance by occupants of nearby properties, but would be reduced with this alternative.

As with the proposed project, construction activities would be required to comply with the San Francisco Noise Ordinance and would be less than significant. To ensure construction noise is reduced to the maximum extent feasible under this alternative, decision makers may decide to impose implementation of Improvement Measure I-NO-1 – Construction Debris Box Delivery, Loading and Removal, identified for the proposed project and described in Section 4.D, Noise, p. 4.D.24.

With the No Major Auditorium Renovations Alternative, there would be no increase in the number of attendees at a maximum, sold-out event in the Auditorium. Because the noise generated by additional attendees would not be noticeable above existing ambient noise, noise impacts from any single event would be substantially the same as under existing conditions, that is, less than significant.

As with the proposed project, the increased frequency of events with the No Major Auditorium Renovations Alternative would result in less-than-significant noise impacts, and none of these occurrences would individually exceed the noise requirements of the San Francisco Noise Ordinance or result in a substantial increase in existing ambient noise levels. Under the No Major Auditorium Renovations Alternative, noise effects of vehicles entering and exiting the garage on Pine Street before and after large events would be similar to those described for the proposed project, which are less than significant. However, as with the proposed project, under the No Major Auditorium Renovations Alternative the increased frequency of less-than-significant noise levels associated with large events would be noticeable and could be perceived as an annoyance to some adjacent residents such as those at Gramercy Towers and by residents adjacent to the Pine Street loading dock area.

With this alternative, there would be no noise effects related to an increase in the number of attendees, in comparison to the proposed project which would have less-than-significant impacts related to event-activity and traffic due to the increase of up to 134 attendees at large events.

As with the proposed project, decision makers may decide to impose Improvement Measure I-NO-2a – Appointment of a Noise Control Officer(s) and Improvement Measure I-NO-2b – Service and Maintenance of the Pine Street Loading Dock, described on p. 4.D.28 to further reduce less-than-significant event-related noise impacts on noise-sensitive receptors, especially those at the Gramercy Towers and residences near the Pine Street loading dock.
Therefore, in comparison to the proposed project, which would have less-than-significant noise impacts, as described in Section 4.D, Noise, the No Major Auditorium Renovations Alternative would also have reduced, less-than-significant noise impacts.

Public Services

As with the proposed project, the increased number of events with the No Major Auditorium Renovations Alternative would result in less-than-significant impacts on police protection and fire protection services, including emergency services. The April 2012 CU conditions of approval concerning security would be implemented as part of the procedures in the Events Operations Manual concerning security measures (Condition No. 27). Additionally, although not required by the April 2012 CU authorization, Live Nation would continue to provide on-site emergency medical services for large events held at the Auditorium. As discussed in Section 4.E, Public Services, the increased number and frequency of events would result in less-than-significant impacts on public services. Public service impacts under the No Major Auditorium Renovations Alternative would be similar to those under the proposed project.

CONCLUSION

The No Major Auditorium Renovations Alternative would not increase the number of attendees per event; however, it would increase the total number and frequency of events similar to the proposed project. This alternative would not result in impacts related to an increase of up to 134 events attendees as compared to the proposed project which would have less-than-significant impacts due to the increased number of event attendees. As with the proposed project, the No Major Auditorium Renovations Project Alternative would result in more frequent, but less-than-significant, impacts on land use, transportation and circulation, noise and public services. The increased number of events and frequency of event-related activity with this alternative could be perceived by some adjacent and nearby neighbors as an annoyance, as with the proposed project and as under existing conditions.

In comparison to the proposed project, topics that were addressed in the Initial Study (see Chapter 8, Appendix A) and found to have no impacts or less-than-significant impacts, including public services (library and schools), biological resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, hazards and hazardous materials, mineral and energy resources, and agricultural and forest resources, would also have no impacts or similar less-than-significant impacts for the No Major Auditorium Renovations Alternative.

The No Major Auditorium Renovations Alternative would not achieve most of the basic project sponsor's objectives. This alternative would not modernize and upgrade the Masonic Auditorium to increase revenue-generating use of the Center; provide a flexible range of venue configurations
that would accommodate contemporary performers, artists, organizations, and institutions. Without major renovations to the Auditorium, the No Major Auditorium Renovations Alternative would not provide a facility that could attract and retain a full-time professional entertainment management company to operate and promote events at the Center.

D. ALTERNATIVE C: REDUCED NUMBER OF LIVE ENTERTAINMENT EVENTS AND CONCESSION AREAS

DESCRIPTION

The intent of Alternative C: Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas is to provide an alternative that would increase the number of annual large live entertainment events in the Auditorium by a smaller amount in comparison to existing conditions and the proposed project. Alternative C also would reduce the number of allowed food and beverage concession areas during public events to five, in comparison to eight under the proposed project. As with the proposed project, attendance at maximum sold-out events with general admissions (no seating on the main floor of the Auditorium) would increase from 3,166 by up to 3,300 persons, an increase of up to 134 attendees. This alternative would reduce the total number of large live entertainment events from 95 per year to 79 per year. The total number of large non-entertainment events would be 220, the same as under the proposed project. Accordingly, the total number of large events that would take place at the Masonic Center would be about 299 events a year.

Of the 79 large live entertainment events, this alternative would have a maximum limit of 54 large live entertainments events per year that would be live music and electronic dance music events. Under the proposed project, all of the 95 live entertainment events could be live music or electronic music events, although this would be unlikely. The total number of large live and non-live entertainment events, 16 fewer than with the proposed project (refer to Table 6.2: Comparison of Proposed Number of Live and Non-Live Large Events (More Than 250 Attendees) per Year with Alternative C Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas). Except for the elimination of three proposed concession areas, the Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas Alternative would have all of the same physical features of the proposed project, including renovations to the main floor of the Auditorium. With the Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas Alternative, renovations would include installation of a new stage and lighting and sound systems in the Auditorium. Under this alternative, the ground-floor California Room and Exhibition Hall would be renovated, and the existing ground-floor catering kitchen would be upgraded to a commercial kitchen. This alternative would have three fewer food and beverage concession areas than are proposed with the project; the total number of concessions areas during public events...
Table 6.2: Comparison of Proposed Number of Live and Non-Live Large Events (More Than 250 Attendees) per Year with Alternative C Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>Total Number of Large Events per Year</th>
<th>Existing Conditions</th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>Alternative C</th>
<th>Maximum Net Change from Proposed Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live Entertainment(^a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comedy &amp; Cultural Live Entertainment</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Music and Electronic Dance Music</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Live Entertainment Events</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>95(^b)</td>
<td>79(^c)</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Non-Live Entertainment(^d)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Events</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>230</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
\(^a\) Live Entertainment is defined as in Planning Code Section 790.38 to include dramatic and musical performances (including comedy shows), and/or provide amplified taped music for dancing on the premises.
\(^b\) Under the proposed project, all of the live entertainment events could be live music or electronic dance music events, it would be unlikely to occur with Alternative C.
\(^c\) Of the 79 annual total limit of large live entertainment events under Alternative C, a maximum of 54 events large (over 250 attendees) live music and electronic dance music events would be allowed within the 79 live-entertainment event limit.
\(^d\) Non-Live Entertainment includes all events other than live entertainment, such as meetings, conferences, trade shows, and special events such as weddings, banquets and private parties.

**Source:** Live Nation; Turnstone Consulting, 2013

would be up to five depending on the type of event which is the same number as under existing conditions. As with the proposed project, there would be no limit on the number or configuration of concession areas during private events open only to members and invitees of the sponsoring organization, such as corporate meetings and private ceremonies.

As with the proposed project, outdoor seating would be set up on occasion for outdoor refreshment and break areas during daytime events on the existing portico leading to the California Street main entrance, the lower terrace on California Street, and the upper terrace facing Taylor Street.

As with the proposed project, the existing conditions of approval imposed by the April 2012 CU authorization would be implemented at the Masonic Center, including full implementation of Condition 6; however, Condition 34, which limits large live entertainment events to a total of 54 events per year, would no longer be applicable and would be modified as part of the proposed project approval process to allow a maximum of 79 large live entertainment events per year, of which a maximum of 54 could be live music and electronic dance events.
6. Alternatives

IMPACTS

Land Use and Land Use Planning

As with the proposed project, the Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas Alternative would not construct a physical barrier to neighborhood access or remove an existing means of access. For these reasons, this alternative would not physically divide an established community. Like the proposed project, this alternative would have no land use impact, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

As with the proposed project, implementation of the Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas Alternative would require the same approvals as the proposed project. The project sponsor would seek approval of a Conditional Use authorization to change the Masonic Center from a legal nonconforming use to a conditionally permitted “Other Entertainment” use under Planning Code Section 182(b)(1), establish permanent food and beverage service under Planning Code Section 238(d), and intensify the legal nonconforming use at the Masonic Center under Planning Code Section 723.48, if the appeal to the June 2011 Writ of Mandate is successful (refer to p. 4.B.8). If the appeal is denied and the writ is upheld, then the project sponsor would be required to seek a legislative amendment to the Nob Hill SUD to allow the legal nonconforming use at the Masonic Center to be intensified with conditional use authorization. Under this scenario, a Conditional Use authorization would then be required to implement the proposed intensification and to establish permanent food and beverage service.

Since zoning regulations are adopted for the purposes of regulating the location of various uses, this alternative would not conflict with any land use plans, policies, or regulations adopted to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect. Under this alternative, the limit of 79 large live entertainment events, of which no more than 54 events could be live music and electronic dance music events, is allowed under the proposed zoning and approvals as proposed for the project. Land use impacts in comparison to the proposed would be decreased, as there would be less potential for the consumption of alcoholic beverages by attendees that could result in fewer incidents of behavior that could be perceived as disruptive to nearby residents and affect the character of the Nob Hill neighborhood. This alternative would reduce the less-than-significant land use impacts of the proposed project, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

As with the proposed project, the Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas Alternative would increase the maximum number of attendees by up to 134 for events in the Auditorium. Similar to the proposed project, this increase in attendance would have a less-than-significant impact on land use character because the increased number of attendees would be similar to the proposed project and existing event-related conditions that currently occur at the Masonic Center.
With the Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas Alternative, large live entertainment event activities such as pedestrian activity, crowd noise, traffic noise (e.g., honking horns), traffic volumes, and attendee drop-off/pick-up activity; and performer equipment unloading/loading would occur 16 fewer times a year than with the proposed project. The decreased number of concession areas that service alcoholic beverages would also reduce the potential for disruptive behavior that could indirectly affect perceived land use character during and after large, live-entertainment events.

Due to the decreased frequency of large entertainment events and reduced number of concession areas, this alternative could be perceived as less annoying or disruptive to nearby and adjacent residents during large events at the Auditorium, and would further reduce less-than-significant impacts on the existing land use character in the vicinity that would occur with the proposed project. As with the proposed project, although event-related activities in the vicinity of the Masonic Center could be considered to be an annoyance to nearby residents, these event-related activities would be similar to those that already occur under existing conditions and are not direct physical land use impacts under CEQA.

Therefore, as with the proposed project, the Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas Alternative would not have a substantial adverse effect on the existing land use character of the vicinity. In addition, the interior renovations to the Masonic Center would not change the physical land use character of the project site or the project vicinity. Like the proposed project, this alternative would have less-than-significant land use impacts, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Transportation and Circulation**

Under the Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas Alternative nearby and adjacent residents would experience traffic, transit, pedestrian and bicycle conditions, as well as passenger and performer unloading/loading before and after concert events in a similar manner to the proposed project. Due to the reduced number of large live entertainment events, the frequency of these conditions would be less than those under the proposed project, which were determined to be less than significant. Cumulative transportation conditions in 2035 would also be less frequent but with the same intensity as those described in section 4.C, Transportation and Circulation for the proposed project, which were also determined to be less than significant.

As with the proposed project, all of the existing traffic and parking conditions of approval imposed by the April 2012 CU authorization would be implemented at the Masonic Center under the Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas Alternative. Under this alternative, the transportation effects of vehicular access (entry/exit) to the parking garage from the Pine Street loading dock for vehicles with pre-paid tickets during large events (Condition
No. 6) would be similar to the less-than-significant impacts described for the proposed project, but would occur less often.

**Noise**

Under the Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas Alternative, construction activities would be similar to those with the proposed project. As with the proposed project, construction activities associated with this alternative would primarily occur within the interior of the existing Masonic Center. Construction noise associated with concrete pouring and pumping for renovations in the main floor of the Auditorium would also be similar to the proposed project. Therefore, noise from building construction-related activities and construction truck trips would be the same as for the proposed project. Construction activities would be required to comply with the San Francisco Noise Ordinance and would be less than significant. To ensure construction noise is reduced to the maximum extent feasible under this alternative, decision makers may decide to impose implementation of Improvement Measure I-NO-1 – Construction Debris Box Delivery, Loading and Removal, identified for the proposed project and described in Section 4.D, Noise, p. 4.D.24.

As under the proposed project, event-related activities and increased vehicle trips with an increase of up to 134 additional attendees at a sold-out event would result in a less than 1.0 dBA increase in ambient noise levels, which is imperceptible. Under the Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events Alternative, noise effects of vehicles entering and exiting the garage on Pine Street before and after large events would be similar to those described for the proposed project (less than significant), but would occur less often. As with the proposed project, noise levels would comply with the San Francisco Noise Ordinance and would not result in a substantial permanent increase in existing ambient noise levels. Thus, as with the proposed project, the operational noise effects of this alternative would be less than significant.

In comparison to the proposed project, the Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas Alternative would result in 16 fewer large events per year and would limit the total number of events that would include live music and electronic dance music. As with the proposed project, noise and groundborne vibration from within the Auditorium would not be audible outside of the Center. With implementation of the proposed new sound system, decision makers may decide to impose Improvement Measure I-NO-3 - Installation of New Sound System, to ensure that less than significant noise and groundborne vibration levels remain inaudible outside of the Auditorium, thus reducing the incidents of noise levels that could be noticeable and perceived as annoying to some adjacent and nearby neighbors in the vicinity of the Masonic Center.
The reduced number of concession areas would be reduced, from eight under the proposed project to five, as under existing conditions. This could reduce the amount of alcoholic beverages consumed and could further reduce the less-than significant impacts of the proposed project associated with crowd noise that is perceived as disruptive by some adjacent and nearby residents.

As with the proposed project, to ensure that the less-than-significant event-related noise on noise-sensitive receptors, especially those at the Gramercy Towers and residences near the Pine Street loading dock, is reduced to the maximum extent feasible under this alternative, the project sponsor would implement Improvement Measure I-NO-2a – Appointment of a Noise Control Officer(s) and Improvement Measure I-NO-2b – Service and Maintenance of the Pine Street Loading Dock, identified for the proposed project and described on p. 4.D.28.

Therefore, compared to the proposed project, which would have less-than-significant noise impacts, as described in Section 4.D, Noise, the Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas Alternative would have similar less-than-significant noise impacts because the addition of 134 attendees would result in imperceptible increases in noise levels, would not expose people to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the Noise Ordinance, and would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity substantially above existing levels. The Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas Alternative would have 16 fewer large events per year than the proposed project. In comparison to the proposed project, this alternative would further reduce less-than-significant noise impacts related to event activities such as crowd noise, honking horns, and performer bus unloading/loading activities.

Public Services

The project site is currently adequately served by existing police protection, fire protection, and emergency services. As with the proposed project, the increased number of event attendees with the Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas Alternative would have less-than-significant impacts on police protection and fire protection services, including emergency services. The April 2012 CU conditions of approval would apply, and would include security measures for large events at the Masonic Center and Huntington Park, and emergency medical services. The reduced number of concession areas could result in less consumption of alcoholic beverages, which could reduce the number of incidents requiring police or emergency medical services, as compared with the proposed project.

As discussed in Section 4.E, Public Services, for the proposed project, the Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas Alternative would result in less-than-significant impacts on public services. This alternative would further reduce the less-than-significant
impacts on public services as there would be 16 fewer large, live-entertainment events than would occur with the proposed project.

CONCLUSION

As with the proposed project, the Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas Alternative would increase the number of event attendees by up to 134 patrons per event. The increase in the number of attendees would be similar to existing conditions, and the less-than-significant impacts of the proposed project related to land use and land use planning, transportation and circulation, noise, and public services would be similar to those described in Chapter 4, Environmental Setting and Impacts.

In comparison to the proposed project, the Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas Alternative would have 16 fewer large live entertainment events per year. As such, this alternative would increase the total number and frequency of events at the Masonic Center Auditorium by a smaller number than the proposed project and would further reduce the less-than-significant impact related to land use, transportation and circulation, noise and public services. In comparison to the proposed project, the Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas Alternative would also reduce event-related activity that could be perceived by some adjacent and nearby neighbors as an annoyance.

In comparison to the proposed project, topics that were addressed in the Initial Study (see Appendix A) and found to have no impacts or less-than-significant impacts, including public services (library and schools), biological resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, hazards and hazardous materials, mineral and energy resources or agricultural and forest resources), these topic areas would also have no impacts or similar or fewer less-than significant impacts for the Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas Alternative.

The Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas Alternative would achieve most of the basic project objectives. This alternative would modernize and upgrade the Masonic Auditorium to increase revenue-generating use of the Center; provide a flexible range of venue configurations that would accommodate contemporary performers, artists, organizations, and institutions; and provide a facility that would attract and retain a full-time professional management company to operate and promote events at the Center. However, the Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas Alternative would not optimize revenue-generating use of the renovated Masonic Center Auditorium.
E. ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) requires identification of an environmentally superior alternative if the proposed project has significant impacts that cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. If the No Project Alternative is environmentally superior, CEQA requires selection of the “environmentally superior alternative other than the no project alternative” from among the proposed project and the alternatives evaluated. The No Project Alternative is considered the overall environmentally superior alternative, because the less-than-significant impacts associated with implementation of the proposed project, other than the less-than-significant impacts related to garage access from Pine Street, would not occur under the No Project Alternative. The No Project Alternative would not meet any of the project objectives of the project sponsor.

Pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR is required to identify the environmentally superior alternative other than the No Project Alternative that would also have the fewest environmental impacts from among the alternatives evaluated. Even though the proposed project would not cause any significant environmental impacts, Alternative C: Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas would be the environmentally superior alternative because it would reduce less-than-significant impacts identified for the proposed project. The Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas Alternative would reduce the number and frequency of large live-entertainment events at the Masonic Center, and would reduce the number of proposed concession areas. The reduction in the number of proposed food and beverage concession areas could result in fewer land use, noise and public services impacts related to alcohol consumption in comparison to the proposed project.

Thus, besides the No Project Alternative, the environmentally superior alternative would be the Reduced Number of Live Entertainment Events and Concession Areas Alternative.

F. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED

This section identifies an alternative that were considered but rejected because they were found to be infeasible to implement the proposed renovation project.

Off-Site Alternative

Because the proposed project does not propose new construction of a different building, and only includes changes to the existing interior assembly and entertainment uses at the Masonic Center, an off-site alternative would not be feasible.
Pine Street Loading Dock Alternative

This alternative would require performer equipment unloading/loading at the Pine Street loading dock rather than at the curbside loading area on the south side of California Street in front of the Masonic Center. This alternative was considered by the San Francisco Planning Department as the lead agency, but was rejected as infeasible. The reasons underlying rejection of this alternative are discussed below.

This alternative was considered to minimize or avoid potential noise and traffic impacts associated with performer equipment unloading/loading at the California Street curbside loading area. These activities occur in the California Street loading zone under existing conditions and would continue with the proposed project. This alternative was determined not be feasible because the dimensions of the Pine Street loading dock are too small to accommodate the types of trucks that transport performer equipment, and there is no freight elevator access to the Auditorium from the Pine Street loading dock to transport performer equipment to the Auditorium (the freight elevator accesses only the ground floor of the Masonic Center, where the kitchen, Exhibition Hall, and California Room are located). In addition, the Pine Street Loading Dock Alternative would not avoid or minimize any significant impacts that would occur with implementation of the proposed project, and could result in significant noise impacts on residents that abut or are adjacent to the Pine Street loading dock.
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8. APPENDICES

Chapter 8 presents two appendices:

- Appendix A: Notice of Preparation / Initial Study
- Appendix B: April 2012 Conditions of Approval
APPENDIX A: NOTICE OF PREPARATION / INITIAL STUDY
A Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the above-referenced project, described below, has been issued by the Planning Department. The NOP/Initial Study is either attached or is available upon request from Brett Bollinger, whom you may reach at (415) 575-9024 or at the address above. It is also available online at http://tinyurl.com/sfceqadocs. This notice is being sent to you because you have been identified as potentially having an interest in the project.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The Nob Hill Masonic Center ("Masonic Center") is located at 1111 California Street, at the southwest corner of California and Taylor Streets, in the Nob Hill neighborhood. The project block is bound by California, Taylor, Pine and Jones Streets. The Masonic Center is an assembly and entertainment venue that includes a 3,166-seat Auditorium, conference/exhibition space, a 565-space underground parking garage accessed from California Street, a small loading dock area mid-block on Pine Street, and cultural facilities and offices of the Masons of California. The Masonic Center contains approximately 325,093 square feet of floor area.

The California Masonic Memorial Temple, the project sponsor, proposes to renovate and modernize the existing Auditorium, and ground-floor California Room, Exhibition Hall, and catering kitchen. The existing fixed seating area on the main floor of the Auditorium would be removed and replaced with four tiered floor levels to allow for flexible audience and seating configurations on the main floor, ranging from general admission to classroom-style, banquet, and cabaret-style seating. The fixed seating on the second-floor Auditorium balcony would not change. New lighting and sound systems would be installed in the Auditorium and the existing stage would be replaced. The ground-floor California Room would be renovated to create a "VIP Lounge" and pre-concert hospitality area. The Exhibition Hall would be upgraded, including renovations to the existing ceiling. The total floor area of the Exhibition Hall would be reduced to accommodate a new ground-floor storage area. The existing catering kitchen on the ground floor would be renovated and upgraded to a full commercial kitchen.

With the proposed renovation project, the number of large events (e.g., those for over 250 attendees) would change from an existing annual maximum of 230 events to an estimated annual maximum of 315 events, an increase of about 85 large events per year. The maximum number of event attendees within the Auditorium would increase from 3,166 up to a maximum of 3,300 at a sold-out event with general admission (standing only on the main floor of the Auditorium, fixed seating in the balcony), an increase...
of 134 attendees per event. The Masonic Center’s existing building capacity of 4,674 persons in its assembly spaces would not change with the proposed renovation project.

The proposed project renovations would not alter the existing second-floor Henry Wilson Coil Library and Museum of Freemasonry, the third-floor offices of the Masons and their affiliates, or the underground garage. Proposed renovations would not change the Masonic Center’s existing total square footage, total assembly space capacity, building height, façades, or footprint.

The project sponsor seeks a Conditional Use authorization to change the currently authorized nonconforming assembly and entertainment use to a conditionally permitted “Other Entertainment” use (Planning Code § 182(b)(1)) and for intensification of a conditional use (Planning Code § 723.48). Alternately, the project sponsor would request amendments to the Nob Hill Special Use District (“Nob Hill SUD”); (§ 238 of the San Francisco Planning Code)) to authorize the intensification of a large, nonconforming assembly and entertainment use within the Nob Hill SUD. The project sponsor is seeking Conditional Use authorization for installation of permanent on-site food and beverage service for event patrons only in the Nob Hill SUD under Planning Code § 238(d).

**FINDING**

This project may have a significant effect on the environment, and an Environmental Impact Report is required. This determination is based upon the criteria of the State CEQA Guidelines, § 15063 (Initial Study), § 15064 (Determining Significant Effect), and § 15065 (Mandatory Findings of Significance). The purpose of the EIR is to provide information about potential significant physical environmental effects of the proposed project, to identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and to describe and analyze possible alternatives to the proposed project. Preparation of an NOP and an EIR does not indicate a decision by the City to approve or disapprove the proposed project. Prior to making any such decision, the decision-makers must review and consider the information contained in the EIR.

**PUBLIC SCOPING PROCESS**

Written comments on the scope and content of the environmental impact analysis will be accepted until 5:00 p.m. on **November 9, 2012**. Written comments should be sent to Bill Wycko, San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103.

If you work for a Responsible or Trustee Agency, we need to know the views of your agency regarding the scope and content of the environmental information that is relevant to your agency’s statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project. Your agency may need to use the EIR when considering a permit or other approval for this project. We will also need the name of the contact person for your agency. If you have questions concerning environmental review of the proposed project, please contact **Brett Bollinger** at (415) 575-9024 or brett.bollinger@sfgov.org.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>Assembly Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAG</td>
<td>Association of Bay Area Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB</td>
<td>California Air Resources Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAAQMD</td>
<td>Bay Area Air Quality Management District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMPs</td>
<td>best management practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAA</td>
<td>Clean Air Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAAQS</td>
<td>California Ambient Air Quality Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>2010 Clean Air Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCAA</td>
<td>California Clean Air Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDMG</td>
<td>California Division of Mines and Geology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA</td>
<td>California Environmental Quality Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₄</td>
<td>methane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMMT</td>
<td>California Masons Memorial Temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>carbon monoxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>carbon dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂E</td>
<td>“carbon dioxide-equivalent” measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>combined sewer overflow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU</td>
<td>Conditional Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBI</td>
<td>Department of Building Inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPM</td>
<td>diesel particulate matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIR</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>US Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>Federal Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRMs</td>
<td>Flood Insurance Rate Maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHGs</td>
<td>greenhouse gases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gpf</td>
<td>gallons per flush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>Institutional Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMTCO₂E</td>
<td>million metric tons of CO₂E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRZ</td>
<td>Mineral Resource Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAAQS</td>
<td>National Ambient Air Quality Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCD</td>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESHAP</td>
<td>National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFIP</td>
<td>National Flood Insurance Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO₂</td>
<td>nitrogen dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOₓ</td>
<td>oxides of nitrogen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPDES</td>
<td>National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSR</td>
<td>New Source Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N₂O</td>
<td>nitrous oxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPR</td>
<td>Office of Planning and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCBs</td>
<td>polychlorinated biphenyls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>particulate matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10</td>
<td>particulate matter equal to or less than 10 micrometers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM2.5</td>
<td>particulate matter equal to or less than 2.5 micrometers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>reactive organic gases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Senate Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFBAAB</td>
<td>San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFPD</td>
<td>San Francisco Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFPUC</td>
<td>San Francisco Public Utilities Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFRPD</td>
<td>San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO$_2$</td>
<td>sulfur dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sq. ft.</td>
<td>square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUD</td>
<td>Special Use District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>toxic air contaminant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC$_3$</td>
<td>volatile organic compounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu$g/m$^3$</td>
<td>micrograms per cubic meter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Nob Hill Masonic Center (hereinafter referred to as Masonic Center or Center) is located at 1111 California Street, at the southwest corner of California and Taylor Streets, in the Nob Hill neighborhood of San Francisco on Assessor’s Block 0253, Lot 020. The project site has a total area of approximately 1.1 acres, or 49,841 square feet (sq. ft.). The project block is bound by California, Taylor, Pine and Jones Streets, and is located within an RM-4 (Residential-Mixed, High Density) Zoning District, a 65-A Height and Bulk District, and the Nob Hill Special Use District (SUD). See Figure 1: Project Location. The Masonic Center encompasses approximately 325,093 sq. ft. of floor area. The Center is an assembly and entertainment venue that includes a 3,166-seat Auditorium, conference/exhibition space, a 565-space underground parking garage accessed from California Street, a small loading dock area mid-block on Pine Street, and cultural facilities and offices of the Masons of California. The total existing capacity of the assembly spaces in the building is 4,674 persons.\(^1\)

The California Masonic Memorial Temple, the project sponsor, proposes to renovate and modernize the existing main floor and second-floor balcony of the Masonic Center Auditorium. The existing fixed seating area on the main-floor level of the Auditorium would be removed and replaced with four tiered floor levels to allow for flexible audience and seating configurations, ranging from general admission to classroom-style, banquet, and cabaret-style seating. The fixed seating on the second-floor Auditorium balcony would not change. New lighting and sound systems would be installed in the Auditorium, and the existing stage would be replaced. As part of the proposed project, the ground-floor California Room would be renovated to create a “VIP Lounge” and pre-concert hospitality area. The Exhibition Hall would be upgraded, including renovations to the existing ceiling. The total floor area of the Exhibition Hall would be reduced to accommodate a new ground-floor storage area. The existing catering kitchen on the ground floor would also be renovated and upgraded to a full commercial kitchen.

The proposed project renovations would not alter the existing second-floor Henry Wilson Coil Library and Museum of Freemasonry, the third-floor offices of the Masons and their affiliates, or

---

\(^1\) Building capacity is based on the occupancy requirements specified in the 2010 California Building Code, Table 1004.1.1, Chapter 10, Section 1004 prepared by Heller Manus Architects, July 3, 2012.
the underground garage. Proposed renovations would not change the Center’s existing total square footage, total capacity, building height, façades, or footprint.

With the proposed renovation project, the number of large events (over 250 attendees) would change from an existing annual maximum of 230 events to an estimated 315 annual events, an increase of about 85 large events per year. The maximum number of event attendees within the Auditorium would increase from 3,166 up to a maximum of 3,300 at a sold-out event with general admission (standing only on the main floor of the Auditorium, fixed seating in the balcony), an increase of 134 attendees per event. The Center’s existing building capacity in the assembly spaces of 4,674 persons would not change with the proposed renovation project.

The project sponsor seeks a Conditional Use authorization to change the currently authorized nonconforming assembly and entertainment use to a conditionally permitted “Other Entertainment” use (Planning Code Section 182(b)(1)) and for intensification of a conditional use (Planning Code Section 723.48). Alternately, the project sponsor would request amendments to the Nob Hill SUD (Section 238 of the San Francisco Planning Code) to authorize the intensification of a large, nonconforming assembly and entertainment use within the Nob Hill SUD. The sponsor also is seeking Conditional Use authorization for installation of permanent on-site food and beverage service, for event patrons only, in the Nob Hill SUD under Planning Code Section 238(d).

PROJECT HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

The Masonic Center was completed and dedicated for use by the Masons in 1958. At that time the site was zoned as “Commercial,” which permitted use of the facility as a commercial assembly and entertainment venue—a use that has continued since the Center was built. The Masonic Center became a “legal nonconforming use” in the 1960s when the site was rezoned to a residential classification that did not permit entertainment and assembly uses. The Center has not undergone any substantial renovations since it was completed.

In 2008 and 2009, the project sponsor, the California Masonic Memorial Temple, filed Environmental Evaluation applications and a Conditional Use application with the San Francisco Planning Commission on January 19, 2012, and by the Board of Supervisors on April 3, 2012.

Because the Masonic Center is the only large nonconforming assembly and entertainment use in the Nob Hill SUD, an amendment to the Nob Hill SUD would not authorize any other large assembly and entertainment use in the special use district, which encompasses an area of approximately 10 blocks at the crest of Nob Hill, to be intensified with conditional use approval.

An extension and continuation of the Masonic Center as a legal nonconforming commercial assembly and entertainment use under Section 185(e) of the Planning Code was approved by the Planning Commission on January 19, 2012, and by the Board of Supervisors on April 3, 2012.

The Zoning Administrator issued a Letter of Determination in 2009 stating that the Masonic Center was entitled as a commercial assembly and entertainment venue (rather than a private lodge) in 1956 with no operating conditions of approval and is a now legal nonconforming use. The Board of Appeals upheld that determination in 2010, and the Superior Court upheld the Zoning Administrator and Board of Appeals in 2011. San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. 510365.
Planning Department for the proposed renovation project. On February 18, 2010, the Planning Department issued a Categorical Exemption Certificate of Determination. The Planning Department determined that a Categorical Exemption was appropriate for the project under the Class 32 Infill Development exemptions pursuant to Section 15332 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations, Section 15000 et seq.). In March 2010, the Planning Commission approved a Conditional Use authorization to reclassify the nonconforming use status of the Center to a conditionally permitted “Other Entertainment” use under Planning Code Section 182(b)(1) and to intensify the use under Section 723.48; to add permanent food and beverage service under Section 238(d) of the Planning Code; and to impose operating conditions of approval.

The Categorical Exemption determination and Conditional Use authorization were subsequently appealed to the Board of Supervisors. In May 2010, the Board of Supervisors upheld the Categorical Exemption, modified and approved the Conditional Use authorization for the proposed project, and imposed additional conditions of approval regulating total occupancy, number and times of events, and operation of the Masonic Center.

In 2010, two neighborhood groups and several individuals filed four lawsuits with the San Francisco Superior Court, challenging the City’s Categorical Exemption determination and approval of Conditional Use authorization, and the determinations by the Zoning Administrator and Board of Appeals that found that the Center is a legal nonconforming commercial assembly and entertainment venue. The Superior Court upheld the Zoning Administrator’s and Board of Appeal’s determination. However, the Superior Court overturned the Categorical Exemption determination and thereby voided the Conditional Use authorization. The challenge to the Conditional Use approval ‘became moot after the Categorical Exemption was overturned.

On April 28, 2011, the Superior Court issued a Statement of Decision and Writ of Mandate (hereinafter referred to as the April 2011 Statement of Decision and April 2011 Writ of Mandate) in Case Nos. 510495 and 510501. The April 2011 Writ of Mandate directed the City to prepare an Initial Study and otherwise comply with the requirements of CEQA to prepare a Negative Declaration or EIR before project approvals could be reconsidered.

On April 27, 2011, and June 28, 2011, the Superior Court issued a second Statement of Decision and Writ of Mandate, respectively, in Case No. 501365 that upheld the Zoning Administrator’s and Board of Appeal’s determination that the Center is a legal nonconforming commercial

---

5 Section 15332 of the CEQA Guidelines defines Class 32 In-Fill Development projects as projects that (a) are consistent with applicable general plan designs and all applicable general plan policies as well as applicable zoning designations and regulations; (b) are within city limits on a site of not more than five acres and substantially surrounded by urban uses; (c) have no value as habitat for endangered, rare or threatened species; (d) their approval would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality; and (e) can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.

6 San Francisco Superior Court Case Numbers 510365, 510495, 510501 and 510541.
assembly and entertainment venue, but also held that the City improperly authorized
intensification of use at the Masonic Auditorium as a nonconforming use under Planning Code
Sections 182(6)(1) and 723.48, such that a rezoning or amendment to the Planning Code would
be required before those authorizations for an “Other Entertainment” use and intensified use
could be reconsidered. The second element of that writ (requiring a Planning Code amendment
or rezoning) has been appealed to the California Court of Appeal by the City and California
Masonic Memorial Temple and is therefore stayed (i.e., temporarily postponed).

Under Planning Code Section 185, the legal nonconforming status of a Type I construction
building located in a residential zoning district, such as the Masonic Center, expires after 50 years
unless the Planning Commission extends the nonconforming status by a Conditional Use
authorization. A Conditional Use (CU) authorization under Section 185 to extend the current
operation of the Nob Hill Masonic Center as a nonconforming use (but not to allow any
intensification of the use) was approved by the Planning Commission on January 19, 2012, and
upheld with one modification on April 3, 2012, by the Board of Supervisors (hereinafter referred
to as the April 2012 CU authorization).

The April 2012 CU authorization imposed a maximum limit of 230 large events (over 250
attendees) per year within the existing Auditorium. Prior to this approval, no maximum limit on
the number of events existed. This maximum limit was based on an analysis of the Center’s
existing use pattern and established the baseline conditions for analyzing changes to the existing
Masonic Center in comparison to the proposed project. The April 2012 CU authorization also
included 35 conditions of approval that restrict the existing total occupancy, number and times of
events, and event operations, and impose other requirements concerning food and beverage
service, parking, traffic, loading, noise, odors, waste storage and removal, exterior lighting, public
safety, emergency access, community outreach, exterior signage, and monitoring and
enforcement of these conditions

PROJECT LOCATION

The Masonic Center is located at 1111 California Street between Taylor and Jones Streets in the
Nob Hill neighborhood of San Francisco. The project block is bordered by California Street to
the north, Pine Street to the south, Taylor Street to the east, and Jones Street to the west. Refer to
Figure 1 on p. 2.

The Masonic Center site is irregularly shaped and encompasses all of Lot 20 on Assessor’s
Block 0253. The site has a total area of approximately 1.1 acres, or 49,841 sq. ft., including a
25-foot-wide portion fronting on Pine Street that provides access to a loading dock. Refer to
Figure 2: Site Plan.

The Masonic Center is approximately 65 feet in height at the main entrance on California Street.
The site slopes upward, approximately 18 feet in elevation, from east to west along California
Street with a 5 to 6 percent slope. See Figure 3: Existing East West Section. On Taylor Street, between California and Pine Streets, the site slopes sharply downward from north to south, dropping about 56 feet over a 275-foot distance, with a slope of around 20 percent. Pine Street slopes upward gradually from east to west.

The site is served by local and regional public transit service. The C California Street cable car line runs east-west along California Street, directly adjacent to the project site, and the PM Powell/Mason and PH Powell/Hyde Street cable car lines run north-south along Powell Street two blocks to the east. The nearest C California Street cable car stop is across the street from the project site at California and Taylor Streets. The site is served by two Muni bus lines: the 1 California and the 27 Bryant.

In the project vicinity, inbound and outbound bus lines operate on separate streets. The 1 California trolley bus line runs eastbound (inbound) on Clay Street and westbound (outbound) on Sacramento Street. The nearest inbound bus stops are located about two blocks north of the Center at Clay and Taylor Streets and Clay and Jones Streets; the nearest outbound bus stops are about one and a half blocks north at Sacramento and Jones Streets and Sacramento Street and Sproule Lane. In the project vicinity, the 27 Bryant motor coach bus line runs northbound (inbound) on Leavenworth Street and southbound (outbound) on Hyde Street. The nearest stops are one and a half blocks west of the project site at California and Leavenworth Streets, and two and a half blocks west of the project site at California and Hyde Streets. The Embarcadero BART station is located three-quarters of a mile east of the project site and can be accessed from the Masonic Center via the 1 California bus and the C California cable car. The other nearest BART station, the Powell Street station, is located one-half mile south of the site and is accessed via the PM Powell/Mason and PH Powell/Hyde cable car lines and the 27 Bryant bus. The Caltrain terminal, at Fourth and King Streets, is located approximately one and a half miles southeast of the project site and can be accessed via the 27 Bryant bus. The Transbay Temporary Terminal, on the block bounded by Howard, Main, Folsom, and Beale Streets, is located approximately one mile southeast of the project site and can be accessed via the 1 California bus and the C California cable car lines.

The Masonic Center is located within an RM-4 (Residential-Mixed Use, High Density) zoning district and within the Nob Hill SUD, which encompasses all or portions of ten blocks at the top of Nob Hill bound by Sacramento, Bush, Stockton, and Jones Streets. The Nob Hill SUD (Planning Code Section 238) is a special use district overlay that permits certain commercial uses, such as hotels, restaurants and clubs, that would otherwise not be permitted in an RM-4 district. The project site is within a 65-A Height and Bulk District. The Masonic Center is an

7 In the Muni service system, inbound service usually is heading toward downtown San Francisco, and outbound service is usually heading away from downtown.
FIGURE 3: EXISTING EAST WEST SECTION
EXISTING LEGAL NONCONFORMING USE AS DEFINED BY SECTION 180(a)(1) OF THE SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING CODE. THE NONCONFORMING STATUS WAS EXTENDED INDEFINITELY BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND AFFIRMED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ON APRIL 3, 2012, AS PERMITTED BY SECTION 185(e) OF THE PLANNING CODE.8

EXISTING MASONIC CENTER

The Masonic Center is a four-level, above-grade structure, with a five-level, 565-space underground public parking garage. The Center contains approximately 325,093 gross sq. ft., plus about 12,860 gross sq. ft. of outdoor open-space areas. Built in 1958, the Center is an assembly and entertainment venue that hosts a variety of assembly, live entertainment, and special events, as well as the annual convention of the Masons of California held in the fall of each year.

Architecturally, the Center features a relief on the upper eastern portion of the California Street façade that encases four 12-foot-high architectural elements depicting the four branches of the armed forces, accompanied by 14 marble figures engaged in a tug of war. The Center is also noted for its 38-by-48-foot-high endomosaic9 window along the south wall of the entrance lobby that depicts the founders of California Freemasonry.

The main entrance to the Center is on California Street. An open-air “porch” extends along the northwestern frontage of the building that leads to the main entrance lobby on the first floor. Assembly and live entertainment auditorium space, and related support facilities and services occupy the ground floor, first floor and the eastern half of the second floor. The western portion of the second floor and the entire third floor are occupied by the cultural facilities and offices of the Masons of California and their affiliates.

Existing Assembly and Live Entertainment Uses

The ground floor contains the 16,480-sq.-ft. Exhibition Hall, the 4,400-sq.-ft. California Room, a 1,700-sq.-ft. catering kitchen, and the main public restrooms. The Exhibition Hall and California Room are used for exhibitions, corporate events, meetings, banquets, private parties, and special events. Food for events at the Center, such as banquets and private parties, is prepared in the catering kitchen by outside catering services. The ground-floor level is accessible from the first-floor elevators located at the southeast corner of the entrance lobby, from stairways located at the

8 Conditional Use Authorization No. 2011.0471C, Planning Commission Motion No. 18520, as modified by Board of Supervisors Motion No. M12-42 (hereinafter April 2012 CU authorization). A copy of the April CU authorization is available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Cast File Noo. 2011.047E.
9 Endomosaic is a technique invented by artist Emile Norman (1918-2009), who created the endomosaic window at the Masonic Center. The technique incorporates colored crushed glass and other materials such as stones, soil, fabric, and shells suspended between two panes of clear plastic or glass, and then soldered and hung in a window frame.
north and south ends of the main floor Auditorium, and directly from California Street. See Figure 4 on p. 19.

The first-floor main lobby serves as the entrance to the main level of the Auditorium, and includes a portable food and beverage (concession) area at the southern end of the lobby. The main entrance lobby contains approximately 12,000 sq. ft.

The first and second floors of the Center contain the Masonic Auditorium, a 3,166-seat auditorium and concert hall, with the main seating area and stage on the first floor and balcony seating on the second floor. The Auditorium is used for a variety of assembly events that include lectures, speaker events, corporate meetings, civic events (such as graduations and naturalization ceremonies), and entertainment events such as music concerts, comedy shows, and cultural performances.

The main floor of the Auditorium contains 1,860 fixed seats situated around a platform stage that extends into the audience seating area. Event patrons access the Auditorium through entryways located along the eastern wall of the main lobby, and enter the main-floor seating area of the Auditorium directly from doorways along the Auditorium concourse. The concourse area contains a small food preparation area, two portable food and beverage (concession) areas, a first aid office, and stairways leading to the second-floor balcony level. The backstage area is situated along a hallway east of the stage and main floor of the Auditorium; the backstage area contains several dressing rooms for performers, a lounge, two restrooms, and a tour and a production office.

From the first floor, the second floor is accessible by elevators located at the southeast end of the main lobby, by stairs located at the southwest corner of the entrance lobby, and by stairways located in the Auditorium concourse. Event patrons enter the second-floor balcony seating from a lobby that leads to the balcony concourse, and then through doorways situated along the concourse. The second-floor balcony contains 1,306 fixed seats. Restrooms are located at the northwest end of the balcony concourse. One portable food and beverage area is located in the second-floor lobby.

The Auditorium (main floor and balcony), main-floor concourse, balcony concourse, and second-floor lobby total almost 60,000 sq. ft.

Existing Food and Beverage Operations

Depending on the event and number of attendees, the Masonic Center currently operates with three to five portable food and beverage stations (concession areas): one in the main entrance lobby, one or two in the concourse area in the main floor of the Auditorium, one in the second-floor balcony lobby, and one in the California Room when it is in use. Each concession area operates with multiple “points of sale” (cash registers). These concession areas are operated by
an outside catering service and offer beverages, including alcoholic beverages, meals and snacks to event attendees during many, but not all, events. Alcoholic beverage sales are limited to a two-drink maximum, per transaction, and are further limited after the last intermission or one hour prior to the conclusion of live entertainment events. During private events, such as corporate meeting or banquets, alternative food and beverage service strategies, such as waiter service to tables or meal buffets, are sometimes employed.

Existing Uses Associated with the Masons of California

The western portion of the second floor contains the approximately 800-sq.-ft. Henry Wilson Coil Library and Museum of Freemasonry. The library and museum contain the collections and archives that chronicle the history of the California Freemasonry. The third floor, which totals approximately 9,564 sq. ft., contains the administrative offices of the Masons of California and their affiliated organizations, including the project sponsor, California Masonic Memorial Temple.

Existing Open Space

The Masonic Center contains approximately 12,860 gross sq. ft. of publicly accessible and private outdoor open space, comprised of four areas: (1) a publicly accessible entrance porch (portico) at the northwest corner of the site; (2) a lower terrace on California Street along the northeast building face; (3) an upper terrace along the east side of the building facing Taylor Street; and (4) an outdoor patio at the south end of the main-floor entrance lobby behind the endomosaic window (see Figures 5 and 6 on pp. 20-21). The publicly accessible open-air entrance portico, which contains approximately 6,000 gross sq. ft., extends from the top of the entrance stairway on California Street to the main entrance lobby and is enclosed above by a roof frame supported by columns. The lower terrace is located at the northeast corner of the main floor above the parking garage entrance on California Street. This private terrace is a designated smoking area, which contains approximately 3,100 gross sq. ft., and is accessible only during events from the interior concourse on the main floor of the Auditorium. The upper terrace facing Taylor Street is accessed from an exterior stairway at the eastern end of the terrace. This private terrace encompasses about 3,400 gross sq. ft. and currently is not used by event attendees. A private outdoor patio, containing about 360 gross sq. ft., is located at the southern end of the main-floor lobby and affords elevated views to the south. The patio is enclosed by glass on its northern side and spans the width of the endomosaic window. Access to the patio is from the first-floor lobby. Due to its small size, this patio is open to patrons on a limited basis only during daytime events.

10 April 2012 CU Authorization, Condition No. 30.
11 A portico is a porch with a roof structure supported by columns that leads to the entrance of a building.
There are ornamental street trees and shrubbery on the project site along the Center’s California Street frontage. The upper outdoor terrace facing Taylor Street is landscaped with ornamental trees and shrubbery.

**Existing Parking, Loading, and Access**

The Masonic Center includes a five-level, approximately 211,750-sq.-ft., 565-space, below-grade public parking garage. The garage has a main entrance/exit on California Street and a secondary entrance/exit from the loading dock on Pine Street. To improve garage operations and minimize vehicle queues before events, the main garage entrance was upgraded in 2010. At that time, a second garage entrance lane was added and the ticket dispenser was relocated to the first level of the garage, allowing up to approximately 18 vehicles to queue off-street before reaching the ticket dispenser.

The Center is served by one loading dock at the back of the building adjacent to the fifth level of the parking garage. The approximately 35-foot-long-by-10-foot-wide loading dock, accessed from Pine Street, accommodates small to mid-size trucks, typically up to 30 feet long by 8.5 feet wide in size. The loading dock is used primarily by catering service and delivery companies. The loading area and dock are accessible by a narrow entryway between two multi-family residential buildings. A freight elevator near the northern end of the loading dock extends only to the ground-floor level of the Center, adjacent to the kitchen, and does not access the main (Auditorium) level of the Center (refer to Figure 4 on p. 19). When the dock is not being used for loading, it operates with a ramp for vehicles exiting the garage to Pine Street. After events with 1,000 patrons or more, vehicles are permitted to exit from the garage via either the Pine Street loading dock ramp or the ramps to California Street. Under the 2012 CU authorization, patrons with pre-paid parking tickets are also allowed to enter the garage from Pine Street to reduce potential queuing on California Street for vehicles entering the garage.\(^{12}\)

Because of the dimensions, constrained access, and functional limitations of the Pine Street loading dock and freight elevator, trucks delivering stage equipment, sets, instruments and other materials being transported to the Auditorium for performances are loaded and unloaded curbside on California Street in an approximately 185-foot-long temporary loading zone that the Center reserves through the San Francisco Police Department prior to large events (over 250 attendees). As required by the April 2012 CU authorization, once loading activities prior to events are completed, trucks using the temporary loading zone depart, park off-site, and do not return for loading until the performance is almost over. No overnight curb parking of trucks is permitted on California Street.\(^{13}\)

\(^{12}\) April 2012 Conditional Use authorization, Condition No. 6.

\(^{13}\) April 2012 CU authorization, Condition No. 10.
No more than two performer tour buses are allowed to park in the California Street temporary loading zone during the period 1.5 hours before and during some live entertainment events so that the remainder of the temporary loading zone (the portion not occupied by performer buses) is available for use by taxis and other vehicles picking up and dropping off passengers and by vehicles queuing to enter the Masonic Center garage. Performer bus operators have access to electric power provided by the Masonic Center to avoid running bus engines and/or generators while parked within the loading zone. When the California Street loading zone is not reserved by the Center, it is available for general street parking.

Disabled access to the Center is provided from the parking garage elevator, the access ramp west of the main entrance stairway, and elevators into the California Room and the Exhibition Hall. The Auditorium also provides designated seating for event attendees with disabilities.

Existing Number of Auditorium Events

The Masonic Center currently operates as a nonconforming use as permitted under Planning Code Section 185(e) and as extended by the April 2012 CU authorization approved by the Board of Supervisors. Prior to April 2012, there were no limitations on the number or type of events permitted at the Center. The April 2012 CU authorization imposed a maximum limit of 54 large live entertainment events and 176 large non-live entertainment events per year, for a maximum total of 230 large events per year. Live entertainment as defined in Planning Code Section 790.38 includes dramatic and musical performances (including comedy shows), and/or amplified taped music for dancing on the premises. Non-live entertainment includes all events other than live entertainment, such as meetings, conferences, trade shows, exhibits, and special events such as naturalization ceremonies, graduations, weddings, and banquets. There is no limitation on the number of events at the Center that are attended by 250 or fewer patrons; therefore, events with 250 or fewer attendees are in addition to the maximum annual limits for large events. For purposes of environmental review, the baseline number of events for existing conditions is the maximum total number of large events imposed by the April 2012 CU authorization.

During events in the Auditorium, private functions associated with the events, such as VIP hospitality functions with performers or pre-concert receptions, may be held in the California Room or Exhibition Hall. However, for operational reasons, the Masonic Center does not book separate, additional or concurrent events (i.e., exhibitions, trade shows, corporate events, meetings, banquets, and private parties) in the California Room or Exhibition Hall when events are being held in the Auditorium.

---

14 April 2012 Conditional Use authorization, Condition No. 13.
15 April CU authorization, Condition No. 13.
17 April 2012 CU authorization, Condition No. 34, as modified.
Historical Number of Events in the Auditorium

The April 2012 CU authorization considered the historical number of events held in the Masonic Auditorium to determine the number of events that were approved for continuation of the Masonic Center as a nonconforming use.

Between 2002 and 2007, the Masonic Center operated with an average of about 229 total event-days per year. (The 229 historical average number of events closely approximates the 230 events per year approved by the April 2012 CU Authorization.) This period (2002-2007) is the most-representative period of operations, because bookings were curtailed in 2008 in anticipation of the proposed interior renovation of the Auditorium and the leasing of the Center to a professional operator (Live Nation). Total attendance during this period varied by event type. As shown in Table 1, on the average most of the annual events held at the Center each year were non-live entertainment events (about 76 percent). These events also comprised the highest number of daytime and all-day events held at the Center (63 percent). Live entertainment comprised about 24 percent of the average total number of events during this period, and the highest percentage of nighttime events (about 67 percent).

| Table 1: Average Number of Events by Type and Time of Day (2002-2007) a |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Event Type     | Daytime b      | Nighttime b    | All Day b      | Total          | Percent of Total |
| Live Entertainment c | 8             | 46             | 0             | 54             | 24%             |
| Non-Live Entertainment d | 122           | 23             | 30            | 175            | 76%             |
| Totals         | 130            | 69             | 30            | 229            | 100%            |

Notes:

a Total events by type and time of day represent the average of events between 2002 and 2007, which were representative of historic operating levels prior to leasing of the Center by Live Nation and curtailment of event booking in anticipation of construction activities. Since 2008, there have been about 66 events at the Center per year, on average.

b Daytime events are defined as events that end before 6:00 PM; nighttime events are defined as events that end after 6:00 PM; and all-day events are defined as events that start before 6:00 PM and end after 6:00 PM.

c Live entertainment as defined in Planning Code Section 790.38 includes dramatic and musical performances (including comedy shows), and/or amplified taped music for dancing on the premises.

d Non-Live entertainment includes all events other than live entertainment, such as meetings, conferences, trade shows, exhibits, and special events such as naturalization ceremonies, graduations, weddings, and banquets.

Sources: California Masonic Memorial Temple; Turnstone Consulting, 2012

As noted above, fewer events have been held at the Center since 2008. Between 2008 and 2011, the average number of events held at the Center each year decreased to about 66. About 19 of these events were live entertainment concerts.

---

18 A copy of a report prepared by CMMT detailing all events held at the Masonic Center during the period of 2002-2007 is available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2011.0471E.
Existing Number of Events and Attendees

In 2009, the project sponsor retained Live Nation, a professional venue operator and entertainment promoter, to manage, operate, promote, and book all assembly and entertainment events at the Masonic Center. In this capacity, Live Nation is responsible for implementing and overseeing all aspects of event operations.19

As noted above, the Masonic Center currently operates as a nonconforming use as permitted under Planning Code Section 185(e) and as extended by the April 2012 CU authorization. The April CU authorization contains conditions of approval for the operation of the Masonic Center, including the maximum number of events with over 250 persons, as described in the “Existing Events” discussion on p. 13. Under the conditions, the maximum number of attendees allowed in the Auditorium for all events (including live entertainment) is restricted to 3,282 persons. Events are also required to end by 11:00 PM on weeknights (non-holidays, Sunday through Thursday), and by 11:30 PM on weekends (Friday, Saturday, and holidays). The number of events that extend until 1:00 AM on weekends (Friday and Saturday and pre-holiday evenings) is restricted to no more than three events per year subject to prior consultation with and approval by the San Francisco Police Department, San Francisco Planning Department, and the Entertainment Commission with 30 days’ advance notice.20

Existing Neighborhood Noise, Security, and Maintenance Operations

Under the April 2012 CU authorization, the Masonic Center operates with a queuing plan that limits patron queuing to the main lobby and front entrance porch.21 As required by the April 2012 CU authorization, all assembly and entertainment functions are restricted to the interior of the building, and the Center has adequate soundproofing and insulation so that noise is not audible outside of the Center and meets the requirements of the San Francisco Noise Control Ordinance (San Francisco Police Code Article 29). As required by the April 2012 CU authorization, Live Nation has developed an Event Operations Manual for the California Masonic Memorial Temple (CMMT), which describes a security plan, including measures for security in the surrounding neighborhood and a post-event trash pick-up program within two hours after each event. Event personnel are required to comply with the provisions of the operations manual.22 The San Francisco Police Department also can cancel an event based on a prior history of safety and security problems associated with a particular performer.23

19 The Masons retain the right to book events in the California Room, Henry Wilson Coil Library and Mason’s Museum and/or Exhibit Hall on days for which no events are planned for the first-floor Auditorium.
20 April 2012 CU authorization, Condition No. 35.
21 April 2012 CU authorization, Condition No. 28.
22 April 2012 CU authorization, Condition No. 27.
23 April 2012 CU authorization, Condition No. 31.
PROPOSED RENOVATION PROJECT

The proposed project would modernize and upgrade the Masonic Center Auditorium to accommodate flexible audience configurations and food, beverage, and other services for a range of assembly and live entertainment events. Proposed renovations and improvements would occur primarily on the ground level and in the Auditorium, and include interior demolition/removal, interior construction of walls, flooring, and stage platform, acoustical work, plumbing upgrades/replacements, electrical work, drywall framing, heating and ventilation upgrades/replacement, electrical work, millwork, painting, new doors, ceiling replacement, carpeting, interior painting, and making minor repairs in the areas affected by the renovations.

The total square footage of the Masonic Center would not change with the proposed renovations. Table 2 shows the changes in use and floor area at the Center with the proposed renovations.

The remaining interior portions of the existing Masonic Center would not change with implementation of the renovation project. The Henry Wilson Coil Library and Museum of Freemasonry on the second floor and the third-floor administrative offices of the Masons, as well as the first-floor entrance lobby and endomosaic mural, would not be altered as part of the proposed project.

Proposed Ground-Floor Renovations

On the ground-floor level, the existing 1,700-sq.-ft. catering kitchen would be upgraded to a full commercial kitchen where food would be prepared for concessions and banquets. The upgraded kitchen facility would be operated by a single food and beverage concessionaire. The proposed project would also be licensed for on-site sale of alcoholic beverages with food service (Type 47 license). As under current conditions, no outside food service is proposed as part of the project; only event attendees would have access to on-site food and beverage service. There would be no public restaurant or bar serving meals or beverages to persons not attending events at the Center.

The California Room on the ground-floor level would be renovated to create a “VIP Lounge” and pre-concert hospitality area that would be used during live entertainment events. Renovations would include a new food and beverage area, and new men’s and women’s restrooms that would replace an existing dressing room and lounge area at the southeast corner of the California Room.

24 California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control, Type 47 License – On Sale General – Eating plan. A Type 47 license permits the sale of beer, wine and distilled spirits for consumption on and off the licensed premise. California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control, Common ABC License Types and their Basic Privileges, ABC-616 (09-11). The April 2012 CU authorization prohibits food or beverage service off-site or to the general public. Food and beverage service is limited to service to patrons of on-site assembly and entertainment events within the Masonic Center (Condition No. 29. Food and Beverage Service).

25 April 2012 CU authorization, Condition No. 29.
### Table 2: Existing and Proposed Uses after Renovation, by Floor Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Uses</th>
<th>Floor Area (Sq. Ft.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Proposed&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition Hall&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Assembly</td>
<td>Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Room</td>
<td>Assembly</td>
<td>Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Catering</td>
<td>Commercial Kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical/Restrooms</td>
<td>Ancillary</td>
<td>Ancillary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>Ancillary</td>
<td>Ancillary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium</td>
<td>Assembly/Entertainment</td>
<td>Assembly/Entertainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobby/Circulation</td>
<td>Ancillary</td>
<td>Ancillary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium</td>
<td>Assembly/Entertainment</td>
<td>Assembly/Entertainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balcony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum of Freemasonry/Henry Wilson Coi Library</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>Ancillary</td>
<td>Ancillary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Offices</td>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Garage</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
<sup>a</sup> Proposed changes in uses and floor area are shown in **bold typeface**.  
<sup>b</sup> Approximately 1,900 square feet of space would be removed from the Exhibition Hall and converted to storage space as part of the proposed project.

**Total Floor Area**  
325,093  | 325,093  | --

**Notes:**

- Proposed changes in uses and floor area are shown in **bold typeface**.
- Approximately 1,900 square feet of space would be removed from the Exhibition Hall and converted to storage space as part of the proposed project.

**Source:** Heller Manus Architects, 2012
The California Room would also continue to operate as an event space for smaller receptions and other events. Refer to Figure 4: Ground Floor Renovations.

Proposed ground-floor renovations to accommodate a new storage area at the southwest corner of the Exhibition Hall would reduce the hall’s square footage by 1,900 sq. ft. The existing ceiling in the Exhibition Hall would be renovated. An existing women’s restroom at the western end of the ground-floor hallway would be renovated. Refer to Figure 4.

Proposed Auditorium Renovations

The Auditorium, including the balcony, has a total of 3,166 fixed seats. Proposed renovations would remove all of the 1,860 existing fixed seats on the main floor of the Auditorium and replace the seating area with four tiered floor levels to allow for flexible audience and seating configurations, ranging from general admission (standing only on the main floor; existing fixed seating in the balcony) to classroom-style, banquet, and cabaret-style seating. The existing “thrust” stage26 in the Auditorium would be replaced with a new rectangular stage (approximately 40 feet in width and 32 feet in depth) intended to improve sightlines for live entertainment events. New permanent sound and lighting systems would be installed. Two new portable food and beverage areas would be added in areas north and south of the new stage. Renovations to the main floor of the auditorium would replace an existing men’s room and backstage production spaces with two new unisex restrooms at the southeast end of the backstage hallway, and would renovate an existing restroom at the northeast end of the backstage hallway. The exiting second-floor, 1,306-seating in Auditorium balcony would not be altered and would be retained for all types of events. A portable food and beverage area would be added at the northern end of the balcony concourse.

The maximum audience capacity of the Auditorium would increase from 3,166 to up to 3,300 patrons, a net increase of 134 patrons per event. Refer to Figure 5: First Floor Renovations – Main Floor Auditorium, and Figure 6: Second Floor – Auditorium Balcony.

Proposed Food and Beverage Areas

Three additional portable food and beverage concession areas are proposed - one in the ground-floor California Room, and two in the main floor of the Auditorium - for a total of up to eight concession areas on the ground floor, main entrance lobby, first-floor Auditorium and concourse, and second-floor balcony lobby and concourse, each with several points of sale (see Figures 4, 5, and 6 on pp. 19, 20, and 21, respectively). The number and locations of the eight total concession areas in use at any time on the ground floor, main floor Auditorium and balcony would vary depending on the event and number of attendees.

---

26 A thrust stage is a stage that extends into the audience’s portion of a theater or auditorium, and typically has seats facing the stage on three sides.
The location and use of the existing food and beverage area could vary depending on the event.
**Proposed Use of Outdoor Open Space Areas**

During daytime events, the portico leading to the California Street main entrance, the lower terrace on California Street, and the upper terrace facing Taylor Street would be used on occasion by event attendees. Portable tables and chairs also may be set up in these areas. Alcoholic beverages would not be served or allowed to be consumed in the outdoor areas. However, patrons attending events would be allowed to carry and consume snacks and non-alcoholic beverages purchased at the portable food and beverage areas onto the outdoor terraces. No amplified music, public address systems, or other types of audio equipment would be used in the outdoor areas. Event attendees would not be allowed to use any of the outdoor areas after 7:00 PM, with the exception of the portico (to enter the main lobby) and the lower terrace for smoking during nighttime events.

**Proposed Parking, Loading and Access**

**Masonic Center Garage**

After implementation of the renovation project, the existing 565-space Masonic Center parking garage on California Street would continue to operate as described under existing conditions on pp.12-13. During events of 1,000 patrons or more, the garage would continue to operate, as under existing conditions, with two entrance lanes on California Street to minimize vehicle queuing on California Street.

**Pine Street Access/Loading Dock**

As under existing conditions, vehicles with pre-paid parking would continue to be allowed to enter the Masonic Center garage from Pine Street during events of 1,000 patrons or more to reduce vehicle queuing on California Street before events; vehicles would continue to be allowed to exit the garage via Pine Street after large events. The loading dock would continue to be used by small trucks delivering building supplies and for deliveries of food and beverages to the kitchen. These existing loading dock operations and procedures would continue with the proposed project.

**Performers’ Trucks and Tour Buses**

With implementation of the proposed renovation project, performers’ trucks and tour bus operations would continue as under existing conditions. Performers’ trucks would continue to unload and load equipment on the southern side of California Street directly in front of the main entrance to the Masonic Center before and after events via the ramp west of the main stairs. Once loading activities are completed, trucks using the California Street curb loading zone would
depart, park off-site, and not return for loading until the performance is almost over. No overnight curb parking of trucks would be permitted on California Street.\textsuperscript{27}  

Performers’ tour buses would also continue to park on the southern side of California Street before and during some live entertainment events, as under existing conditions. During the 1.5-hour period prior to the start of an event, as under existing conditions, no more than two buses would be permitted to park in the temporary curbside area, and any additional buses would be directed to park in other nearby bus parking zones designated by the City. Buses parked in the loading area would be directed to connect to electric power provided by the Masonic Center to avoid running their engines and/or generators.\textsuperscript{28}  

Disabled Access  

There would be no change to disabled access to the Center with the proposed renovations. Disabled access would continue to be provided from the parking garage elevator, the access ramp west of the main entrance stairway, and elevators into the California Room and the Exhibition Hall. Designated seating for event attendees with disabilities would continue to be provided in the renovated Auditorium.

Proposed Neighborhood Noise, Security, and Maintenance Operations  

As under existing conditions, the proposed project would continue to implement existing measures related to traffic control, noise, security, and trash pick-up, as described on p. 15.

Proposed Number of Attendees and Events in the Auditorium  

Number of Attendees  

The intent of the proposed renovation project is to make the Masonic Center a more attractive, flexible venue for performers and audience members, meeting planners, event destination companies, and corporations, which, in turn, would enable the Center to attract more live entertainment and other events. Table 3 shows the proposed change in event attendees in the Auditorium the main floor and second-floor balcony, in comparison to the number of attendees at existing events in the Auditorium. As shown in Table 3, the total estimated number of attendees could increase or decrease from existing conditions depending on the audience and seating configuration.

Attendees at general admission concerts (standing only on the main floor of the Auditorium, existing fixed seating in the balcony) would increase attendance by 134 persons, a 4.2 percent increase over the maximum number of attendees under existing conditions. A general admission  

\textsuperscript{27} April 2012 CU authorization, Condition No. 10.  
\textsuperscript{28} April CU authorization, Condition No. 13.
### Table 3: Existing and Proposed Number of Attendees by Auditorium Configuration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Configuration</th>
<th>Main Floor</th>
<th>Balcony</th>
<th>Total Attendees&lt;sup&gt;a,b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Change From Existing Conditions&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seated Attendees Auditorum/Balcony</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>3,166</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Admission (Auditorium Main Floor Standing Only)&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1,994</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>134 (+4.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium Style (Auditorium Main Floor Seated/ Balcony Seated)&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1,231</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>2,537</td>
<td>-629 (-19.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom-Style (Seated Auditorium/ Balcony Seated)&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>2,066</td>
<td>-1,100 (-34.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabaret-Style (Auditorium Seated/ Balcony Seated Attendees)&lt;sup&gt;g&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>1,814</td>
<td>-1,352 (-42.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

<sup>a</sup> The number of attendees is for large events (over 250 attendees). This total does not include stage occupancy of approximately 117 persons under existing conditions, and stage occupancy of 102 persons with proposed renovations.

<sup>b</sup> No separate events would occur in the ground-floor California Room or Exhibition Hall that are not associated with events taking place in the Auditorium.

<sup>c</sup> Change in attendees is the difference between the total existing fixed seating attendance in both the main-floor Auditorium and balcony (3,166) and the proposed total number of attendees with each of the proposed seating configurations in the Auditorium.

<sup>d</sup> General admission with standing audiences on the main-floor Auditorium; and fixed seating on the balcony level.

<sup>e</sup> Non-reserved and/or reserved seating on the main-floor Auditorium and fixed seating on the balcony level.

<sup>f</sup> Table or desk seating on the main floor Auditorium, and fixed seating on the balcony level.

<sup>g</sup> Cocktail-style seating with tables and chairs or banquet seating.

**Sources:** California Masonic Memorial Temple, Heller Manus Architects, Live Nation, 2012

concert with standing only and existing fixed seating in the balcony represents the maximum, sold-out Auditorium configuration at the Masonic Center or the highest number of attendees that could be accommodated in the Auditorium) with the proposed renovation project.

Under the other possible audience and seating configurations in the main floor of the Auditorium, the total number of event attendees that could be accommodated in the Auditorium would be less than with the existing fixed seating (3,166 seats) in the Auditorium main floor and balcony. With an auditorium-style event (non-reserved or reserved seating in the Auditorium main floor), attendance would be about 19.9 percent less than under existing conditions. With classroom-style seating (tables or desks suitable for lectures or professional development classes in the Auditorium main floor, attendance would be about 34.7 percent less, and with cabaret-style or
banquet table and chair seating on the main floor Auditorium, attendance would be about 42.7 percent less than under existing conditions.

No separate events would occur in the ground-floor California Room or Exhibition Hall that are not associated with events taking place in the Auditorium; therefore, the number of attendees shown in Table 3 is the total number of persons who would occupy the assembly spaces in the Masonic Center during an event.

Number of Events

Table 4 shows the estimated changes in events by type with the proposed renovation project. As shown in this table, the number of live entertainment and non-live entertainment event days could increase with the proposed renovation project. Large live entertainment events would increase from the existing maximum permitted total of 54 events to an estimated 95 total events per year, an increase of up to about 41 concerts. The majority of the proposed live entertainment events are anticipated to be nighttime events. Of the proposed 95 live entertainment events, approximately 10 would be daytime events and approximately 85 are projected to be nighttime events. With the proposed project, large non-live entertainment events would also increase in number from the existing maximum permitted total of 176 events to 220 events year per year. Approximately 22 of the total proposed non-live entertainment events are anticipated to be nighttime events; the remaining approximately 198 events are expected to be daytime events, a portion of which could be all-day events that end after 6:00 PM.

**Table 4: Proposed Large (Over 250 Attendees) Live and Non-Live Entertainment Events by Type Per Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>Existing Events</th>
<th>Proposed Events</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live Entertainment</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Live Entertainment</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Events by Type</strong></td>
<td><strong>230</strong></td>
<td><strong>315</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
<td><strong>37%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** California Masonic Memorial Temple; Live Nation; Turnstone Consulting, 2012

---

**Notes:**
- a Total annual maximum number of large (over 250 attendees) allowed to be held at the Masonic Center under Conditional Use Authorization No. 2011.0471C, Planning Commission Motion No. 18520, as modified by the Board of Supervisors, Motion No. M12-051.
- b Proposed total maximum number of large events after completion of the proposed renovation project.
- c Totals do not equal 100 percent due to rounding.
- d Live Entertainment is defined as in Planning Code Section 790.38 to include dramatic and musical performances (including comedy shows), and/or provide amplified taped music for dancing on the premises.
- e Non-Live Entertainment includes all events other than live entertainment, such as meetings, conferences, trade shows, and special events such as weddings, banquets and private parties.
Smaller events with fewer than 250 attendees would also continue to be held at the Center and could increase in frequency. Overall, the total number of large events (over 250 persons) at the Masonic Center would increase to about 315 events from the existing maximum allowed of 230 events. This would represent an increase of about 85 total events, or a 37 percent increase.

The current venue operator (Live Nation) is expected to continue to manage assembly, entertainment, meeting, exhibition and other events at the Masonic Center after implementation of the proposed renovation project under its current leasing agreement with the Masonic Center.

**Renovation Schedule and Cost**

The project sponsor estimates that proposed interior construction and renovations to the Masonic Center would take approximately seven months. If approved, proposed renovation of the Masonic Center is anticipated to begin in 2013.

All renovation activities would occur within the interior of the Masonic Center except for demolition debris removal, and concrete mixing and pouring to install the new stage and tiered flooring in the main floor of the Auditorium. Interior demolition and debris removal would require delivery/pick-up of approximately 20 debris boxes during the first month of project renovations, primarily for removal of the existing flooring, fixed seating and stage in the main floor of the Auditorium. There would also be approximately 10 debris boxes delivered/picked up at various times throughout the seven-month renovation period for drywall removal. Debris boxes would be staged in the 185-foot-long curbside area on the south side of California Street in front of the Masonic Center.

Interior construction of the new stage and tiered flooring in the main floor of the Auditorium would require concrete pouring for a total of five days over a three-month period, including one day in Month 2, three consecutive days in Month 3, and one day in Month 4. On these days, a maximum of eight concrete delivery trucks would use the California Street curbside area to deliver premixed concrete; and one concrete pump truck would be staged in the curbside area for the entire day when concrete pouring occurs. No excavation, foundation or below-grade construction would occur. During the proposed renovations, no events would occur in the Auditorium and ground-floor California Room and Exhibition Hall.

The estimated cost for renovations is approximately $5.5 million.

---

29 In Month 2, there would be approximately seven concrete truck deliveries on one day; in Month 3, there would be approximately eight deliveries each day for three days; and in Month 4, there would be approximately four deliveries on one day. Daniel O’Hara, Project Manager, Turner Construction, email communication, April 23, 2012. A copy of this email is available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in Case File No. 2011.0471E.
**Project Approvals**

Required approval actions for the proposed renovation project may include, but are not limited to, the following:

**Planning Commission**
- Certification of the Environmental Impact Report.
- Conditional Use authorization for change of nonconforming assembly and entertainment use to conditionally permit “Other Entertainment” use and intensification of conditional use under Planning Code Sections 182(b)(1) and 723.48 and installation of permanent food and beverage service in the Nob Hill SUD under Planning Code Section 238(d)).

**Board of Supervisors**
- Possible approval of amendments to the Nob Hill SUD (Section 238 of the San Francisco Planning Code) to authorize the intensification of a large nonconforming assembly and entertainment use within the Special Use District.

**San Francisco Entertainment Commission**
- Approval of a Place of Entertainment Permit under Section 1060.12 of the San Francisco Police Code.

**San Francisco Police Department**
- Approval for the installation and enforcement of temporary signage authorizing loading and passenger drop-off and pick-up on California Street before, during, and after large events; approvals must be obtained prior to each event.

**California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control**
- Issuance of a license to permit the on-site sale of alcoholic beverages (Type 47 Liquor License), with supporting food services.

**B. PROJECT SETTING**

The Masonic Center is located near the top of Nob Hill in the Nob Hill neighborhood, a densely built area in the northeast section of the City. The Chinatown neighborhood is located to the east, the Russian Hill neighborhood to the north, and the Downtown/Civic Center neighborhood, which includes the Tenderloin, and the downtown shopping district (Union Square) to the south.

---

30 An extension and continuation of the Masonic Center as a legal nonconforming commercial assembly and entertainment use under Section 185(e) of the Planning Code was approved by the Board of Supervisors on April 3, 2012.

31 This amendment to the Nob Hill SUD would not be necessary if the City and CMMT prevail at the Court of Appeal in their appeal of the writ of mandate in Case No. 510365. The Masonic Center is the only large nonconforming assembly and entertainment use in the Nob Hill SUD, such that an amendment to the Nob Hill SUD would not authorize any other use in the Special Use District, which encompasses an area of approximately 10 blocks at the crest of Nob Hill, to be intensified.
Within the project block (Assessor’s Block No. 0253), the 16-story Gramercy Towers (1177 California Street) is immediately to the west of the Masonic Center, and the 4-story Nob Hill Inn and three residential apartment buildings ranging from 3 to 14 stories in height are immediately to the south on Pine Street. All lots on the project block are within the RM-4 (Residential-Mixed, High Density) Zoning District, a 65-A Height and Bulk District, and the Nob Hill Special Use District (SUD) zoning district, which is bounded by Sacramento, Stockton, Bush, and Jones Streets.

Surrounding the Masonic Center are primarily mid- and high-rise residential buildings, tourist hotels, civic/institutional buildings, and public open space uses. Grace Cathedral, a City Landmark, and its affiliated school, Cathedral School for Boys, as well as the Grace Cathedral public garage, are located on the block directly north of the Masonic Center.

Several residential apartment, condominium, and cooperative buildings ranging from 3 to 16 stories are west and south of the project block. The 16-story 1201 California Street Cooperative Apartments and 7-story Maria Victoria’s Apartments (1233 California Street) are west of the project block, across Jones Street. The 27-story 1200 California Street cooperative apartment building is located diagonally opposite the Gramercy Towers to the northwest, at California and Jones Streets. Residential apartment buildings, ranging from 4 to 12 stories, interspersed with small, neighborhood-serving retail establishments, are located on Pine Street south of the project block.

Directly to the east across Taylor Street are the 12-story Huntington Hotel, a tourist hotel and City landmark; the Crocker Garage, a privately owned public parking facility; and a seven-story apartment building. Huntington Park, a public park owned and maintained by the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department, is located diagonally opposite the project site to the northeast, at California and Taylor Streets. The Pacific Union Club, a City landmark, is directly east of Huntington Park. Four other tourist hotels, two of which are City landmarks, are located within two to four blocks east and northeast of the Masonic Center: the landmark Fairmont Hotel, on Mason Street, between California and Sacramento Streets; the landmark Mark Hopkins Hotel, on the corner of California and Mason Streets; the Renaissance Stanford Court Hotel, at the corner of Mason and Powell Streets; and the Ritz Carlton Hotel, on Stockton, between California and Pine Streets. The Fairmont, Mark Hopkins and Ritz Carlton Hotels, as well as Grace Cathedral, host large public assembly events in their ballrooms, meeting rooms and church facilities, some of which may overlap with large events held at the Masonic Center. Potential project impacts that could result from simultaneous events held at the renovated Masonic Center and these nearby existing uses are discussed in the impacts discussions below where relevant.

The C California Street cable car line runs east-west along California Street, between Market/Drumm Streets and Van Ness Avenue. The nearest C California cable car stops for both
inbound and outbound directions are located adjacent to the Center at California and Taylor Streets.

The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would be consistent with local and regional growth projections, such as Projections and Priorities 2009, published by the Association of Bay Area Governments, and adopted planning documents, such as the 2009 Update of the Housing Element of the San Francisco General Plan. This cumulative development in the City and the region is not expected to conflict with any land use plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Reasonably foreseeable development proposals under consideration within one-quarter-mile radius of the project site include existing residential buildings proposed to be leased by the Academy of Art University for student residences and other institutional uses. These proposals are discussed below to provide a local context for the assessment of potential cumulative impacts.

C. COMPATIBILITY WITH EXISTING ZONING AND PLANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicable</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discuss any variances, special authorizations, or changes proposed to the Planning Code or Zoning Map, if applicable.

Discuss any conflicts with any adopted plans and goals of the City or Region, if applicable.

Discuss any approvals and/or permits from City departments other than the Planning Department or the Department of Building Inspection, or from Regional, State, or Federal Agencies.

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING CODE AND ZONING MAP

The San Francisco Planning Code (Planning Code), which incorporates the City's Zoning Maps by reference, implements the San Francisco General Plan (General Plan) and governs permitted uses, densities, and configuration of buildings within the City. Permits to construct new buildings or to alter or demolish existing buildings may not be issued unless (1) the proposed project conforms to the Planning Code, (2) allowable exceptions are granted pursuant to provisions of the Planning Code, or (3) amendments to the Planning Code are included as part of the project.

The Masonic Center has been a lawful, nonconforming use since the 1960s. The site is currently zoned RM-4 (Residential, Mixed Use, High Density) and is within the Nob Hill Special Use District and a 65-A Height and Bulk District. The Center is classified as a Type 1 building under the Uniform Building Code. Under Planning Code Section 185, the legal nonconforming status

32 A Type 1 Building is defined in the Uniform Building Code as fire-resistive construction with a structural frame of fire-protected structural steel, iron or concrete; exterior walls, inner courts and walls of fire-resistive construction; roof construction and floors of fire-resistive construction, doors, windows; and other openings in exterior walls that are protected by fire doors or windows.
of a Type I building located in a residential zoning district, such as the Masonic Center, expires after 50 years unless the Planning Commission extends the nonconforming status by Conditional Use (CU) authorization. The Planning Commission approved an extension of the operation of the Masonic Center as a nonconforming use on January 19, 2012, and the Board of Supervisors upheld that approval with one modification on April 3, 2012 concerning the number and types of events held at the Center. This extension pertains only to continuing the existing use of the Masonic Center, and does not pertain to the CU authorizations that would be required under Planning Code Sections 182(6)(1) and 723.48 for the proposed renovation project.

Implementation of the proposed project would require CU authorization for intensification of entertainment use on the Masonic Center site. The project sponsor is requesting CU authorization under Planning Code Sections 182(b)(1) to change the current nonconforming assembly and entertainment use of the Masonic Center to “Other Entertainment” use as defined by Planning Code Section 790.38. The sponsor is also requesting CU authorization for an intensification of use under Planning Code Section 723.48. “Other Entertainment” permits live entertainment, defined as live music, amplified music, movies, comedy shows, floor/stage shows, disc jockey, and patron dancing, provided that the use is adequately soundproofed or insulated so that noise is confined on the premises. Section 182(b)(1) allows for nonconforming uses located within one-quarter mile of a Neighborhood Commercial District (NCD) to change to another use which is permitted as a conditional use in that NCD at the first story and below. The Masonic Center and proposed renovations are within one-quarter mile of the Polk Street Neighborhood Commercial District (Planning Code Section 723), and would meet the provisions of Section 182(b)(1). Other Entertainment uses are permitted in the Polk Street NCD as a conditional use. The sponsor is requesting CU authorization for the installation of permanent food and beverage service (to replace the current temporary catering operations) in the Nob Hill SUD under Planning Code Section 238(d).

However, if the California Court of Appeal upholds certain elements of the June 28, 2011 Writ of Mandate (Case No. 510365), approval under Section 182(b) to permit a nonconforming use within a quarter mile of a neighborhood commercial district would not be allowed and the proposed project would require amendments to the Nob Hill SUD of the San Francisco Planning Code to authorize an intensification of the nonconforming use. Amendments to the Nob Hill SUD, including potential conflicts of the amendments to the Planning Code, will be analyzed in the EIR.

**PLANS AND POLICIES**

Conflicts between the proposed project and policies that relate to physical environmental issues are discussed in this Initial Study’s Section E, Evaluation of Environmental Effects. Conflicts of the proposed project with applicable plans and policies that do not relate to physical environmental issues will be considered by decision-makers as part of their deliberations to
approve or disapprove the proposed project. Any potential conflicts identified as part of the project approval decision-making process would not alter the physical environmental effects of the proposed project.

San Francisco General Plan

In addition to the Planning Code and zoning regulations, the project site is subject to the General Plan. The General Plan provides general policies and objectives to guide land use decisions in the City. The compatibility of the proposed project with General Plan policies that do not relate to physical environmental issues would be considered by decision-makers as part of their decision whether to approve or disapprove the proposed project. Any potential conflicts identified as part of the process would not alter the physical environmental effects of the proposed project. The EIR will contain a discussion of the consistency of the project with applicable General Plan Elements, Objectives and Policies.

The Arts Element of the General Plan, which will be discussed in more detail in the EIR, is intended to strengthen arts and culture in the City and to incorporate consideration of arts and artists, including the performing arts, in the local decision-making process. The Arts Element also seeks to make art, including the performing arts, accessible to City residents by supporting performing arts and other arts venues, art organizations, public art, and arts-related educational programs through public policy and other means.

The Commerce and Industry Element of the General Plan sets forth objectives and policies that address the broad range of economic activities, facilities, and support systems that constitute San Francisco’s employment and service base. The Commerce and Industry Element focuses on three overriding goals that call for continued economic vitality, social equity, and environmental quality. Within the framework of these broad interrelated goals, the Commerce and Industry Element seeks to meet the needs of specific economic activities, and to reconcile conflicts and competition among the various economic sectors, including conventions and visitor trade, and other land uses and activities. The EIR will contain a discussion of the consistency of the proposed project with the Commerce and Industry Element in more detail.

Proposition M

In November 1986, the voters of San Francisco approved Proposition M, the Accountable Planning Initiative, which added Section 101.1 to the Planning Code to establish eight Priority Policies. These policies are: 1) preservation and enhancement of neighborhood-serving retail uses; 2) protection of neighborhood character; 3) preservation and enhancement of affordable housing; 4) discouragement of commuter automobiles; 5) protection of industrial and service land uses from commercial office development and enhancement of resident employment and business ownership; 6) maximization of earthquake preparedness; 7) landmark and historic building
preservation; and 8) protection of open space. The Priority Policies, which provide general policies and objectives to guide certain land use decisions, contain certain policies that relate to physical environmental issues that will be evaluated in the EIR. Consistency with Priority Policies that do not relate to physical environmental issues will be considered by decision-makers as part of their deliberations to approve or disapprove the proposed project.

Other Plans

Other local environmental plans and policies such as the City’s Climate Action Plan, the San Francisco Sustainability Plan, and the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy directly address physical environmental issues and/or contain targets or standards that must be met in order to preserve or improve characteristics of the City’s physical environment. The EIR will contain a discussion of project consistency with these and other applicable plans.

Regional Plans and Policies

The principal regional planning agencies and their policy plans to guide planning in the nine-county Bay Area are the Association for Bay Area Governments (ABAG), A Land Use Policy Framework and Projections 2009; the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan and Bay Area 2005 Ozone Strategy; the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Transportation 2035 Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area; and the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Basin Plan; and the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, San Francisco Bay Plan. The EIR will contain a discussion of project consistency with these and other regional plans as applicable.

OTHER APPROVALS AND PERMITS

Other than the approvals listed in Section A, Project Description, on p. 27, no other approvals and/or permits are required from City departments other than the Planning Department and the Department of Building Inspection (DBI), or from regional, state or federal agencies.
D. SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

The proposed project could potentially affect the environmental factor(s) checked below. The following pages present a more detailed checklist and discussion of each environmental factor.

☒ Land Use ☐ Air Quality ☐ Biological Resources
☐ Aesthetics ☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions ☐ Geology and Soils
☐ Population and Housing ☐ Wind and Shadow ☐ Hydrology and Water Quality
☐ Cultural and Paleo. Resources ☐ Recreation ☐ Hazards/Hazardous Materials
☒ Transportation and Circulation ☐ Utilities and Service Systems ☐ Mineral/Energy Resources
☒ Noise ☒ Public Services (Police, Fire and Emergency Services) ☐ Agricultural and Forest Resources

☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

EFFECTS FOUND TO BE POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT

On the basis of this Initial Study, topics for which there are project-specific effects that have been determined to be potentially significant include: Land Use and Land Use Planning; Transportation and Circulation; Noise; and Public Services (Police, Fire Protection and Emergency Services). These topics, along with Compatibility with Existing Zoning and Plans and Policies, will be evaluated in an EIR prepared for the project. Project-specific and cumulative impacts in other topical areas would be less than significant, and will not be evaluated in the EIR. These topics include: Aesthetics; Population and Housing; Cultural and Paleontological Resources; Air Quality; Greenhouse Gas Emissions; Wind and Shadow; Recreation; Utilities and Service Systems; Public Services (Schools and Libraries); Biological Resources; Geology and Soils; Hydrology and Water Quality; Hazards and Hazardous Materials; Mineral/Energy Resources; and Agricultural and Forest Resources. These topics are discussed below.
E. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. LAND USE AND LAND USE PLANNING—Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial impact upon the existing character of the vicinity?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact LU-1: The proposed project could physically divide an established community. *(Potentially Significant)* (Criterion 1a)

The proposed renovation project would not introduce a new land use into the Nob Hill community. The Masonic Center would continue to operate as an assembly and entertainment venue. The proposed project renovations would not change the Center’s existing total square footage, building height, façades, or footprint. The proposed increase in the number of events and attendees at the Masonic Center Auditorium could have the potential to divide an established community; this topic will be discussed in the EIR.

Impact LU-2: The proposed Conditional Use authorizations and, if required, amendments to the Nob Hill SUD could conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations (including, but not limited to, the San Francisco General Plan or Planning Code) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. *(Potentially Significant)* (Criterion 1b)

The City’s General Plan, which provides general policies and objectives to guide land use decisions, contains policies that relate to physical environmental issues. As described under Compatibility with Existing Zoning and Plans, pp. 29-32, the proposed renovation project is not authorized under the April 2012 CU authorization which extended existing operations of the
Center as a nonconforming use. The project sponsor would request Conditional Use authorization to change the nonconforming assembly and entertainment use to conditionally permitted “Other Entertainment” use at the project site under Planning Code Section 182(b)(1). The sponsor would also request an intensification of the conditional use under Planning Code Section 723.48 to increase the number of event attendees and the number and frequency of events per year (from the existing total of 230 event days to 315 large events per year). In addition, the sponsor would request approval of permanent food and beverage service in the Nob Hill SUD under Planning Code Section 238(d). With the proposed project, the existing catering kitchen would be upgraded to a permanent commercial kitchen, and a single concessionnaire would operate the kitchen to prepare food for concessions, private parties, and banquets for event attendees.

Should the California Court of Appeal uphold certain elements of the June 28, 2011 Writ of Mandate, the project sponsor would be required to seek amendments to the Nob Hill SUD Planning Code Section 238 to authorize intensification (with conditional use approval) of a large nonconforming assembly and entertainment use within the Nob Hill SUD, rather than Conditional Use authorizations under Section 182(b)(1) and 723.48 to conditionally permit and intensify “Other Entertainment” use.

Proposed Conditional Use authorizations or, if required, amendments to the Nob Hill SUD to authorize the Masonic Center as a large nonconforming assembly and entertainment use within the Nob Hill SUD could result in conflicts with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations of an agency with jurisdiction over the project. Conflicts with applicable land use plans, policies and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental impacts could result in potentially significant impacts and will be addressed in the EIR.

Impact LU-3: The proposed project could have a substantial impact on the existing character of the site vicinity. (Potentially Significant) (Criterion 1c)

The Masonic Center has been used as an assembly and live entertainment venue since it was completed in 1958, and this use would continue with implementation of the proposed renovation project. The exterior of the building, including its square footage, height, façades, and footprint,

---

33 An extension and continuation of the Masonic Center as a legal nonconforming commercial assembly and entertainment use under Section 185(e) of the Planning Code was approved by the Planning Commission on January 19, 2012 under Motion No. 18520, as modified by Board of Supervisors Motion M12-42 on April 3, 2012.

34 The Masonic Center is the only large nonconforming assembly and entertainment use in the Nob Hill SUD, such that an amendment to the Nob Hill SUD would not authorize any other use in the special use district, which encompasses an area of approximately 10 blocks at the crest of Nob Hill, to be intensified.

35 Should the Court of Appeals uphold certain elements of the June 28, 2011 Writ of Mandate, Conditional Use authorization would still be required for installation of permanent food and beverage service under Planning Code Section 238(d), separate from the amendments to the Nob Hill SUD that would authorize the Masonic Center as a large nonconforming assembly and entertainment use within the Nob Hill SUD.
would not be altered as part of the proposed renovations. The proposed project would not alter the renowned endomosaic window in the first-floor entrance lobby. As such, the Masonic Center would maintain its current use and physical appearance, and would not alter the existing physical character of the site vicinity.

The proposed project would alter and upgrade the main floor of the Auditorium to accommodate more flexible seating and audience configurations on the main floor of the Auditorium, would add permanent food and beverage concession areas, and would modernize and upgrade the ground-floor Exhibition Hall, California Room, and kitchen to provide food, beverage, and other services for a range of events.

The renovated Auditorium would continue to be used for assembly events that include lectures, speaker events, corporate meetings, civic events (such as graduations and naturalization ceremonies), and live-entertainment such as music concerts, comedy shows, and cultural performances, and would not change the existing character of the site vicinity with implementation of the proposed project. The Exhibition Hall and California Room would continue to be used for exhibitions, trade shows, corporate events, meetings, banquets, and private parties, and would not change the existing character of the site vicinity with implementation of the proposed project.

The existing catering kitchen on the ground level would be upgraded to a permanent commercial kitchen to allow on-site food preparation by a single operator for concessions, banquets for event attendees, and private parties. The sponsor is also seeking a permanent permit for on-site sale of alcoholic beverages. These changes in food and beverage service are not anticipated to change the character of the Center since similar services are currently provided on-site by caterers using temporary permits. Also, as under current operating conditions, only event attendees would have access to on-site food and beverage service; there would be no public restaurant or food and/or bar service available to people who are not attending events at the Center. The effect of on-site food preparation and sale of alcoholic beverage on the existing character of the site vicinity will be discussed in the EIR.

With proposed renovations, the total maximum number of large events in the Center could increase from the existing total of 230 event days to about 315 large events per year, an increase of approximately 85 events, or about a 37 percent increase. The total maximum attendees (defined as a sold-out, general admissions event with standing only – no seating in the main floor

---

36 The average of 229 event days is based on historical data of events at the Masonic Center during the period between 2002 and 2007. The number of event days decreased to an average of 66 events between 2008 and 2011, when bookings were substantially curtailed in anticipation of proposed renovations to the Center, and the upgraded Center was leased to a professional operator (i.e., Live Nation). California Masons Memorial Temple prepared a report that itemizes all events held at the Masonic Center during the period 2002-2011. A copy of that report is available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in Case File No. 2011.0471E.
of the Auditorium and fixed seating in the Auditorium balcony) would increase by 134 additional attendees per event, from 3,166 to 3,300, or about a 4 percent increase.

The increased number of attendees and the increased frequency of events would result in an intensification of activity and use of the Masonic Center. The increased frequency of 85 events per year could affect existing land use character in the site vicinity. The April 2012 CU authorization includes a number of conditions that are currently being implemented, and would continue to be implemented with the proposed project. These measures are described in Initial Study Sections 2, Aesthetics; 7, Air Quality; 10, Recreation; 11, Utilities and Service Systems; and 12, Public Services. The increase of up to 134 attendees per event and an increase of 85 events per year could result in potentially significant impacts on the character of the site vicinity, and this topic will be discussed in the EIR.

Cumulative Impacts

Impact C-LU-1: The proposed project in combination with past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future projects in the site vicinity could have a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative land use impact. *(Potentially Significant)*

The proposed project would intensify uses at the Masonic Center site that could, in combination with past, present, or reasonably foreseeable projects, have a cumulatively considerable impact on land use. This topic will be discussed in the EIR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. AESTHETICS—Would the project:</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact AE-1: The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas, substantially damage scenic resources, or substantially degrade the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings. (*No Impact*) (*Criteria 2a – 2c*)

All proposed renovations would occur within the interior of the Masonic Center. The proposed renovation project would not involve any physical changes to the total square footage, building height, façades, or footprint of the existing Masonic Center. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on scenic vistas, and would not damage scenic resources, including trees, rock outcroppings, and other features that contribute to a scenic public setting, or degrade the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings. Therefore, these topics will not be discussed in the EIR.

Impact AE-2: The proposed project would not 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. (*Less than Significant*) (*Criterion 2d*)

At the Masonic Center during daytime hours under existing conditions, there are no sources of exterior or interior daytime lighting at the Masonic Center that create light or glare\(^{37}\) or affect views in the project area.

Under existing conditions, nighttime operations and events at the Masonic Center are a source of lighting and glare. This section discusses existing lighting and glare effects in comparison to the proposed project to evaluate increased frequency of potential lighting effects of the proposed project renovations. Under existing conditions, there are sources of nighttime lighting at the Masonic Center on both non-event and event days. With the proposed renovation project, the frequency of nighttime light on event days would occur more often than is currently allowed at the Center.

Off-site existing sources of nighttime light in the project vicinity include street lighting on California, Taylor, Jones, and Pine Streets; lighting at Huntington Park, which closes each day at 10:00 PM; lighting at the Grace Cathedral garage entrance; exterior lighting at Grace Cathedral when nighttime events are held; decorative lighting on ornamental trees at the California Street entrance of Gramercy Towers; exterior lighting from nearby highrise apartment buildings, hotels and restaurants; and headlights and brake lights of vehicles traveling along streets in the project vicinity.

\(^{37}\) Glare is defined as visual discomfort resulting from insufficiently shielded light sources in the field of view such that one sees only the light source, and not the effects of lighting.
Existing Non-Event Nighttime Lighting and Glare

Masonic Center First-Floor Lobby

On non-event days, low-level interior security lighting is provided in the first-floor main entrance lobby that is visible from California Street, but does not spill over onto nearby properties and is not a source of glare.

The endomosaic window in the first-floor lobby is illuminated with dimmed lighting that is positioned and deflected north toward California Street to display this feature of the Masonic Center to passing pedestrians and vehicles traveling on California Street. The window is translucent and requires minimal nighttime lighting that is operated with automatic timers that shut off at 10:00 PM each day. The illuminated endomosaic window is noticeable, but is not an obtrusive source of lighting to residents near the Center with north-facing windows on the southern side of Pine Street between Taylor and Jones Street, and to residents with rear windows on the north side of Pine Street. Because lighting for the endomosaic window is filtered and directed to the north, it does not affect nighttime views south of the Masonic Center along Pine Street or more distant views from the south. The existing security lighting and the illuminated endomosaic window on the first-floor lobby are not a source of glare.

Masonic Center Garage

The Masonic Center garage operates 24 hours a day, seven days a week, regardless of whether there is an event at the Center. Sources of nighttime light at the Masonic Center garage fronting California Street include the interior entrance/exit level of the garage, exterior lighting and illuminated signage above the garage entrance, and the headlights and brake lights of vehicles entering or exiting the garage. Interior and exterior lighting above the garage entrance is visible all year long during nighttime hours.

Vehicles entering and exiting the garage do not create a source of direct glare to nearby people or properties because the headlights and brake lights of vehicles exiting the garage face Grace Cathedral and then become part of the typical lighting associated with vehicular traffic on California Street and surrounding streets.

Under existing conditions, vehicles are allowed to enter the garage from Pine Street for ticketholders who have pre-paid parking tickets. For events with 1,000 patrons or more, vehicles are permitted to exit from the garage via either the Pine Street loading dock ramp or the

---

38 Information concerning existing nighttime lighting at the Masonic Center was obtained from Dale Vigil, Nob Hill Masonic Center, Building Engineer, telephone communication, July 5, 2012, and Richard Gentschel, Production Director, August 30, 2012. A copy of the record of these telephone calls is available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in Case File No. 2011.0471E.

39 April 2012 CU authorization, Condition No. 6.
ramps to California Street. The headlights of vehicles exiting the garage from the Pine Street
loading dock ramp are visible to residents across from the loading dock ramp on the southern side
of Pine Street, particularly those residents directly opposite the exit level (fifth floor) of the
garage on Pine Street. Headlights of vehicles exiting the garage are an intermittent source of
direct glare to residents in buildings directly opposite the Pine Street loading dock area when
vehicles are delayed on the fifth-floor exit level of the garage before descending onto the ramp to
exit at street grade onto Pine Street. An average of 225 vehicles exit the garage for events with
1,000 patrons or more. Exiting occurs for up to an hour after the end of an event.40

Pine Street Loading Dock Area – Emergency Exit Stairway

On non-event days, safety lighting is provided on each level of the existing exterior emergency
exit stairway on the east side of the existing Pine Street loading dock. There are no other sources
of lighting in the Pine Street loading dock area. The emergency exit stairway extends from the
roof to the ground level on the southern face of the Masonic Center. Safety lighting is mounted
above the stairway landing on each floor, and is directed downward to provide adequate lighting
for emergency egress. Nighttime lighting is provided in the emergency exit stairway, year long,
24 hours a day, regardless of whether there is a nighttime event at the Center. The existing
exterior lighting on the emergency exit stairway is adequate for safety and is visible, but is not a
source of glare.

The Pine Street loading dock area abuts two existing multi-unit residential buildings - 1034 Pine
Street and 1042 Pine Street. Nighttime lighting from the emergency exit stairway is visible from
windows on all three sides of the shallow “U”-shaped interior light wells of each building, and
from the east-facing windows on the upper level of 1042 Pine Street.

Exterior lighting from the existing emergency exit stairway is not directed toward windows in the
light wells of the adjacent multi-level residential buildings, and does not spill over onto nearby
properties on the southern side of Pine Street.

Event-Related Nighttime Lighting and Glare

During nighttime events, existing additional sources of lighting at the Masonic Center are lighting
in the first-floor main entrance lobby, front entrance portico, and the three bay windows in the
California Room that face Taylor Street when it is in use during events.

---

40 Sha Brown, San Francisco Area Manager, ACE Parking Management, Inc. Masonic Center Garage,
telephone conversation, September 7, 2012. A copy of the record of this telephone call is available for
public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in Case File
No. 2011.0471E.
First Floor Lobby and Front Entrance Portico Lighting

During nighttime events under existing conditions, interior lighting in the first-floor entrance lobby and exterior lighting in the front entrance portico is visible from the south-facing and easternmost stairs of Grace Cathedral and from the upper levels of residential buildings located on Sacramento Street between Taylor and Mason Streets, but is not visible from farther points north due to the height and massing of Grace Cathedral and intervening topography.

Existing exterior lighting from the front entrance portico is visible from the windows of north- and east-facing units in the Gramercy Towers high-rise residential building at 1177 California Street immediately west of the Center, and from the upper-floor units of the 1200 California Street high-rise residential building located northwest of the Center at the corner of California and Jones Streets. Interior lighting in the main entrance lobby, by itself, is not directly visible to units in these residential buildings; however, in combination with lighting from the front entrance porch, it is noticeable to Gramercy Towers residences west of the Center. On event days, full lighting in the entrance lobby is converted to low-level security lights after all event attendees, performers, and event employees exit the building. The exterior lights in the entrance portico are turned off after performer buses exit and equipment trucks complete loading and exit, typically about one to two hours after events.

On event days, nighttime lighting in the first-floor lobby and entrance portico are in addition to the interior lighting on the entrance/exit level of the Masonic Center garage and the exterior lighting above the garage entrance. Lighting in the main entrance lobby and the front entrance portico are not sources of glare.

Under existing conditions, during nighttime events, there are no additional sources of light from safety lighting at the Pine Street loading dock area as existing lighting on the exterior emergency exit stairway would continue to operate similar to existing conditions on non-event days. Existing sources of glare from vehicles exiting the garage from the Pine Street loading dock are discussed on pp. 39-40.

There are three bay windows in the California Room on the east side of the Masonic Center building across from the Huntington Hotel. When the California Room is used during nighttime events in the Auditorium, lighting from these windows is noticeable from the west-facing windows of the Huntington Hotel and from pedestrians and vehicles on Taylor Street, but it is directed inward, and is not obtrusive or a source of glare.
Proposed Project Event-Related Nighttime Lighting and Glare

With the proposed project, there would be no changes to the existing interior and exterior daytime or nighttime building lighting systems described above under existing conditions. The existing lighting during nighttime events in the first-floor main entrance lobby, front entrance porch, and California Room would not change from existing conditions with the proposed project, and the lighting of the endomosaic would continue to be turned off at 10:00 PM. As discussed above, existing nighttime lighting in the Masonic Center garage, the Pine Street exterior emergency exit stairway, and from vehicles entering the garage from the Pine Street loading dock area would continue to occur with or without the proposed project.

The increase of up to 134 attendees per event in the Auditorium would not create new sources of nighttime light or glare that would substantially effect nearby people or properties as these effects already occur under existing conditions.

Due to the proposed increase in the number of nighttime events, the proposed project would increase the frequency of nighttime lighting that is currently allowed at the Masonic Center under existing conditions. As listed in Table 1 on p. 14, based on existing historical conditions there are an average of 69 nighttime events. As discussed on p. 25, it is anticipated that there would be approximately 107 total nighttime events (22 non-live and 85 live-entertainment events) with the proposed project. This would represent an increase of about 38 nighttime events in comparison to existing conditions. The increase of approximately 38 nighttime events would increase the frequency of nighttime lighting visible from the first-floor main entrance lobby, front entrance portico, and the three bay windows of the California Room when in use for nighttime events.

There would be no increased frequency in lighting from the Masonic Center garage entrance/exit on California Street and the exterior emergency exit stairway in the Pine Street loading area since the garage and emergency exit stairway are existing sources of light.

The proposed project would increase the frequency of the number of vehicles entering and exiting the Masonic Center garage on California Street, and the Pine Street loading dock area. The increased number of vehicles using the California Street garage entrance would enter and exit opposite Grace Cathedral and not result in an adverse environmental impact that would create a new source of substantial light or glare that would affect residents in the project area.

Due to the increase of approximately 38 nighttime events with the proposed project, residents in buildings on the southern side of Pine Street directly opposite the loading dock area could experience an increased incidence of intermittent glare from vehicle headlights. This could occur

---

A new interior lighting system would be installed as part of proposed renovations to the Auditorium; however, this new lighting would not be visible from outside of the Auditorium or from the exterior of the building and would not create a new source of light or glare.
when vehicles are delayed on the fifth-floor exit level of the garage before descending onto the ramp to exit at street-grade onto Pine Street. As under existing conditions, an average of about 225 vehicles could exit the garage from the Pine Street loading dock area; however, not all vehicles exiting the garage would create a new source of glare to residents on the southern side of Pine Street since not all cars would be delayed on the fifth-floor exit ramp. Intermittent glare from vehicles exiting the garage would occur for about an hour when vehicles vacate the garage, and would not affect a substantial number of people or result in a substantial environmental effect on light and glare.

Except for the increase in intermittent nighttime glare from headlights of vehicles exiting the Masonic Center garage from Pine Street, there would be no other new sources of glare (i.e., reflective windows, exterior building materials, or signage) with implementation of the proposed renovation project.

As under existing conditions, all project lighting (exterior and interior) would be directed onto the project site and immediately surrounding sidewalk area only, and would be designed and managed so as not to be a nuisance to adjacent residents. Exterior nighttime lighting is required to be kept at the minimum necessary to ensure safety, but is restricted from any placement or design that would be a nuisance to any surrounding property. These requirements would continue to be required as part of the proposed project.

As such, although the increased frequency in nighttime lighting would be noticeable, as under existing lighting conditions, nighttime lighting at the Masonic Center would not be directed to, or spill over onto, surrounding uses in a manner that would create a nuisance to surrounding properties. As under existing conditions, exterior and interior lighting at the Masonic Center would not spill over in a way that would be noticeable from a distance that would affect nighttime views.

For the reasons discussed above, the proposed renovation project would not create a new source of substantial light and glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area that would substantially impact other people or properties. Thus, this impact would be less than significant, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

Cumulative Impacts

Impact C-AE-1: The proposed project in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development in the site vicinity would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant impact on aesthetics (light and glare). (Less than Significant)

As described above, the proposed project would have no impacts on scenic vistas, scenic resources, and existing visual character, and therefore the project would not have cumulative impacts on visual resources.

Reasonably foreseeable cumulative development within one-quarter mile of the project site would involve leasing and reuse of existing residential buildings by the Academy of Art University that would not be expected to create new sources of substantial light and glare. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant impacts on light and glare. This topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

---

### 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)?
  - Potentially Significant Impact: 
  - Less Than Significant Impact: 
  - Mitigation Incorporated: 
  - Less Than Significant Impact: 
  - No Impact: 
  - Not Applicable: 

- **b)** Displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or create demand for additional housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing?
  - Potentially Significant Impact: 
  - Less Than Significant Impact: 
  - Mitigation Incorporated: 
  - Less Than Significant Impact: 
  - No Impact: 
  - Not Applicable: 

- **c)** Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
  - Potentially Significant Impact: 
  - Less Than Significant Impact: 
  - Mitigation Incorporated: 
  - Less Than Significant Impact: 
  - No Impact: 
  - Not Applicable: 

**Impact PH-1:** The proposed project would not induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly. *(No Impact)* *(Criterion 3a)*

The proposed renovation project would not include residential development, and therefore would not directly induce population growth in the project area or citywide through the construction of housing.

Currently, there are approximately 51 full-time employees at the Masonic Center: 49 persons employed by the Masons of California, including parking garage and security staff, and 2 persons employed on-site by Live Nation. After renovations to the Center are completed, Live Nation would add one additional staff person, bringing the total number of full-time employees on-site at the Masonic Center to 52. Other Live Nation staff, such as a production manager, an accountant, and marketing personnel, are shared with other Live Nation offices in Northern California, and these staff members would travel to work at the Masonic Center periodically.
On event days, there are typically 75 to 100 temporary workers on-site, including ushers, ticket takers, security, food service staff, concessionaries, merchandise vendors, stagehands, and cleaning staff. With implementation of the proposed project, it is anticipated that the number of temporary workers who would work at the Center on event days would be about the same. These temporary workers are likely to already reside in San Francisco or elsewhere in the Bay Area and would not relocate as a result of the proposed project.

Implementation of the proposed project would increase total full-time employment at the Center, excluding temporary workers on event days, by one worker. This increase would be imperceptible (less than 0.0001 percent) in the context of total employment in the City and County of San Francisco.43

The proposed project would not indirectly increase population through changes or extensions to area roads, utilities, or other infrastructure to serve the site.

For these reasons, the proposed project would not impact, directly or indirectly, population growth or employment in the project area and citywide. This topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

Impact PH-2: The proposed project would not displace housing units, create a demand for additional housing, or displace a substantial number of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. (No Impact) (Criterion 3b)

There are no housing units on the project site and, therefore, the proposed project would not displace any housing units. According to the City’s 2009 Housing Element EIR, San Francisco is projected to experience continued housing growth through 2030, for an overall housing unit increase of approximately 52,051 housing units between 2010 and 2030.44 The addition of one new permanent employee at the Masonic Center would not result in an increase in the demand for housing which could not be accommodated in the projected housing growth between 2010 and 2030. The 75 to 100 temporary workers who work at the Center during events are likely to be existing San Francisco or Bay Area residents, and are not anticipated to relocate to seek housing. Therefore, these temporary workers would not increase demand for housing that is not already accommodated in projected housing growth.

As shown in Table 4 on p. 25, the total number of large events at the Center would increase by about 85 events per year. Temporary workers would thus work at the site more frequently. As stated above, these temporary workers are likely to already reside in San Francisco or elsewhere in the Bay Area and, therefore the increased frequency of events at the Center would not increase

43 Association of Bay Area Governments, Projections 2009. San Francisco’s overall employment is projected to increase from about 606,540 employees in 2015 to approximately 647,190 in 2020, and to 748,100 in 2030.

demand for housing that is not already accommodated in projected housing growth with the increased number of events.

Given the discussion above, the proposed project would have no impact on housing displacement and demand, and would not create substantial demand for additional housing that would necessitate the construction of replacement housing. This topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

**Impact PH-3: The proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. (No Impact) (Criterion 3c)**

As discussed in Impact PH-2, there are no housing units on the Masonic Center site. As such, no residents would be displaced by the proposed renovation project. No employees would be displaced. Therefore, the proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Thus, there would be no impact, and this topic will not be addressed in the EIR.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES—Would the project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5, including those resources listed in Article 10 or Article 11 of the San Francisco Planning Code?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact CP-1: The proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. (Less than Significant) (Criterion 4a)**

The modernist, white-marble-clad Masonic Auditorium building was designed by architect Albert Roller and was completed in 1958. As described on the Masonic Center website:

Several unique aspects of the building are the Memorial Sculpture topping the east end of the California Street wall. The sculpture is dominated by four huge figures, each 12 feet high, representing branches of our Country’s Armed Forces.
Adjoining these, a frieze of 14 smaller marble figures depicts a titanic tug-of-war in the global struggle between the forces of good and evil. Below this portrayal is a dedicatory inscription, dedicated to Our Masonic Brethren Who Died in the Cause of Freedom. This relief was crafted by renowned California artist Emile Norman.

Emile Norman also crafted the one-of-a-kind mosaic window that dominates the entrance foyer. This historical window, fabricated in the endomosaic process, incorporates thousands of bits of metal, parchment, felt, linen, silk, natural foliage, thinly sliced vegetable matter, shells and sea life, plus 180 colors of stained glass. The lower portion of the frieze is comprised of actual gravels and soils of the 58 counties of California and the Islands of Hawaii. The window depicts the history of the wayfarers and the seafarers that helped found California Freemasonry.  

The Masonic Auditorium building is not included in, and has not been determined eligible for inclusion in, a local, State or Federal register of historical resources. According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a)(4), “The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources, or identified in an historical resource survey does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resources may be an historical resource…”

For the purposes of this evaluation of potential project impacts on historical resources, the Masonic Center building is considered eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources under Criterion 1 (Design), based on its distinctive, white-marble-clad, modernist exterior which features an abstracted portico colonnade and a sculptural relief by artist Emile Norman. A colorful translucent “endomosaic,” also by Emile Norman, illuminates and defines the character of the entrance foyer space. Other interior spaces in the Masonic Center are not distinctive or character defining features that contribute to its historic significance.

The proposed renovation project would alter the Auditorium, California Room, Exhibition Hall and kitchen in the interior of the building, but would not change the physical fabric of the building exterior, or the entrance foyer and its endomosaic. The proposed project does not include any physical alteration to the building that “demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of the historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources as determined by the lead agency for purposes of CEQA” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5).

---


46 The mosaic has recently been restored. See Architectural Resources Group Website at http://www.argsf.com/projects/california-masonic-memorial-temple-0a, accessed November 9, 2011.
For these reasons, the proposed project impact on an historical resource under CEQA would be less than significant, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

Impact CP-2: The proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of subsurface cultural resources. (No Impact) (Criteria 4b – 4d)

Construction of the proposed project does not require or include any excavation or any other activity that could disturb the soils beneath the project site. For this reason, the proposed project would have no impact on an archaeological resource, unique paleontological resource, or unique geologic feature, nor would it disturb human remains, if any such features exist within the project site. The topic will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Cumulative Impacts

Impact C-CP-1: The proposed project in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts on cultural resources or archaeological resources. (Less than Significant)

As described above, the proposed project does not involve activities that would disturb subsurface cultural resource, and therefore would not contribute to cumulative impacts on archaeological, paleontological, or unique geologic resources.

The proposed project does not include any physical alteration to the Masonic Center building that materially alters in an adverse manner characteristic defining features of the building. Therefore the proposed project would not have a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact on cultural resources. This topic will not be addressed further in the EIR.

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A transportation impact study will be prepared for the proposed project and summarized in the EIR. The study will examine existing conditions and assess the proposed project’s net new daily and PM peak trips, the increased frequency of trips associated with the project, and their impacts on intersection operations, transit, passenger loading operations, large-truck equipment loading operations, bicycle and pedestrian safety, emergency vehicle access, and parking, including performer’s tour bus parking.

The Masonic Center site is not located within an airport land use plan area or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, Topic 5c is not applicable to the proposed project and will not be addressed in the transportation impact study or the EIR.

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- Less Than Significant Impact
- No Impact
- Not Applicable

- ☒
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐

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?

- ☒
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐

A noise background study and impact analysis will be prepared for the EIR. The background noise study will describe existing noise conditions, discuss noise standards and ordinances applicable to the proposed project, and analyze potential noise impacts of the proposed project on nearby land uses and sensitive receptors. The noise study will analyze traffic-related noise and noise associated with loading activities on California Street and within the Pine Street loading dock area. Event-related noise, such as noise associated with attendees before and after events on the entrance plaza, adjacent sidewalks, and in Huntington Park will also be addressed, as well as potential low-frequency vibration and noise associated with amplified music from within the Auditorium.

The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, within an airport land use plan area, or within two miles of any nearby public airports or public use airports that have not adopted land use plans. Thus, Topics 5e and 5f are not applicable to the proposed project and will not be discussed in the background noise study or the EIR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. **AIR QUALITY**—Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

- ☐
- ☐
- ☒
- ☐
- ☐

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

- ☐
- ☐
- ☒
- ☐
- ☐
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Topics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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)?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

The proposed project is in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB). The primary factors that determine air quality in the SFBAAB are the locations of air emission sources and the amounts of pollutants emitted. Meteorological and topographical conditions are also important factors. Atmospheric conditions such as wind speed, wind direction, and air temperature gradients interact with the physical features of the landscape affecting the movement and dispersal of air pollutants.

The San Francisco Bay Area has a Mediterranean climate characterized by mild, dry summers and mild, moderately wet winters (about 90 percent of the annual total rainfall occurs during the November to April period), moderate daytime onshore breezes, and moderate humidity. Weather is moderated by the adjacent oceanic heat reservoir that leads to fog. In summer, the northwest winds to the west of the coastline are drawn into the interior valleys through the Golden Gate and over the lower topography of the San Francisco Peninsula. This channels wind so that it sweeps eastward and widens downstream across the region. In winter, periods of storminess tend to alternate with periods of stagnation and light winds. Onshore winds from the west dominate at the project site such that emissions from San Francisco tend to be carried eastward over the San Francisco Bay.

Regulatory Setting

The federal Clean Air Act (CAA) requires the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to establish and periodically review National Ambient Air Quality Standards (national standards or NAAQS) to protect public health and welfare. National standards have been established for the following seven air pollutants, many of which have been made more stringent by California standards: ozone, carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), particulate matter equal to or less than 10 micrometers (coarse particulates or PM10), particulate matter equal to or less than 2.5 micrometers (fine particulates or PM2.5), and lead. These pollutants are called “criteria air pollutants.”
The California Air Resources Board (ARB) manages air quality, regulates mobile emissions sources, and oversees the activities of county and regional air districts in California. The ARB regulates local air quality indirectly by establishing California Ambient Air Quality Standards (state standards or CAAQS) and vehicle emissions standards, and by conducting research, planning, and coordination activities. California has adopted ambient air quality standards that are generally more stringent than the federal standards for the seven criteria air pollutants.

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has jurisdiction over the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin that encompasses nine counties within the Bay Area, including San Francisco. The BAAQMD is responsible for ensuring that federal and state air quality standards are met by monitoring ambient air pollutant levels throughout the region and implementing strategies to attain those standards. The Association of Bay Area Governments, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, county transportation agencies, cities and counties, and various nongovernmental organizations are also involved in managing air quality in the region.

The BAAQMD monitors air quality at more than 30 locations throughout the San Francisco Bay Area. The closest monitoring station to the site is located approximately 2 miles south at 16th and Arkansas Streets in the Potrero Hill neighborhood. Criteria pollutants monitored at this location include ozone, CO, NO₂, PM10, and PM2.5. A summary of the monitored pollutants for 2006 through 2010 shows a trend of generally improving (i.e., lower) concentrations over this time period.

In general, the SFBAAB experiences concentrations of air pollutants within air quality standards for most pollutants except for ozone and particulate matter. In June 2004, the Bay Area was designated as a marginal non-attainment area of the national 8-hour ozone standard. The EPA lowered the national 8-hour ozone standard from 0.80 to 0.75 parts per million effective May 27, 2008. On February 7, 2012 the EPA proposed a rule that takes necessary steps to implement the 2008 national 8-hour ozone standard, establishing an approach for classification of non-attainment areas not meeting the 2008 ozone standard. The SFBAAB is unclassified for the national PM10 standard, and in 2009, the EPA designated the SFBAAB as a non-attainment area for PM2.5.

Under the California Clean Air Act (CCAA), patterned after the federal CAA, areas have also been designated as attainment or non-attainment with respect to the state standards. With respect to state standards, the San Francisco Bay Area is currently designated as a non-attainment area for ozone and both PM10 and PM2.5.

---

**San Francisco Construction Dust Control Ordinance**

The San Francisco Health Code Article 22B and San Francisco Building Code Section 106A.3.2.6 collectively constitute the Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 176-08, effective July 30, 2008). The Ordinance requires that all site preparation work, demolition, or other construction activities within San Francisco that have the potential to create dust comply with specific dust control measures whether or not the activity requires a permit from the Department of Building Inspection (DBI). For projects over one-half acre, the Dust Control Ordinance requires that the project sponsor submit a Dust Control Plan. Section 1243 of Article 22B provides that Interior Only Tenant Improvement Projects, and interior improvements that do not produce any exterior visible dust are exempt from complying with these requirements. Asbestos regulations are addressed in Section 16, Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

**Approach to Analysis**

**Criteria Air Pollutants**

The SFBAAB’s criteria air pollutant non-attainment status for ozone and particulate matter is attributed to the region’s development history. By its very nature regional air pollution is largely a cumulative impact in that no single project is sufficient in size to, by itself, result in non-attainment of air quality standards. Instead, a project’s individual emissions contribute to existing cumulative air quality impacts. If a project’s contribution to cumulative air quality impacts is considerable, then the project’s impact on air quality would be considered significant.

Land use projects may contribute to regional criteria air pollutants during the construction and operational phases of a project. Table 5, below, identifies air quality significance thresholds followed by a discussion of each threshold. Projects that would result in criteria air pollutant emissions below these significance thresholds would not violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an air quality violation or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants within the SFBAAB.

**Ozone Precursors.** As discussed previously, the SFBAAB is currently designated as non-attainment for ozone, PM10, and PM2.5. Ozone is a secondary air pollutant produced in the atmosphere through a complex series of photochemical reactions involving reactive organic gases (ROG) and oxides of nitrogen (NOx). The potential for a project to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants, which may contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, are based on the state and federal Clean Air Acts emissions limits for stationary sources. The federal New Source Review (NSR) program was created by the

---

Table 5: Criteria Air Pollutant Significance Thresholds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Construction Thresholds</th>
<th>Operational Thresholds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10</td>
<td>82 (exhaust)</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM2.5</td>
<td>54 (exhaust)</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugitive Dust</td>
<td>Construction Dust Ordinance or other Best Management Practices</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

federal CAA to ensure that stationary sources of air pollution are constructed in a manner that is consistent with attainment of federal health based ambient air quality standards. Similarly, to ensure that new stationary sources do not cause or contribute to a violation of an air quality standard, BAAQMD Regulation 2, Rule 2 requires that any new source that emits criteria air pollutants above a specified emissions limit must offset those emissions. For ozone precursors, ROG and NOx, the offset emissions level is an annual average of 10 tons per year (or 54 pounds [lbs.] per day). These levels represent emissions by which new sources are not anticipated to contribute to an air quality violation or result in a considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants.

Although this regulation applies to new or modified stationary sources, land use development projects result in ROG and NOx emissions as a result of increases in vehicle trips, architectural coating and construction activities. Therefore, the above thresholds can be applied to the construction and operational phases of land use projects, and those projects that result in emissions below these thresholds would not be considered to contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation or result in a considerable net increase in ROG and NOx emissions. Due to the temporary nature of construction activities, only the average daily thresholds are applicable to construction phase emissions.

Particulate Matter (PM10 and PM2.5). The BAAQMD has not established an offset limit for PM2.5. However, the emissions limit in the federal NSR for stationary sources in non-attainment areas is an appropriate significance threshold. For PM10 and PM2.5, the emissions limit under NSR is 15 tons per year (82 lbs. per day) and 10 tons per year (54 lbs. per day), respectively.

---

50 BAAQMD, Revised Draft Options and Justification Report, California Environmental Quality Act Thresholds of Significance, October 2009, p. 17.
These emissions limits represent levels at which a source is not expected to have an impact on air quality.  Similar to ozone precursor thresholds identified above, land use development projects typically result in particulate matter emissions as a result of increases in vehicle trips, space heating and natural gas combustion, landscape maintenance, and construction activities. Therefore, the above thresholds can be applied to the construction and operational phases of a land use project. Again, because construction activities are temporary in nature, only the average daily thresholds are applicable to construction-phase emissions.

**Fugitive Dust.** Fugitive dust emissions are typically generated during construction phases. Studies have shown that the application of best management practices (BMPs) at construction sites significantly controls fugitive dust. Individual measures have been shown to reduce fugitive dust by anywhere from 30 to 90 percent. The BAAQMD has identified a number of BMPs to control fugitive dust emissions from construction activities. The City’s Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 176-08, effective July 30, 2008) requires a number of measures to control fugitive dust to ensure that construction projects do not result in visible dust. The BMPs employed in compliance with the City’s Construction Dust Control Ordinance provide an effective strategy for controlling construction-related fugitive dust.

**Local Health Risks and Hazards**

In addition to criteria air pollutants, individual projects may emit toxic air contaminants (TACs). TACs collectively refer to a diverse group of air pollutants that are capable of causing chronic (i.e., of long-duration) and acute (i.e., severe but of short-term) adverse effects to human health, including carcinogenic effects. A TAC is defined in the California Health and Safety Code §39655 as an air pollutant which may cause or contribute to an increase in mortality or serious illness, or which may pose a present or potential hazard to human health. Human health effects of TACs include birth defects, neurological damage, cancer, and death. There are hundreds of different types of TACs with varying degrees of toxicity. Individual TACs vary greatly in the health risk they present; at a given level of exposure, one TAC may pose a hazard that is many times greater than another.

Unlike criteria air pollutants, TACs do not have ambient air quality standards but are regulated by the BAAQMD using a risk-based approach. This approach uses a health risk assessment to determine which sources and pollutants to control as well as the degree of control. A health risk assessment is an analysis in which human health exposure to toxic substances is estimated, and

---

51 *Ibid*, p. 16.
considered together with information regarding the toxic potency of the substances, to provide quantitative estimates of health risks.

Vehicle tailpipe emissions contain numerous TACs, including benzene, 1,3-butadiene, formaldehyde, acetaldehyde, acrolein, naphthalene, and diesel exhaust. Engine exhaust, from diesel, gasoline, and other combustion engines, is a complex mixture of particles and gases, with collective and individual toxicological characteristics. While each constituent pollutant in engine exhaust may have a unique toxicological profile, health effects have been associated with proximity, or exposure, to vehicle-related pollutants collectively as a mixture. Exposures to fine particulate matter (PM2.5) are strongly associated with mortality, respiratory diseases and lung development in children, and other endpoints such as hospitalization for cardiopulmonary disease. In addition to PM2.5, diesel particulate matter (DPM) is also of concern. The ARB identified DPM as a TAC in 1998, primarily based on evidence demonstrating cancer effects in humans. Mobile sources such as trucks and buses are among the primary sources of diesel emissions, and concentrations of DPM are higher near heavily traveled roadways. The estimated cancer risk from exposure to diesel exhaust is much higher than the risk associated with any other TAC routinely measured in the region.

Air pollution does not affect every individual in the population in the same way, and some groups are more sensitive to adverse health effects than others. Land uses such as residences, schools, children’s day care centers, hospitals, and nursing and convalescent homes are considered to be the most sensitive to poor air quality because the population groups associated with these uses have increased susceptibility to respiratory distress or, as in the case of residential receptors, their exposure time is greater than for other land uses. Exposure assessment guidance typically assumes that residences would be exposed to air pollution 24 hours per day, 350 days per year, for 70 years. Therefore, assessments of air pollutant exposure to residents typically result in the greatest adverse health outcomes of all population groups.

In an effort to identify areas of San Francisco most adversely affected by sources of TACs, San Francisco has partnered with the BAAQMD to inventory and assess air pollution and exposures from mobile, stationary, and area sources within San Francisco. Areas with poor air quality, termed “air pollution hot spots” were identified based on two health-protective criteria:

1. Excess cancer risk from the contribution of emissions from all modeled sources > 100 per one million population; or
2. Cumulative PM2.5 concentrations > 10 micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m³).

**Excess Cancer Risk.** The above one-hundred per one million persons (100 excess cancer risk) criteria is based on the United States EPA guidance for conducting air toxic analyses and making risk management decisions at the facility and community-scale level. As described by the BAAQMD, the EPA considers a cancer risk of 100 per million to be within the “acceptable” range of cancer risk. Furthermore, in the 1989 preamble to the benzene National Emissions
Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) rulemaking, the EPA states that it “…strives to provide maximum feasible protection against risks to health from hazardous air pollutants by (1) protecting the greatest number of persons possible to an individual lifetime risk level no higher than approximately one in one million and (2) limiting to no higher than approximately one in ten thousand [100 in one million] the estimated risk that a person living near a plant would have if he or she were exposed to the maximum pollutant concentrations for 70 years.” The 100 per one million excess cancer cases is also consistent with the ambient cancer risk in the most pristine portions of the Bay Area based on BAAQMD regional modeling.

**Fine Particulate Matter.** In April 2011, the United States EPA published Policy Assessment for the Particulate Matter Review of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards, “Particulate Matter Policy Assessment.”55 In this document, EPA staff concludes that the current federal annual PM2.5 standard of 15 µg/m³ should be revised to a level within the range of 13 to 11 µg/m³, with evidence strongly supporting a standard within the range of 12 to 11 µg/m³. Air pollution hot spots for San Francisco are based on the health protective PM2.5 standard of 11 µg/m³, as supported by the EPA’s Particulate Matter Policy Assessment, although lowered to 10 µg/m³ to account for error bounds in emissions modeling programs.

Land use projects within these air pollution hot spots require special consideration to determine whether the project’s activities would expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations.

**Consistency with Applicable Air Quality Plan**

The BAAQMD has published the 2010 Clean Air Plan, representing the most current applicable air quality plan for the SFBAAB. Consistency with the 2010 Clean Air Plan is the basis for determining whether the proposed project would conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable air quality plan.

**Construction Air Quality Impacts**

Project-related air quality impacts fall into two categories: short-term impacts due to construction and long-term impacts due to project operation. Construction activities (short-term) typically result in emissions of fugitive dust, criteria air pollutants, and DPM. Emissions of criteria pollutants and DPM are primarily a result of the combustion of fuel from on-road and off-road vehicles. However, ROGs are also emitted from activities that involve painting or other types of architectural coatings or asphalt paving activities. The proposed project includes interior renovations and improvements; activity would be limited to interior demolition/removal, interior

construction of walls, flooring, and stage platform, acoustical work, plumbing
upgrades/replacements, electrical work, drywall framing, heating and ventilation
upgrades/replacement, electrical work, millwork, painting, new doors, ceiling replacement,
carpentry, interior painting, and making minor repairs in the areas affected by the renovations.
During the project’s approximately seven-month construction period, construction activities
would have the potential to result in small amounts of fugitive dust emissions, criteria air
pollutants, and DPM, as discussed further below.

Impact AQ-1: The proposed project’s construction activities would not generate a
substantial amount of fugitive dust or criteria air pollutants, and would not violate an air
quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation,
or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. (Less than
Significant)

Fugitive Dust

Dust can be an irritant causing watering eyes or irritation to the lungs, nose and throat.
Demolition, excavation, grading and other construction activities can cause wind-blown dust to
add to particulate matter in the local atmosphere. Depending on exposure, adverse health effects
can occur due to this particulate matter in general and also due to specific contaminants such as
lead or asbestos that may be constituents of soil.

In response, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved a series of amendments to the San
Francisco Building and Health Codes generally referred hereto as the Construction Dust Control
Ordinance (Ordinance 176-08, effective July 30, 2008) with the intent of reducing 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 DBI.

The Ordinance requires that all site preparation work, demolition, or other construction activities
within San Francisco that have the potential to create dust or to expose or disturb more than
10 cubic yards or 500 square feet of soil comply with specified dust control measures whether or
not the activity requires a permit from DBI. The Director of DBI may waive this requirement for
activities on sites less than one-half acre that are unlikely to result in any visible wind-blown dust.

The proposed interior improvements and remodeling activities may generate fugitive dust during
the seven-month construction period, particularly from the removal of interior construction
debris. However, the proposed project would not involve construction activities that would
change the total square footage, building height, façades, or footprint of the existing
Masonic Center.

Interior renovations, such as the proposed project, may be exempt from the requirements of the
San Francisco Construction Dust Ordinance, provided that such activities do not produce visible
dust. However, should fugitive dust be emitted during project renovation activities, pursuant to the Construction Dust Ordinance, the project sponsor and the contractor responsible for construction activities would be required to use the following practices, as applicable, to control construction dust on the site or other practices that result in equivalent dust control that are acceptable to the Director. Dust suppression activities may include watering all active construction areas sufficiently to prevent dust from becoming airborne; increased watering frequency may be necessary whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour. Reclaimed water must be used if required by Article 21, Section 1100 et seq. of the San Francisco Public Works Code. If not required, reclaimed water should be used whenever possible. Contractors shall provide as much water as necessary to control dust (without creating run-off in any area of land clearing, and/or earth movement). During excavation and dirt-moving activities, contractors shall wet sweep or vacuum the streets, sidewalks, paths and intersections where work is in progress at the end of the workday. Inactive stockpiles (where no disturbance occurs for more than seven days) greater than 10 cubic yards or 500 square feet of excavated materials, backfill material, import material, gravel, sand, road base, and soil shall be covered with a 10 millimeter (0.01 inch) polyethylene plastic (or equivalent) tarp, braced down, or use other equivalent soil stabilization techniques.

These regulations and procedures set forth by the San Francisco Building Code would ensure that potential dust-related air quality impacts would be reduced to a level of insignificance. Therefore, project-generated fugitive dust air quality impacts would be less than significant, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

Criteria Air Pollutants

Construction activities would produce criteria pollutants from fuel combustion in construction equipment, construction worker vehicles, and trucks delivering materials to the site and removing construction debris, and from emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs including ROG) from painting and other types of architectural coatings. The construction activity would vary month-to-month with a peak during the first month of about 77 heavy-duty diesel truck trips and 370 medium-duty delivery truck trips per month. Concrete trucks with concrete pumps may be used outside the Center for about five individual days over the course of the renovations.

Construction-phase emissions of criteria air pollutants were modeled for the proposed project to determine if the project emissions would be below the air quality thresholds of significance defined in Table 6. The analysis was performed to quantify criteria air pollutants using emission factors from the Air Resources Board (ARB) OFFROAD inventory and EMFAC2011 data that contains the ARB Mobile Vehicle Emission Inventory that is specific to the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. The emission estimates provide a worst-case conservative estimate of construction equipment and traffic emissions. BAAQMD regulations apply to painting and other types of architectural coatings and specify VOC content of architectural coatings, ensuring
Table 6: Construction-Phase Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase Emission Sources</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On Road, Construction Vehicles (lb)</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Road, On-site Construction Equipment (lb)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugitive Dust (lb)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Coating</td>
<td>Neg.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Emissions (lb)</strong></td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Daily Emissions (lbs./day)</strong></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance Thresholds (lbs./day)</strong></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>54 (exhaust)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significant?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
lb/day = pounds per day; Neg. = negligible
a Construction duration of approximately 140 workdays (seven months).

Source: Aspen Environmental Group, 2012

negligible emissions of organic compounds during the renovation. Table 6 shows the construction emissions of the proposed project compared to the air quality thresholds of significance.56 As shown in Table 6, the proposed project would not exceed any air quality significance thresholds for criteria pollutants during construction, and the proposed project’s construction criteria air pollutant impact would be less than significant. This topic will not be addressed in the EIR.

Impact AQ-2: The proposed project’s construction activities would generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, but would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. (Less than Significant)

Off-road equipment (which includes construction-related equipment) was once estimated to be the second largest source of ambient DPM emissions in California. However, newer and more refined emission inventories have substantially lowered the estimates of DPM emissions from off-road equipment such that off-road equipment is now considered the sixth largest source of DPM emissions in California.57 This reduction in emissions is due, in part, to effects of the economic recession and refined emissions estimation methodologies. For example, revised

56 Emission calculations prepared for the proposed project provides detailed assumptions and methodologies for the construction emissions inventory. The calculations were based on construction-related truck and vehicle trip information, construction activities, and proposed construction equipment information provided by Turner Construction Company. A copy of the supporting calculations prepared by Aspen Environmental Group, and the background construction information are available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2011.0471E.

57 California Air Resources Board (ARB), Staff Report: Initial Statement of Reasons for Proposed Rulemaking, Proposed Amendments to the Regulation for In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets and the Off-Road Large Spark-Ignition Fleet Requirements, October 2010.
particulate matter (PM) emission estimates for the year 2010, of which DPM is a major component of total PM, have decreased by 83 percent from previous estimates for the SFBAAB.\textsuperscript{58} Approximately half of the reduction can be attributed to the economic recession and approximately half can be attributed to updated assumptions independent of the economic recession (e.g., updated methodologies used to better assess construction emissions).\textsuperscript{59}

Additionally, a number of federal and state regulations are requiring cleaner off-road equipment. Specifically, both the EPA and California ARB have set emissions standards for new off-road equipment engines, ranging from Tier 1 to Tier 4. Tier 1 emission standards were phased in between 1996 and 2000 and Tier 4 Interim and Final emission standards for all new engines would be phased in between 2008 and 2015. To meet the Tier 4 emission standards, engine manufacturers will be required to produce new engines with advanced emission-control technologies. Although the full benefits of these regulations will not be realized for several years, the EPA estimates that by implementing the federal Tier 4 standards, NOx and PM emissions will be reduced by more than 90 percent.\textsuperscript{60} Furthermore, California regulations limit maximum idling times to five minutes, which further reduces public exposure to DPM emissions.\textsuperscript{61}

In addition, construction activities do not lend themselves to analysis of long-term health risks because of their temporary and variable nature. As explained in the BAAQMD’s \textit{CEQA Air Quality Guidelines}:

“Due to the variable nature of construction activity, the generation of TAC emissions in most cases would be temporary, especially considering the short amount of time such equipment is typically within an influential distance that would result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations. Concentrations of mobile-source diesel PM emissions are typically reduced by 70 percent at a distance of approximately 500 feet (ARB 2005). In addition, current models and methodologies for conducting health risk assessments are associated with longer-term exposure periods of 9, 40, and 70 years, which do not correlate well with the temporary and highly variable nature of construction activities. This results in difficulties with producing accurate estimates of health risk.”\textsuperscript{62}

Therefore, project-level analyses of construction activities normally conservatively overestimate long-term health risks. However, within air pollution hot spots, as discussed above, additional construction activity may adversely affect populations that are already at a higher risk for adverse long-term health risks from existing sources of air pollution.

\textsuperscript{58} ARB, “In-Use Off-Road Equipment, 2011 Inventory Model,” Query accessed online, April 2, 2012, http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/categories.htm#inuse_or_category.

\textsuperscript{59} ARB, \textit{Staff Report: Initial Statement of Reasons for Proposed Rulemaking, Proposed Amendments to the Regulation for In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets and the Off-Road Large Spark-Ignition Fleet Requirements}, p. 2, October 2010.

\textsuperscript{60} USEPA, “Clean Air Nonroad Diesel Rule: Fact Sheet,” May 2004.

\textsuperscript{61} California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Division 3, § 2485.

The proposed project would require construction activities for the approximate seven-month construction phase. The primary source of diesel emissions would be from on-highway trucks that would deliver materials to the construction site. Small gasoline-powered or electric-powered equipment would be used on site. The sponsor has not identified any on-site diesel-powered equipment (stationary or portable) needed on the project site for construction, although during about five individual days over the course of the renovations, a concrete pump truck may be used outside the Center. Interior construction and renovation activities would be temporary, lasting approximately seven months of total duration.

The project site is not located within an identified air pollution hot spot. Although on-road heavy-duty diesel vehicles and off-road equipment would be required for the seven-month construction duration, emissions would be temporary and variable in nature and would not be expected to expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutants. Furthermore, the proposed project would be subject to, and comply with, California regulations limiting idling to no more than five minutes, which would further reduce exposure of nearby sensitive receptors to temporary and variable DPM emissions. Therefore, construction period TAC emissions would result in a less-than-significant impact to sensitive receptors. This topic will not be addressed in the EIR.

Operational Air Quality Impacts

Land use projects typically result in emissions of criteria air pollutants and TACs primarily from an increase in motor vehicle trips. However, land use projects may also result in criteria air pollutants and TACs from combustion of natural gas, landscape maintenance, use of consumer products, and architectural coating. The proposed project would increase the number of large event days for the Center, resulting in approximately 35 additional vehicle trips by patrons and additional mobile source emissions.

Impact AQ-3: The proposed project would result in emissions of criteria air pollutants, but not at levels that would violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. (Less than Significant)

An analysis of operational criteria air pollutants resulting from the proposed project was conducted to determine whether event operations would result in significant criteria air pollutant emissions. Criteria air pollutants would be emitted from increases in the number of events and patrons, thereby resulting in additional vehicle trips and associated emissions. One additional full-time worker would also be required.

Although the proposed project would increase the number of large event days in the renovated Auditorium by 85 events annually and the maximum number of event attendees by 134 patrons (a 4.2 percent increase), these 134 additional persons would be likely to generate about 32 additional
one-way vehicle trips on an event day. Up to 315 event days would occur each year. No single
day of operation of the Center with the proposed renovations would be likely to result in more
than 1,600 daily motor vehicle trips for up to 3,300 visitors. This level of traffic would not emit
substantial amounts of criteria air pollutants. The Event Operations Manual and April 2012 CU
authorization requires implementation of a traffic control plan and parking guidelines that
minimize vehicle queuing to enter the Masonic Center garage or seeking parking at nearby
garages, and reduce tour bus idling; these procedures would continue with the proposed project
and would reduce total emissions attributable to the proposed project.

Additional minor sources of emissions would occur from on-site fuel use (natural gas and diesel),
for space heating, hot water supply, and food preparation, and VOCs emitted as a result of facility
upkeep (e.g., cleaning, or repainting involving architectural coatings) and on-site permanent food
and beverage service. The existing stationary source (standby emergency diesel generator)
presently permitted to operate at the Center (BAAQMD Permit #18383) would not be modified or
change operations as a result of the proposed project. Table 7 shows the operational emissions of
the proposed project compared to the air quality thresholds of significance.

Table 7: Operational Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants 3,300-Attendance Event

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational Sourcesa</th>
<th>ROG (lb/day)</th>
<th>NOx (lb/day)</th>
<th>PM10 (lb/day)</th>
<th>PM2.5 (lb/day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Trips</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance Thresholds (lb/day)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Trips (tons/year)</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance Thresholds (tons/year)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant? No No No No

Notes: lb/day = pounds per day; Neg. = negligible

a Emissions account for 1,600 one-way motor vehicle trips, total of all vehicle types, for 3,300-attendance event.
Annual emissions based on 315 events per year.

Source: Aspen Environmental Group, 2012

Criteria air pollutant emissions would be well below the air pollutant significance thresholds.
Therefore, the proposed renovation project would not violate any air quality standard or
contribute substantially to existing violations. As shown in Table 7, the proposed project would
not exceed the air quality significance thresholds for criteria air pollutants, and impacts would be
less than significant. This topic will not be addressed in the EIR.

Impact AQ-4: The proposed project would generate toxic air contaminants, including
diesel particulate matter, but would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial air
pollutant concentrations. (Less than Significant)
The proposed project would not involve development of a new facility; rather, it would involve the renovation and upgrade of the existing facility. No building expansion would occur with the proposed interior renovation of the existing building. However, the proposed project does entail expansion of the number of events as well as an increase in event capacity. The proposed project would result in emissions of TACs primarily as a result of an increase in vehicle trips. The BAAQMD considers roads with less than 10,000 vehicles per day “minor, low-impact” sources that do not pose a significant health impact even in combination with other nearby sources and recommends that these sources be excluded from the environmental analysis.

No notable change in health risks would occur as a result of project-related operational activities, including the proposed increase in the number of events and event attendees at the Auditorium. As in the existing conditions, motor vehicles accessing the site would produce exhaust vapors that contain TACs including DPM, benzene, ethyl benzene, toluene and xylene. The project site is not located within an air pollution hot spot. Although the proposed project would increase the number of large event days and the maximum number of event attendees, no single day of operation of the Center with the proposed renovations would be likely to cause greater than 1,600 motor vehicle trips per day, and because this level of traffic would be well below 10,000 vehicles per day project traffic would not substantially contribute to incremental health risks. Therefore an assessment of project-generated TACs resulting from vehicle trips is not required and the proposed project would not generate a substantial amount of TAC emissions that could affect nearby sensitive receptors. This impact would be less than significant and will not be discussed further in the EIR.

**Impact AQ-5: The proposed project would not conflict with, or obstruct implementation of the 2010 Clean Air Plan. (Less than Significant)**

The most recently adopted air quality plan for the SFBAAB is the 2010 Clean Air Plan (CAP). The CAP is a road map that demonstrates how the San Francisco Bay Area will achieve compliance with the state ozone standards as expeditiously as practicable and how the region will reduce the transport of ozone and ozone precursors to neighboring air basins. In determining consistency with the CAP, this analysis considers whether the project would: (1) support the primary goals of the CAP, (2) include applicable control measures from the CAP, and (3) avoid disrupting or hindering implementation of control measures identified in the CAP.

To meet the primary goals, the CAP recommends specific control measures and actions. These control measures are grouped into various categories and include stationary and area source measures, mobile source measures, transportation control measures, land use measures, and energy and climate measures. The CAP recognizes that to a great extent, community design dictates individual travel mode and that a key long-term control strategy to reduce emissions of criteria pollutants, air toxics, and greenhouse gases from motor vehicles is to channel future Bay Area growth into vibrant urban communities where goods and services are close at hand, and
people have a range of viable transportation options. To this end, the CAP includes 55 control measures aimed at reducing air pollution in the SFBAAB.

The measures most applicable to the proposed project are transportation control measures and energy and climate control measures. The proposed project would be consistent with energy and climate control measures as discussed in Section 8, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, which demonstrates that the proposed project would comply with the applicable provisions of the City’s Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy.

Although the proposed project would increase the maximum number of event attendees by 134 persons (a 4.2 percent increase) and the number of large event days by 85 events, the proposed project would be generally consistent with the San Francisco General Plan as discussed on pp. 29-32. Transportation control measures that are identified in the CAP are implemented by the San Francisco General Plan and the Planning Code, for example, through the City’s Transit First Policy, bicycle parking requirements, and transit impact development fees applicable to the proposed project. By complying with these applicable requirements, the project would include relevant transportation control measures specified by the CAP.

Examples of a project that could cause the disruption or delay of CAP control measures are projects that would preclude the extension of a transit line or bike path, or projects that propose excessive parking beyond parking requirements. The proposed project would expand an existing use within a dense, walkable urban area near a concentration of regional and local transit service. It would not preclude the extension of a transit line or a bike path or any other transit improvement, and as such, the proposed project would avoid disrupting or hindering implementation of control measures identified in the CAP.

For the reasons described above, the proposed project would not interfere with implementation of the 2010 Clean Air Plan, and because the proposed project would be consistent with the applicable air quality plan that shows how the region will improve ambient air quality and achieve the state and federal ambient air quality standards, this impact would be less than significant and will not be discussed further in the EIR.

**Impact AQ-6: The proposed project would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. (Less than Significant)**

Typical odor sources of concern include wastewater treatment plants, sanitary landfills, transfer stations, composting facilities, petroleum refineries, asphalt batch plants, chemical manufacturing facilities, fiberglass manufacturing facilities, auto body shops, rendering plants, and coffee roasting facilities. During construction, diesel exhaust from construction equipment would generate some odors. However, construction-related odors would be temporary and would not persist upon project completion.
No notable odor sources would occur as part of the proposed project. Currently, food and beverage service is provided by caterers who prepare food off-site and use the ground-floor kitchen for minor food assembly, warming, and serving. With the proposed project, the existing catering kitchen would be upgraded to a permanent commercial kitchen, and a single concessionaire would operate the kitchen to prepare food for concessions, private parties, and banquets for event attendees. In general, the new permanent commercial kitchen would not result in objectionable odors. Odors from on-site food preparation would be typical of those in the project area from existing nearby tourist hotels and restaurants. As part of the proposed renovations, high-quality air scrubbers would be installed to ensure that exhaust from the kitchen is cleaned before being released into the air. As under existing conditions, the upgraded kitchen would be ventilated with code-compliant hoods and ventilation systems. Odors would dissipate quickly off-site and would occur only when the upgraded kitchen is in use. Also, potential odors from food service and preparation facilities would be controlled in accordance with BAAQMD Regulation 7 for odorous emissions, and applicable requirements of the San Francisco Department of Public Health for proper kitchen filtration and food storage and disposal. For these reasons, the proposed renovation project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Therefore, this impact on odors would be less than significant and will not be discussed further in the EIR.

**Cumulative Air Quality Impacts**

**Impact C-AQ-1:** The proposed project in combination with past present, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development in the project area would result in less than significant cumulative air quality impacts. (Less than Significant)

As discussed above, regional air pollution is by its very nature largely a cumulative impact. Emissions from past, present and future projects contribute to the region’s adverse air quality on a cumulative basis. No single project by itself would be sufficient in size to result in regional non-attainment of ambient air quality standards. Instead, a project’s individual emissions contribute to existing cumulative adverse air quality impacts. The project-level thresholds for criteria air pollutants are based on levels by which new sources are not anticipated to contribute to an air quality violation or result in a considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. Therefore, because the proposed project’s construction (Impact AQ-1) and operational (Impact AQ-3) emissions would not exceed the project-level thresholds for criteria air pollutants, the proposed project would not be considered to result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to regional air quality impacts.

Although the project would expand an existing use, resulting in additional vehicle trips and associated emissions, the project site is not located within an air pollution hot spot and the project’s incremental increase in localized TAC emissions resulting from new vehicle trips would

---

be minor and would not contribute substantially to cumulative TAC emissions that could affect nearby sensitive land uses. Therefore, cumulative air quality impacts are considered less than significant and will not be discussed further in the EIR.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS— Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gases that trap heat in the atmosphere are referred to as greenhouse gases (GHGs) because they capture heat radiated from the sun as it is reflected back into the atmosphere, much like a greenhouse does. The accumulation of GHGs has been implicated as the driving force for global climate change. The primary GHGs are carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, ozone, and water vapor.

Individual projects contribute to the cumulative effects of climate change by emitting GHGs during demolition, construction, and operational phases. While the presence of the primary GHGs in the atmosphere is naturally occurring, carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and nitrous oxide (N₂O) are largely emitted from human activities, accelerating the rate at which these compounds occur within earth’s atmosphere. Emissions of carbon dioxide are largely by-products of fossil fuel combustion, whereas methane results from off-gassing associated with agricultural practices and landfills. Black carbon has recently emerged as a major contributor to global climate change, possibly second only to CO₂. Black carbon is produced naturally and by human activities as a result of the incomplete combustion of fossil fuels, biofuels and biomass. N₂O is a byproduct of various industrial processes and has a number of uses, including use as an anesthetic and as an aerosol propellant. Other GHGs include hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride, and are generated in certain industrial processes. Greenhouse gases are typically reported in “carbon dioxide-equivalent” measures (CO₂E).

---


65 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.
There is international scientific consensus that human-caused increases in GHGs have and will continue to contribute to global warming. Many impacts resulting from climate change, including increased fires, floods, severe storms and heat waves, are occurring already and will only become more frequent and more costly. Secondary effects of climate change are likely to include a global rise in sea level, impacts to agriculture, the state’s electricity system, and native freshwater fish ecosystems, an increase in the vulnerability of levees in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, changes in disease vectors, and changes in habitat and biodiversity.

The California Air Resources Board (ARB) estimated that in 2009 California produced about 57 million gross metric tons of CO₂E (MMTCO₂E). The ARB found that transportation is the source of 38 percent of the State’s GHG emissions, followed by electricity generation (both in-state generation and imported electricity) at 23 percent and industrial sources at 18 percent. Commercial and residential fuel use (primarily for heating) accounted for 9 percent of GHG emissions. In the Bay Area, the transportation (on-road motor vehicles, off-highway mobile sources, and aircraft) and industrial/commercial sectors were the two largest sources of GHG emissions, each accounting for approximately 36 percent of the Bay Area’s 95.8 MMTCO₂E emitted in 2007. Electricity generation accounts for approximately 16 percent of the Bay Area’s GHG emissions followed by residential fuel usage at 7 percent, off-road equipment at 3 percent and agriculture at 1 percent.

Regulatory Setting

In 2005, in recognition of California’s vulnerability to the effects of climate change, then-Governor Schwarzenegger established Executive Order S-3-05, which sets forth a series of target dates by which statewide emissions of GHGs would be progressively reduced, as follows: by

---

2010, reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels (approximately 458 MMTCO2E); by 2020, reduce emissions to 1990 levels (estimated at 427 MMTCO2E); and by 2050 reduce statewide GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels (approximately 85 MMTCO2E).

In response, the California legislature passed Assembly Bill No. 32 in 2006 (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 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 from forecast emission levels).73

Pursuant to AB 32, ARB adopted a Scoping Plan in December 2008, outlining measures to meet the 2020 GHG reduction limits. The Scoping Plan is the State’s overarching plan for addressing climate change. 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 2008 levels.74 The Scoping Plan estimates a reduction of 174 million metric tons of CO2E (MMTCO2E) (about 191 million U.S. tons) from the transportation, energy, agriculture, forestry, and high global warming potential sectors, see Table 8, below. ARB has identified an implementation timeline for the GHG reduction strategies in the Scoping Plan.75

The AB 32 Scoping Plan recommendations are intended to curb projected business-as-usual growth in GHG emissions and reduce those emissions to 1990 levels. Therefore, meeting AB 32 GHG reduction goals would result in an overall annual net decrease in GHGs as compared to current levels and accounts for projected increases in emissions resulting from anticipated growth.

The Scoping Plan also 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, to incorporate a “sustainable communities strategy” in their regional transportation plans 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 development. SB 375

---

Table 8: GHG Reductions from the AB 32 Scoping Plan Sectors\textsuperscript{76,77}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GHG Reduction Measures By Sector</th>
<th>GHG Reductions (MMT\textsubscript{CO}2E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Sector</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity and Natural Gas</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill Methane Control Measure (Discrete Early Action)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Global Warming Potential GHGs</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Reductions Needed to Achieve the GHG Cap</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>174</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Recommended Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government Operations</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methane Capture at Large Dairies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional GHG Reduction Measures:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Buildings</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Recycling/ Zero Waste</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Commercial Recycling</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Composting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Anaerobic Digestion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Extended Producer Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmentally Preferable Purchasing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>41.8-42.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

would be implemented over the next several years and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s 2013 Regional Transportation Plan, Plan Bay Area, would be its first plan subject to SB 375.

AB 32 further 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 noted that successful implementation of the Scoping Plan relies on local governments’ land use planning and urban growth decisions because local governments have the primary authority to plan, zone, approve, and permit land development to accommodate population growth and the changing needs of their jurisdictions.\textsuperscript{78} The BAAQMD has conducted an analysis of the effectiveness of the region in meeting AB 32 goals from the actions outlined in the Scoping Plan and determined that in order for the Bay Area to meet AB 32 GHG reduction goals, the Bay Area would need to achieve an additional 2.3 percent reduction in GHG emissions from the land use driven sector.\textsuperscript{79}


At a local level, the City has developed a number of plans and programs to reduce the City’s contribution to global climate change. San Francisco’s GHG reduction goals, as outlined in the 2008 Greenhouse Gas Reduction ordinance, are as follows: by 2008, determine the City’s GHG emissions for the year 1990, the baseline level with reference to which target reductions are set; by 2017, reduce GHG emissions by 25 percent below 1990 levels; by 2025, reduce GHG emissions by 40 percent below 1990 levels; and finally by 2050, reduce GHG emissions by 80 percent below 1990 levels. San Francisco’s Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy documents the City’s actions to pursue cleaner energy, energy conservation, alternative transportation and solid waste policies. As identified in the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy, the City has implemented a number of mandatory requirements and incentives that have measurably reduced GHG emissions including, but not limited to, increasing the energy efficiency of new and existing buildings, installation of solar panels on building roofs, implementation of a green building strategy, adoption of a zero waste strategy, a construction and demolition debris recovery ordinance, a solar energy generation subsidy, incorporation of alternative fuel vehicles in the City’s transportation fleet (including buses), and a mandatory recycling and composting ordinance. The strategy also identifies 42 specific regulations for new development that would reduce a project’s GHG emissions.

The Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy concludes that San Francisco’s policies and programs have resulted in a reduction in GHG emissions below 1990 levels, exceeding statewide AB 32 GHG reduction goals. As reported, San Francisco’s communitywide 1990 GHG emissions were approximately 6.15 MMTCO₂E. A recent third-party verification of the City’s 2010 communitywide and municipal emissions inventory has confirmed that San Francisco has reduced its GHG emissions to 5.26 MMTCO₂E, representing a 14.5 percent reduction in GHG emissions below 1990 levels.80,81

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 added a new section to the CEQA Checklist (CEQA Guidelines Appendix G) to address questions regarding the project’s potential to emit GHGs.

---


The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is the primary agency responsible for air quality regulation in the nine county San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB). The BAAQMD recommends that local agencies adopt a Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy consistent with AB 32 goals and that subsequent projects be reviewed to determine the significance of their GHG emissions based on the degree to which that project complies with a Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy. As described below, this recommendation is consistent with the approach to analyzing GHG emissions outlined in the CEQA Guidelines.

Approach to Analysis

In compliance with SB 97, OPR amended the CEQA Guidelines to address the feasible mitigation of GHG emissions or the effects of GHGs. Among other changes to the CEQA Guidelines, the amendments added a new section to the CEQA Checklist (CEQA Guidelines Appendix G) to address questions regarding the project’s potential to emit GHGs. The potential for a project to result in significant GHG emissions which contribute to the cumulative effects global climate change is based on the CEQA Guidelines and CEQA Checklist, as amended by SB 97, and is determined by an assessment of the project’s compliance with local and state plans, policies and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing the cumulative effects of climate change. GHG emissions are analyzed in the context of their contribution to the cumulative effects of climate change because a single land use project could not generate enough GHG emissions to noticeably change the global average temperature. CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064.4 and 15183.5 address the analysis and determination of significant impacts from a proposed project’s GHG emissions. CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5 allows for public agencies to analyze and mitigate GHG emissions as part of a larger plan for the reduction of greenhouse gases and describes the required contents of such a plan. As discussed above, San Francisco has prepared its own Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy, demonstrating that San Francisco’s policies and programs have collectively reduced communitywide GHG emissions to below 1990 levels, meeting GHG reduction goals outlined in AB 32. The City is also well on its way to meeting the long-term GHG reduction goal of reducing emissions 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. Chapter 1 of the City’s Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emission (the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy) describes how the strategy meets the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5. The BAAQMD has reviewed San Francisco’s Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy, concluding that “Aggressive GHG reduction targets and comprehensive strategies like San Francisco’s 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.”

With respect to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4(b), the factors to be considered in making a significance determination include: 1) the extent to which GHG emissions would increase or decrease as a result of the proposed project; 2) whether or not a proposed project exceeds a threshold that the lead agency determines applies to the project; and finally 3) demonstrating compliance with plans and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing or mitigating GHG emissions.

The GHG analysis provided below includes a qualitative assessment of GHG emissions that would result from a proposed project, including emissions from an increase in vehicle trips, natural gas combustion, and/or electricity use among other things. Consistent with the CEQA Guidelines and BAAQMD recommendations for analyzing GHG emissions, the significance standard applied to GHG emissions generated during project construction and operational phases is based on whether the project complies with a plan for the reduction of GHG emissions. The City’s Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy is the City’s overarching plan documenting the policies, programs and regulations that the City implements towards reducing municipal and communitywide GHG emissions. In particular, San Francisco implements 42 specific regulations that reduce GHG emissions which are applied to projects within the City. Projects that comply with the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy would not result in a substantial increase in GHGs, since the City has shown that overall communitywide GHGs have decreased and that the City has met AB 32 GHG reduction targets. Individual project compliance with the City’s Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy is demonstrated by completion of the Compliance Checklist for Greenhouse Gas Analysis.

In summary, the two applicable greenhouse gas reduction plans, the AB 32 Scoping Plan and the City’s Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy, are intended to reduce GHG emissions below current levels. Given that the City’s local greenhouse gas reduction targets are more aggressive than the state’s 2020 GHG reduction targets and consistent with the long-term 2050 reduction targets, the City’s Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy is consistent with the goals of AB 32. Therefore, proposed projects that are consistent with the City’s Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy would be consistent with the goals of AB 32, would not conflict with either plan, and would therefore not exceed San Francisco’s applicable GHG threshold of significance. Furthermore, a locally compliant project would not result in a substantial increase in GHGs.

---


Impact C-GG-1: The proposed project would generate greenhouse gas emissions, but not in levels that would result in a significant impact on the environment or conflict with any policy, plan, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. *(Less than Significant)*

The most common GHGs resulting from human activity are CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O.⁸⁵ Individual projects contribute to the cumulative effects of climate change by directly or indirectly emitting GHGs during construction and operational phases. Direct operational emissions include GHG emissions from new 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 proposed project would increase the activity onsite by increasing the number of large events (over 250 attendees) from an existing annual maximum of 230 events to an estimated 315 annual events, and by increasing the number of event attendees within the Auditorium from 3,166 up to a maximum of 3,300 attendees. Therefore, the proposed project would contribute to annual long-term increases in GHGs as a result of increased vehicle trips (mobile sources) and assembly operations that result in an increase in energy use, water use and wastewater treatment, and solid waste disposal. Construction activities would also result in temporary increases in GHG emissions.

As discussed above and consistent with the state CEQA Guidelines and BAAQMD recommendations for analyzing GHG emissions under CEQA, projects that are consistent with San Francisco’s *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* would result in a less-than-significant GHG impact. Based on an assessment of the proposed project’s compliance with San Francisco’s *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, the proposed project would be required to comply with the following ordinances that reduce greenhouse gas emissions, see Table 9.

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, or 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 reduction of annual GHG emissions; (3) San Francisco has met and exceeds AB 32 GHG reduction goals for the year 2020 and is on track towards meeting long-term GHG reduction goals; (4) current and probable future state and local GHG reduction measures will continue to
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### Table 9: Regulations Applicable to the Proposed Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Project Compliance</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Sector</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Benefits Ordinance (San Francisco Environment Code, Section 421)</td>
<td>All employers of 20 or more employees must provide at least one of the following benefit programs: 1. A Pre-Tax Election consistent with 26 U.S.C. § 132(f), allowing employees to elect to exclude from taxable wages and compensation, employee commuting costs incurred for transit passes or vanpool charges, or (2) Employer Paid Benefit whereby the employer supplies a transit pass for the public transit system requested by each Covered Employee or reimbursement for equivalent vanpool charges at least equal in value to the purchase price of the appropriate benefit, or (3) Employer Provided Transit furnished by the employer at no cost to the employee in a vanpool or bus, or similar multi-passenger vehicle operated by or for the employer.</td>
<td>☑ Project Complies ☐ Not Applicable ☐ Project Does Not Comply</td>
<td>The project sponsor (California Masonic Memorial Temple), the Masons of California and its affiliates, and Live Nation would comply with the Commuter Benefits Ordinance to the extent applicable and required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Ride Home Program</td>
<td>All persons employed in San Francisco are eligible for the emergency ride home program.</td>
<td>☑ Project Complies ☐ Not Applicable ☐ Project Does Not Comply</td>
<td>The project sponsor, California Masonic Memorial Temple (CMMT), is enrolled in the Emergency Ride Home program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle parking in parking garages (San Francisco Planning Code, Section 155.2)</td>
<td>(A) Every garage will supply a minimum of six bicycle parking spaces. (B) Garages with between 120 and 500 automobile spaces shall provide one bicycle space for every 20 automobile spaces. (C) Garages with more than 500 automobile spaces shall provide 25 spaces plus one additional space</td>
<td>☑ Project Complies ☐ Not Applicable ☐ Project Does Not Comply</td>
<td>As required by Planning Code Section 155.2, the proposed project would provide no less than 27 bicycle parking spaces in the 565-space Masonic Center garage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation</td>
<td>Requirements</td>
<td>Project Compliance</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for every 40 automobile spaces over 500 spaces, up to a maximum of 50 bicycle parking spaces.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Energy Efficiency Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commercial Water Conservation Ordinance (San Francisco Building Code, Chapter 13A)</th>
<th>Requires all existing commercial properties undergoing tenant improvements to achieve the following minimum standards:</th>
<th>Project Complies</th>
<th>The proposed project would comply with the Commercial Water Conservation Ordinance as applicable and required.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. All showerheads have a maximum flow of 2.5 gallons per minute (gpm)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. All showers have no more than one showerhead per valve</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Does Not Comply</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. All faucets and faucet aerators have a maximum flow rate of 2.2 gpm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. All Water Closets (toilets) have a maximum rated water consumption of 1.6 gallons per flush (gpf)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. All urinals have a maximum flow rate of 1.0 gpf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. All water leaks have been repaired.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Waste Reduction Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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)</th>
<th>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.</th>
<th>Project Complies</th>
<th>The proposed project would comply with San Francisco Green Building Requirements for solid waste by providing space for recycling, composting and trash storage convenient to existing loading facilities as applicable and required.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Does Not Comply</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>San Francisco Green Building Requirements for construction and</th>
<th>Projects proposing demolition are required to divert at least 75% of the project’s construction and demolition debris to recycling.</th>
<th>Project Complies</th>
<th>The project sponsor would comply with the San Francisco Green Building Requirements for construction and demolition debris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Does Not Comply</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation</td>
<td>Requirements</td>
<td>Project Compliance</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demolition debris recycling (San Francisco Building Code, Chapter 13C)</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Project Does Not Comply</td>
<td>recycling during proposed renovations as applicable and required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment/Conservation Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Site Runoff Pollution Prevention for New Construction</td>
<td>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: <a href="http://www.sfwater.org/CleanWater">www.sfwater.org/CleanWater</a></td>
<td>☑ Project Complies</td>
<td>The proposed project would comply with local requirements for construction site runoff pollution prevention as applicable and required. The proposed project would not involve grading, earthmoving or excavation, and would not be required to prepare a stormwater soil loss prevention plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Burning Fireplace Ordinance (San Francisco Building Code, Chapter 13C)</td>
<td>Bans the installation of wood burning fire places except for the following: • Pellet-fueled wood heater • EPA approved wood heater • Wood heater approved by the Northern Sonoma Air Pollution Control District</td>
<td>☑ Project Complies</td>
<td>The proposed project would not install any wood-burning fireplaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation of Diesel Backup Generators (San Francisco Health Code, Article 30)</td>
<td>Requires (among other things): • All diesel generators to be registered with the Department of Public Health • All new diesel generators must be equipped with the best available air emissions control technology.</td>
<td>☑ Project Complies</td>
<td>The Masonic Center's existing diesel back-up generators is registered under Article 30 of the San Francisco Health Code. No new generator is proposed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

reduce a project’s contribution to climate change; and (5) San Francisco’s Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions meet the CEQA and BAAQMD requirements for a Greenhouse Gas
Reduction Strategy, projects that are consistent with San Francisco’s regulations would not contribute significantly to global climate change. The proposed project would be required to comply with the requirements listed above, and was determined to be consistent with San Francisco’s Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions. As such, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact with respect to GHG emissions.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. WIND AND SHADOW—Would the project:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact WS-1: The proposed project would not alter winds in a manner that would substantially affect public areas. *(No Impact)* *(Criterion 9a)*

The proposed renovation project does not involve changes to the exterior physical structure of the existing Masonic Center, including the total square footage, building height, façades, or footprint. Therefore, the project would not alter winds in a manner that would result in impacts to public areas. This topic will not be addressed in the EIR.

Impact WS-2: The proposed project would not create new shadow that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas. *(No Impact)* *(Criterion 9b)*

Planning Code Section 295 was adopted in response to Proposition K (passed by voters in November 1984) in order to protect public open spaces from shadowing by new structures during the period between one hour after sunrise and one hour before sunset, year-round. Planning Code Section 295 restricts new shadow on public spaces under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission by any structure exceeding 40 feet in height unless the Planning Commission finds the impact to be insignificant. There is one public park facility in the vicinity of the Masonic Center, Huntington Park, located diagonally opposite the project site, to the northeast, at California and Taylor Streets.

The steps along the California Street and Taylor Street frontages of Grace Cathedral across California Street from the project site are often used as informal open space by residents and

---

86 Compliance Checklist Table for Greenhouse Gas Analysis: Table 1. Private Development Projects, Masonic Center Renovation Project, December 12, 2011, revised June 1, 2012. A copy of the checklist is available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2011.0471E
tourists, as well as by people attending services or events at Grace Cathedral. Since the Grace Cathedral steps are located on private property, this area is not subject to Planning Code Section 295.

Proposed renovations do not involve changes to the exterior physical structure of the existing Masonic Center, including building height, square footage, façades, or footprint. Because the proposed project would not create new shadow, it would, therefore, not create shadow that would substantially affect outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas. The proposed project would have no impacts on shadows. Thus, this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. RECREATION—Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Physically degrade existing recreational resources?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact RE-1: The proposed project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration would occur, or existing recreational facilities would be physically degraded. *(Less than Significant)* *(Criteria 10a and 10c)*

Collis P. Huntington Park (Huntington Park) is the only public park within walking distance of the Masonic Center. It occupies the entire block bounded by Sacramento Street to the north, Cushman Street to the east, California Street to the south, and Taylor Street to the west, and is diagonally across the intersection of California and Taylor Streets from the Masonic Center. The park is owned and maintained by the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department (SFRPD) and includes a children’s playground, two fountains (the “Fountain of the Tortoises” [recently restored] and the Flood Fountain), benches, pathways, grass lawns and landscaping on 1.07 acres. The park is open daily from 6:00 AM to 10:00 PM; dogs are allowed only on leash. The park is predominantly used by nearby neighborhood residents, neighborhood dog walkers, children, tourists, and workers. Event attendees at the Masonic Center also use Huntington Park.

Hooker Alley Community Garden encompasses about 2,400 sq. ft. on Mason Street between Pine and Bush Streets, approximately 0.3 mile southeast of the Masonic Center. This garden is owned
by the San Francisco Department of Public Works and operated by SFRPD. The garden has 12 plots that are reserved for gardening by residents in the Nob Hill area. The garden does not contain open space that is usable for public recreation.

The south- and east-facing steps on California and Taylor Street, respectively, lead to the main entrance of Grace Cathedral, located opposite the Masonic Center on California Street. The steps and a small plaza located just north of the east-facing steps on Taylor Street are used informally by the public for sitting, gathering, and picture-taking when the cathedral is not in use.87 Besides the Grace Cathedral steps and plaza, there are no publicly accessible, privately owned parks or open spaces in the vicinity of the project site.

With the proposed renovations, the maximum number of event attendees in the Auditorium per event could increase by up to 134 persons, a 4.2 percent increase. It is not anticipated that there would be substantial increased use of Huntington Park due to the small increase in the number of attendees per event and because the park closes at 10:00 PM, prior to the end time of most evening events. The maximum number of events would increase by 85 events per year, about a 37 percent increase. As such, Huntington Park would be used more frequently by event attendees at the Masonic Center. It is not anticipated that the increased frequency in events would result in Huntington Park being used by event attendees in a manner that would substantially deteriorate this neighborhood park. As noted in the discussion above, the most frequent and predominant users of Huntington Park are nearby residents, tourists, workers. The proposed occasional daytime use of existing outdoor open space areas at the Masonic Center for refreshment and break areas would provide additional daytime outdoor opportunities for people attending events at the Center and could decrease the potential number of event attendees who choose to visit Huntington Park during daytime events at the Center.

In accordance with the April 2012 CU authorization, the Masonic Center is required to provide security (patrols and monitoring) in Huntington Park and near Grace Cathedral before, during and after large events, as part the procedures outlined in the Event Operations Manual.88 This procedure would continue with the proposed project, and would minimize the likelihood of physical damage to recreational facilities at Huntington Park by event attendees.

For these reasons, the added number of event attendees and the increased frequency of events per year with the proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in recreational use that would cause or accelerate the physical deterioration of Huntington Park, or degrade recreational resources. Therefore, the proposed project’s impacts on recreational facilities would be less than significant, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

87 Turnstone Consulting, field visit observations, conducted on September 13, 2011 (3:00 PM) and October 21, 2011 (1:00 PM).
88 April 2012 CU authorization, Condition No. 27.
Impact RE-2: The proposed project would not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. (No Impact) (Criterion 10b)

Proposed renovations would not include new recreational facilities, nor would they physically alter existing open space areas at the Masonic Center. The proposed project would not increase residential population. Once complete, the proposed renovations would increase on-site permanent employment by one worker. As such, proposed renovations would not create permanent demand for new recreational facilities. Since the project would not result in a substantial increase in demand for recreational facilities, there would be no need for construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Therefore, the proposed project would not have an adverse physical impact on recreational facilities. This topic will not be discussed in the EIR.

Cumulative Impacts

Impact C-RE-1: The proposed project in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant impact on parks and recreational resources. (Less than Significant)

Cumulative development in the project vicinity includes the re-use by the Academy of Art University of existing buildings with 550 to 600 rooms for student housing in the area bound by Geary Boulevard and Pine, Jones, and Powell Streets, described in the Academy of Art University IMP. The increase in student population could increase use of recreational facilities, such as Huntington Park. As described above, the proposed project would not increase the use of Huntington Park in a manner that would result in substantial physical deterioration of the park or degrade this recreational resource. Thus, the proposed project would not have a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant impacts on recreational facilities or resources. This topic will not be addressed in the EIR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS—Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed use of existing open space areas for refreshment and break areas would not require new construction, expansion or alteration of these spaces.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supply available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or require new or expanded water supply resources or entitlements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that would serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Masonic Center is an existing use located within an urban area served by public utilities and service systems, including water, wastewater, stormwater collection and treatment, and solid waste collection and disposal. The proposed project would increase the maximum number of attendees in the Auditorium by up to 134 persons, a 4.2 percent increase, and would increase the maximum number of large events in the Auditorium by 85 events per year, an approximately 37 percent increase.

**Impact UT-1: The proposed project would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board. (Less than Significant) (Criterion 11a)**

The Masonic Center is served by San Francisco’s combined sewer system, which collects sanitary sewage and stormwater in the same sewers and treats the combined wastewater in the same treatment plants. Wastewater from the project site is treated at the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant (Southeast Plant) according to standards contained in the City’s National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Permit for the Southeast Plant, and then discharged into the Bay. During wet weather, the capacity at the Southeast Plant is supplemented by the North Point Wet-Weather Facility and a series of storage/transport boxes located around the perimeter of the City. The project site is covered with impervious surfaces. Proposed renovations would not alter the exterior structure of the Masonic Center or building footprint. Stormwater runoff comprises the
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90 The storage/transport boxes provide treatment consisting of settling and screening of floatable materials inside the boxes, which is equivalent to primary treatment at the wastewater treatment plants.
majority of the total flow treated by the City’s combined sewer system. Because the project site would continue to be fully covered with impervious surfaces after completion of the proposed renovations, the proposed project would have no effect on the total stormwater volume discharged through the combined sewer system.

While an increase of 134 attendees and an increase of 85 large events per year in the Auditorium would incrementally increase the volume of wastewater flows generated by the Masonic Center, this incremental increase would not be substantial compared to the sewage generated by the City as a whole, and would not affect the City’s ability to treat the additional volume of wastewater generated by the proposed renovation project.

For the reasons discussed above, the proposed project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements, and therefore would have less-than-significant impacts on wastewater treatment. This topic will not be discussed in the EIR.

Impact UT-2: The proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new or the expansion of existing water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage facilities; or result in a determination that the wastewater treatment provider has inadequate capacity to serve the project. *(Less than Significant)* *(Criteria 11b, 11c, and 11e)*

An increase of up to 134 attendees at events and an increase of 85 large events per year in the Auditorium would incrementally increase the volume of water use and wastewater generation at the Masonic Center. This increase would not require new construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. This incremental increase also would not result in a determination by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) that it has insufficient capacity to continue providing wastewater treatment because the proposed renovations would continue to be fully covered with impervious surfaces, and would not add to stormwater flows, the primary source of total flows treated in the City’s combined sewer system. For this reason, the proposed project also would not require new construction or expansion of stormwater facilities.

Therefore, the proposed renovation would result in a less-than-significant impact on water, wastewater treatment, and stormwater drainage facilities. This topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

Impact UT-3: The proposed project would have sufficient water supply available from existing entitlements and would not require new or expanded water supply resources or entitlements. *(Less than Significant)* *(Criterion 11d)*

The SFPUC provides an average of approximately 265 million gallons per day of water to approximately 2.4 million people in San Francisco, Santa Clara, Alameda, San Mateo, and
Tuolumne Counties.91 Approximately 96 percent of the water provided to San Francisco is supplied by the SFPUC Regional Water System, which is made up of water from the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir and Bay Area reservoirs in the Alameda Creek and Peninsula watersheds.92 The Masonic Center is currently served by this adequate water delivery infrastructure.

Although the proposed renovation project would incrementally increase the demand for water in San Francisco, the increase in water demand would not be in excess of the projected demand for the project area and City as a whole.93 In addition, proposed renovations would be designed to incorporate water-conserving measures in the renovated and proposed new restrooms and in the new commercial kitchen, as required by Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, the Building Code.

The proposed renovation project would not require new or expanded water supply resources or entitlements, because the project site is within a developed urban area that is already served by the SFPUC. It would not generate additional demand for water that exceeds water supply projections. Impacts of the proposed renovation project on water supply would be less than significant, and this topic will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Impact UT-4: The proposed project would comply with solid waste regulations, and would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs. (Less than Significant) (Criteria 11f and 11g)

Under the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (Assembly Bill [AB] 939), San Francisco was required to adopt an integrated waste management plan, implement a program to reduce the amount of waste disposed, and have its waste diversion performance periodically reviewed by the California Integrated Waste Management Board. San Francisco has an overall goal to divert 75 percent of its waste by 2010 and to divert all waste by 2020.94

---

92 Ibid, p. 9. Groundwater and recycled water make up the remainder of the SFPUC supplies to the City.
93 The 2005 Urban Water Management Plan for the City and County of San Francisco, p. 47, projects that, during normal precipitation years, the SFPUC will have adequate supplies to meet projected demand though 2025. During multiple dry years, however, additional water sources will be required. To address this issue, the SFPUC initiated the multi-year program Water System Improvement Program to rebuild and upgrade the water system. (San Francisco Planning Department, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Water System Improvement Program Final EIR, available at http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1829, accessed January 3, 2012.)
94 In 2007, with the passage of the Solid Waste Disposal Measurement Act in Senate Bill 1016 (SB 1016), the state replaced the diversion rate measurement system with a more simplified system that sets a 50 percent Equivalent Per Capita Disposal Target (resident or employee) for the state and each jurisdiction. In 2008, the target disposal rate for San Francisco residents and employees was 6.6 pounds/resident/day and 10.6 pounds/employee/day. Both of these targeted disposal rates were met in 2008 (the most recent year reported). CalRecycle, “Jurisdiction Diversion/Disposal Rate Summary”. Website: http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/LGCentral/Tools/MARS/DrmcMain.asp?VW=Disposal, accessed January 3, 2012.
San Francisco’s Mandatory Recycling and Composting Ordinance (San Francisco Environment Code, Art. 19) requires that all “property where refuse is generated…including schools, institutions, and City properties” separate recyclables, compostables, and landfilled trash and participate in recycling and composting programs. The Masonic Center currently practices recycling and composting in compliance with this City ordinance, and would continue to do so with the proposed project. In addition, San Francisco Green Building Requirements for construction and demolition debris recycling (SF Building Code, Chapter 13C) requires that a minimum of 75 percent of all construction and demolition debris be recycled and diverted from landfills.

The proposed renovations would be required to comply with all applicable state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Thus, project impacts would be less than significant, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

Recology provides daily solid waste collection, recycling, disposal, and compost pick-up service to the Masonic Center through its subsidiary, Golden Gate Disposal and Recycling.

Waste that is not composted or recycled is taken to the Altamont Landfill, a regional landfill that handles residential, commercial, and construction waste. The Altamont Landfill has a remaining permitted capacity of about 45.7 million cubic yards and is expected to operate for another 20 years, until 2032.

The City’s contract with the Altamont Landfill expires in 2014. After that date, the City could, under a contract with San Francisco Recycling & Disposal, a subsidiary of Recology, begin to ship solid waste from San Francisco by truck and rail to Recology’s Ostrom Road Landfill in Yuba County. The Ostrom Road Landfill is open to commercial waste haulers and can accept up to 3,000 tons of municipal solid waste per day. It has an expected closure date of 2066 and a total design capacity of over 41 million cubic yards.

Although the proposed project would increase the maximum number of event attendees by 134 persons (a 4.2 percent increase) and the number of large event days in the Auditorium by 85 events and would incrementally increase total waste generation in the City, mandatory recycling, composting and waste reduction efforts, described above, are expected to increasingly divert waste from the Altamont Landfill. The Altamont Landfill is projected to have sufficient capacity to operate until at least 2032 and potentially much longer, depending on waste flows and the incorporation of citywide waste reduction measures. Thus, construction and operation of the renovation project would not result in the Altamont Landfill exceeding its permitted capacities.

95 Ibid.
and impacts of the proposed project on solid waste facilities would be less than significant. The proposed project also would not affect the projected life of the Ostrom Road Landfill should the City contract with this facility in the future for solid waste disposal. Both landfills are required to meet federal, state, and local solid waste regulations pertaining to solid waste. This topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

**Cumulative Impacts**

**Impact C-UT-1:** The proposed project in combination with other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable projects would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant impact on utilities and service systems. *(<Less than Significant>)*

Reasonably foreseeable cumulative development in the project area and elsewhere in the City would incrementally increase demand on citywide utilities and service systems. Given that the City’s existing service management plans address anticipated growth in the region and that this cumulative growth is accounted for in these plans, the proposed project would not be expected to result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative significant impacts on utility service provision or facilities. Therefore, this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

---

**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?

![Table]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Impact PS-1:** The proposed project could result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of police and fire protection services in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives. *(<Potentially Significant>) (Criterion 12a)*

---

98 The proposed project could have potentially significant impacts on the provision of police services, and fire protection and emergency services.

99 The proposed project would have no impacts on the provision of school and library services.
Police Protection Services

The San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) provides police protection services in the City and County of San Francisco. The Masonic Center is located within the Central Police District, which consists of the Financial District, Chinatown, North Beach, and Fisherman’s Wharf, and is served by the Central Police Station located at 766 Vallejo Street, about 0.52 mile north of the project site. The Central Police Station is staffed 24 hours per day.

Implementation of the proposed renovation project would increase the maximum number of persons attending event in the Auditorium by up to 134 persons (a 4.2 percent increase), and increase the frequency of events at the Auditorium by 85 events per year (a 37 percent increase).

Live Nation and the Masonic Center currently work closely with the SFPD to assist the Center’s event staff, when necessary. In accordance with the April 2012 CU authorization, Live Nation also employs a minimum of two off-duty SFPD officers to staff all events with more than 1,250 attendees. Live Nation also carries out security and safety procedures to ensure neighborhood safety, including Huntington Park and the area near Grace Cathedral, before, during, and after performances. The SFPD is permitted to cancel shows based on a prior history of violence or other security breaches associated with a particular performer. These conditions would continue with implementation of the proposed renovation project.100

The proposed project could result in an increased demand for police services due to the increased number of events, and the increased number of attendees at the Masonic Center Auditorium. This topic will be discussed in the EIR.

Fire Protection and Emergency Services

The San Francisco Fire Department provides fire suppression services and emergency medical services to the City and County of San Francisco. The Masonic Center is located in the Division 2 service area, which encompasses an area extending from the Downtown and Financial Districts to the northwestern boundaries of the City. The Masonic Center is in the First Alarm area101 for Station 41, located at 1325 Leavenworth Street, approximately 0.29 mile west of the Masonic Center. This station is responsible for arriving first in the event of an emergency. As with current building conditions and operating procedures, the proposed renovation project would be required to comply with the life-safety construction standards of the Uniform Building Code and the requirements of the San Francisco Fire Code (Section 12.202(e)(1)) to establish procedures in case of a fire or other emergencies.

---

100 April 2012 CU authorization, Condition Nos. 27, 31, and 32.
101 The First Alarm area is the geographic area in which a station is responsible for arriving first in the case of an emergency.
The increase in the maximum number of event attendees by 134 persons and the number of large events by 85 events per year could contribute to more frequent local traffic congestion or otherwise interfere with emergency access by the Fire Department. The proposed project would also contribute to existing local congestion that occurs when there are simultaneous events or functions at nearby venues such as Grace Cathedral and the five hotels located one to four blocks east and northeast of the Masonic Center.

The project sponsor has implemented traffic management strategies as required by the April 2012 CU authorization to reduce vehicular queuing at the Masonic Center garage entrance, and to minimize the need for vehicles to circulate to search for available parking at nearby garages. The Event Operations Manual for the Center also specifies procedures for evacuation during an emergency. These measures would reduce the potential for emergency access by the Fire Department to be impeded. For all events over 1,250 attendees, Live Nation provides an on-site Emergency Medical Technician (EMT), and would continue to do so after implementation of the proposed project.

Potential impacts on fire protection and emergency services access could be potentially significant and this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

**Impact PS-2:** The proposed project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of school and library services in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives. *(No Impact)* *(Criterion 12a)*

**Schools**

The proposed project does not involve residential development and therefore would not result in a residential population with school-aged children. The project would employ one new worker, which would have a negligible effect on school facilities and services. Thus, the proposed project would have no impact on San Francisco Unified School District facilities and services, and this topic will not be discussed in the EIR.

**Libraries**

The proposed project does not involve residential development, and would increase permanent employment on site by one worker. As such, the proposed project would have no impact on demand for library services, and this topic will not be discussed in the EIR.

Refer also to Topic 10, Recreation, pp. 79-81, for a detailed discussion of the proposed project’s impacts on recreational and park services.

---

102 April 2012 CU authorization, Condition Nos. 2, 4, 7 and 27.
Cumulative Impacts

Impact C-PS-1: The proposed project in combination with other past, present or reasonably foreseeable projects would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant impacts on police services, and fire protection and emergency services. *(Potentially Significant)*

When considered with reasonably foreseeable cumulative development in the vicinity of the project site, the proposed project would incrementally increase demand for police protection and fire protection and emergency services. Therefore, the proposed project could have a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts on police protection and fire protection and emergency services. This topic will be addressed in the EIR.

As discussed in Impact PS-2, above, the proposed project would result in no impacts on the provision of school and library services, and therefore the proposed project would not contribute to cumulative impacts on these services.

Refer to Topic 10, Recreation, on p. 81 for a discussion of cumulative impacts on park services.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES—Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact BI-1: The proposed project would not 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; on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations; or on federally protected wetlands through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means; nor would it conflict with any provisions in an approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. (No Impact) (Criteria 13a-13c and 13f)

The existing Masonic Center is located in San Francisco’s Nob Hill neighborhood within a developed urban area. The site does not provide or support habitat for any rare or endangered wildlife or plant species. No rare or endangered animal species are known to exist on the project site. The project site contains ornamental shrubbery adjacent to the east and west side of the main entrance of the Center on California Street, and four ornamental tree boxes within the northeast smoking terrace, and ornamental shrubbery within the upper eastern terrace facing Taylor Street. There are no sensitive or special-status plant species on the project site. The proposed project would not directly or indirectly affect any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, special-status animal or plant species, or any riparian habitat identified in local, regional, state, or federal plans, policies, or regulations. None of the proposed project renovation construction-related activities would have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. Moreover, there is no adopted habitat conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan that affects the project site. Therefore, the proposed renovation project would have no impact on biological resources, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

Impact BI-2: The proposed project would not substantially interfere 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. (No Impact) (Criterion 13d)

The existing Masonic Center is in a fully developed urban area, does not provide habitat for any rare or endangered species, and is not located on or in the vicinity of a native wildlife nursery site. The project site is not located within or near any natural watercourses or established wildlife corridors. The proposed renovation project would not alter the exterior physical structure of the existing Masonic Center, including the building height, and would not create any hazards for
birds. Hence, the proposed project would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory wildlife or fish species, and would have no impact. Therefore, these topics will not be discussed in the EIR.

**Impact BI-3:** The proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. *(No Impact)* (Criterion 13e)

The Planning Department, Department of Building Inspection, and Department of Public Works have established guidelines to ensure that legislation adopted by the Board of Supervisors governing the protection of trees, including street trees, is implemented. Department of Public Works Code Section 8.02-8.11 requires disclosure and protection of Landmark, Significant, and street trees, collectively known as “protected trees” located on private and public property. There are four ornamental trees in planter boxes and shrubbery on the Masonic Center property. There are no Landmark or Significant trees on the project site. No trees would be removed with the proposed renovation project. The proposed project would not conflict with the local tree preservation ordinance or with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, and would have no impact on biological resources. Therefore, this issue will not be discussed further in the EIR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. GEOLOGY AND SOILS— Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? <em>(Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Be located on geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Change substantially the topography or any unique geologic or physical features of the site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Septic tanks would not be used, as the site is entirely served by the municipal sewer system. Therefore, Topic 14e is not applicable to the proposed project, and this topic is not discussed further. The Masonic Center is connected to and is entirely served by the City’s municipal sewer system that includes wastewater conveyance, treatment, and disposal. Therefore, Topic 14e is not applicable to the proposed project and is not discussed below.

Impact GE-1: The proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, ground failure, and landslides. (Less than Significant) (Criteria 14a(i) – 14a(iv))

There are no Fault Hazard Zones located within the City and County of San Francisco and no known active fault exists on the project site. The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act’s main purpose is to prevent the construction of buildings used for human occupancy on the surface trace of active faults. The project site is not located within the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Map; therefore, its requirements do not apply to the project. Accordingly, the potential to expose people or structures to impacts related to surface fault rupture is very low, and would be less than significant.

Like the rest of the San Francisco Bay Area, the project site is subject to ground shaking in the event of an earthquake on regional fault lines. The nearest active or potentially active fault to the proposed project is the San Andreas Fault, approximately 7 miles to the west. Near San Francisco, the San Andreas Fault is located immediately offshore near Daly City and continues due west of the Golden Gate Bridge. No trace of the San Andreas Fault is located within San Francisco urban areas. Other active or potentially active faults are the Hayward Fault, approximately 10 miles to the east; the San Gregorio Fault, 11 miles to the west; the Rodgers Creek Fault, 20 miles to the north; and the Calaveras Fault, approximately 22 miles to the east.

The Association of Bay Area Governments has prepared maps that show areas of the City subject to ground shaking during an earthquake. The project site is located in an area subject to “strong” to “very strong” ground shaking from earthquakes along the Peninsula segment of the San Andreas Fault, and “moderate” to “strong” ground shaking from the northern segment of the
Hayward Fault. Although the potential for “strong” to “very strong” seismic ground shaking is present, the intensity of earthquake ground motion in the vicinity of the Masonic Center would depend on the characteristics of the generating fault, the distance to the earthquake’s epicenter, the magnitude and duration of the earthquake, and site geologic conditions. The Masonic Center meets current building standards of the Department of Building Inspection. The proposed project would not include any exterior subsurface construction; therefore, the building structure and existing seismic conditions would remain the same at the project site. Thus, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects related to seismic ground shaking.

The Masonic Center is not within an area susceptible to liquefaction or within a hazard zone for seismically induced landslides, according to the official State of California Seismic Hazards Zone Map for San Francisco. The nearest potential liquefaction zone mapped by the California Geological Society extends along Washington and Clay Streets, northeast of the Masonic Center. Accordingly, potential risks from liquefaction and seismically induced landslides would be low. The proposed renovation project would not increase seismically induced geologic hazards beyond those that already exist at the Masonic Center. Because the existing Masonic Center site meets current City building standards, and is not located within an Alquist Priolo Zone or within areas susceptible to liquefaction or seismically induced landslides, potential exposure of people and structures to seismically-induced geologic hazards such as rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, ground failures resulting from liquefaction, and landslides would be less than significant. Therefore, these topics will not be discussed further in the EIR.

Impact GE-2: The proposed project would not cause soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, and would not substantially alter site topography or unique geologic or physical features of the project site. (No Impact) (Criteria 14b and 14f)

The Masonic Center was completed in 1958 and the site is fully developed, including a sub-grade, a ground-floor level, and a below-grade, five-level parking structure. The proposed project would not involve excavation or new construction, and therefore would not cause soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, or substantially alter site topography. No unique geologic features exist at the site. For these reasons, the proposed project would have no impact on these topics, and they will not be discussed further in the EIR.

104 California Geological Survey (formerly the Division of Mines and Geology), 2000, State of California, Seismic Hazard Zones, City and County of San Francisco, Official Map.
Impact GE-3: The proposed project would not result in the potential for on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse due to its location on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or be located on expansive soil that would create substantial risks to life or property. *(Less than Significant)* *(Criteria 14c and 14d)*

The proposed project would not alter the physical structure and foundation of the Masonic Center, including the existing subsurface garage, and no subsurface construction would be required. As discussed above in Impact GE-1, hazards related to liquefaction and lateral spreading are not present. The project site and vicinity would not become unstable as a result of the renovation project and would not result in on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. No subsurface soils would be disturbed during proposed renovations; as such, the proposed project would not create substantial risks to life or property due to expansive soils. For these reasons, the proposed project would have no impact on the topography, geology, groundwater, or dewatering, and these topics will not be discussed further in the EIR.

**Cumulative Impacts**

Impact C-GE-1: The proposed project in combination with other past, present or reasonably foreseeable projects in the site vicinity would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant impact on geology, soils and seismicity. *(Less than Significant)*

Geology impacts are generally localized and site specific and do not have cumulative effects with other projects. Reasonably foreseeable projects, primarily renovations of existing buildings suitable for student residential and institutional uses, would be subject to applicable seismic standards and safety measures to reduce geologic hazards. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts on geology, soils and seismicity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY—Would the project:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Topics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c)</th>
<th>Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion of siltation on- or off-site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d)</th>
<th>Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e)</th>
<th>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?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>f)</th>
<th>Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>g)</th>
<th>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?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>h)</th>
<th>Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i)</th>
<th>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?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>j)</th>
<th>Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impact HY-1: The proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. *(Less than Significant) (Criteria 15a and 15f)*

Domestic wastewater from the Masonic Center site flows to the City’s combined sewer system, where it is treated to standards contained in the City’s National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit for the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant (Southeast Plant) prior to discharge. During dry weather (typically May 1 to October 15), all sanitary sewage generated at the Masonic Center is treated at the Southeast Plant, which currently operates at about 80 percent of its design capacity. During wet weather (typically October 16 to April 30), the combined sewer system collects large volumes of stormwater runoff, and other facilities in the City provide additional treatment as needed before discharging treated effluent to the Bay. When combined flows exceed the total capacity of all of the facilities, excess flows receive primary treatment and are discharged through combined sewer overflow (CSO) structures located along the Bayside waterfront. These intermittent CSO discharges occur in compliance with the current NPDES permit.
Implementation of the proposed renovation project would increase the number of events held in the renovated Auditorium by about 85 events per year. The number of attendees would increase by up to a maximum of 134 attendees. With the proposed project, discharge of typical wastewater at the Masonic Center to the existing wastewater treatment system would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements and would be within the capacity of the Southeast Plant. Additional dry weather flow associated with the proposed project could be accommodated within the system’s existing capacity. During wet weather, any net increase in combined sewage could cumulatively contribute to an increase in the average volume of CSO discharges to the Bay. Such an increase could be a concern because the Regional Water Quality Control Board has designated this portion of the Bay as an impaired water body under Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act, which indicates water quality standards are not expected to be met after implementation of technology-based effluent limitations, and because CSO discharges contain pollutants for which the Bay is impaired. However, the City is undertaking a number of measures to reduce the quantity and frequency of overflows and to improve the water quality of overflows. In light of these efforts, the proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. The impacts of the proposed project on water quality and wastewater discharge would be less than significant, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

**Impact HY-2:** The proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table. *(No Impact)* *(Criterion 15b)*

The Masonic Center site is developed and completely covered with impervious surfaces. The proposed interior renovations would not change the amount of impervious surface on the project site, and therefore would not affect groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. Because the proposed renovation project does not involve excavation or new building construction, no dewatering would occur at the project site. Thus the project would not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

**Impact HY-3:** The proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would cause flooding. *(No Impact)* *(Criteria 15c and 15d)*

The Masonic Center site is developed and completely covered with impervious surfaces. The proposed project would not include earthwork, such as clearing, grading, stockpiling or excavation, that could lead to erosion from exposed soil. There are no surface water channels on the project site, so siltation would not occur on or off site. The project would not alter drainage patterns, and impacts related to erosion and siltation would not occur with the proposed renovation project. Since proposed renovations would not change the existing site coverage,
remove any existing impervious surfaces, or alter the building footprint or exterior of the Masonic Center, the proposed project would not increase the rate or amount of surface runoff from the project site that could result in flooding on or off site.

The proposed project would have no impact on existing drainage patterns, erosion or siltation, or on the rate or amount of runoff that could cause flooding. These topics will not be addressed in the EIR.

**Impact HY-4: The proposed project would not create or contribute excess runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide additional sources of polluted runoff. (No Impact) (Criterion 15e)**

As discussed under Impact HY-3, the proposed project would not increase the amount of surface runoff from the site, and therefore would not contribute excess runoff water that would exceed the capacity of the stormwater system. After renovations are complete, the Masonic Center would continue to operate in a manner similar to the existing Center, except that the number of attendees and frequency of events would increase. The increase of 85 events per year in the Auditorium would increase the number of total vehicles entering and exiting the Masonic Center garage, and could contribute incrementally to additional sources of polluted runoff (e.g., increased oil or fluid leaks from vehicles); however, the volume would not be substantial in the context of the total volume of polluted runoff in the City as a whole.

For these reasons, the proposed renovation project would not affect surface runoff or drainage patterns on the Masonic Center site or in the project area, and these topics will not be discussed further in the EIR.

**Impact HY-5: The proposed project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area or place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows. (No Impact) (Criteria 15g and 15h)**

Flood risk assessment and some flood protection projects are conducted by federal agencies including the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps). The flood management agencies and cities implement the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) under the jurisdiction of FEMA and its Flood Insurance Administration. Currently, the City of San Francisco does not participate in the NFIP, and no flood maps are published for the City. However, FEMA is preparing Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) for the City and County of San Francisco for the first time. FIRMs identify areas that are subject to inundation during a flood having a 1.0 percent chance of occurrence in a given year (also known as a “base flood” or “100-year flood”). FEMA refers to the floodplain that is at risk from a flood of this magnitude as a special flood hazard area. Because FEMA has not previously published a FIRM for the City and County of San Francisco, there are no identified special flood hazard areas within San Francisco’s geographic boundaries.
On June 10, 2008, legislation was introduced at the San Francisco Board of Supervisors to enact a floodplain management ordinance to govern new construction and substantial improvements$^{105}$ in flood-prone areas of San Francisco, and to authorize the City’s participation in NFIP upon passage of the ordinance. The Mayor and Board of Supervisors approved a Floodplain Management Ordinance and prepared accompanying flood zone maps in July 2008 that regulate new construction and substantial improvements to structures in flood-prone areas; that ordinance was amended in March 2010.$^{106}$

The project site is not located within a flood zone designated on the City’s interim floodplain map.$^{107}$ In addition, there are no natural waterways within or near the Masonic Center site that could cause stream-related flooding. Therefore, impacts related to the placement of housing or other structures in a 100-year flood hazard area would not be applicable to the proposed renovation project, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

**Impact HY-6: The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death from flooding as a result of a levee/dam failure, or as a result of inundation by tsunami, seiche, or mudflow. (No Impact) (Criteria 15i and 15j)**

The Masonic Center site is not located within an area that would be flooded as the result of failure of a levee or dam.$^{108}$ Therefore, no impact would occur, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

The project site is not located within an area that is subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.$^{109}$ Therefore, no impact would occur, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

---

$^{105}$ New construction means structures for which the start of construction commenced on or after the effective date of the floodplain management regulations were adopted, and includes any substantial improvements to such structures. The proposed renovation project would not involve new construction as defined by the Floodplain Management Ordinance, as amended.


Cumulative Impacts

Impact C-HY-1: The proposed project in combination with other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable projects in the site vicinity would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant impacts on water quality and hydrology. *(Less than Significant)*

As discussed above in Impacts HY-2 though HY-6, the proposed project would have no impacts related to groundwater, alteration of existing drainage patterns, stormwater drainage, increased polluted runoff, or flooding. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to cumulative impacts for these topics.

Reasonably foreseeable cumulative development within an approximately quarter-mile radius of the project site would involve the reuse of existing residential buildings by the Academy of Arts University, and would also be subject to water quality standards or waste discharge requirements and would not substantially degrade water quality. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts on hydrology and water quality. This impact would be less than significant, and will not be discussed in the EIR.

---

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

The proposed project would not be located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, Topics 16e and 16f above would not be applicable to the proposed project and no further discussion is required.

**Impact HZ-1:** The project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through either: a) the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, or b) through reasonably foreseeable upset or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. (Less than Significant) (Criteria 16a and 16b)

The Masonic Center has been in continuous use as an assembly and live-entertainment venue since 1958. The transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials has not been associated with these uses or the operation of the Center.

Renovations would be limited to the interior of the Center. There would be no soil disturbance as part of the renovations. Major renovation activities include renovating the Auditorium by removing the fixed seating and existing stage on the main floor of the Auditorium, constructing new tiered floors for flexible audience and seating arrangements and a new reconfigured stage, and installing two new portable food and beverage areas; renovating the California Room for use as a “VIP” lounge, including two new restrooms and a new portable food and beverage area; upgrading the Exhibition Hall with a new ceiling; and upgrading the existing catering kitchen to a full commercial kitchen. Other renovations throughout the ground floor and Auditorium would involve installing new carpeting, painting, upgrading existing restroom fixtures, and removing and installing dry wall, as well as making minor repairs in the areas affected by the renovations.

Due to the age of the Masonic Center, lead-based paint, asbestos-containing building materials, and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) related to fluorescent lighting and other building materials could be present in the building and could be encountered during interior demolition and dry wall removal.
Lead-Based Paint

Work that could result in the disturbance of lead paint must comply with Section 3407 of the San Francisco Building Code, Work Practices for Exterior Lead-Based Paint on Pre-1979 Buildings and Steel Structures. Where there is any work that may disturb or remove lead paint on the exterior of any building built prior to December 31, 1978, Chapter 34, Section 3407 requires specific notification and work standards, and identifies prohibited work methods and penalties. (The reader may be familiar with notices commonly placed on residential and other buildings in San Francisco that are undergoing re-painting. Generally affixed to a drape that covers all or portions of a building, these notices are a required part of the Section 3407 notification procedure.)

Section 3407 applies to the exterior of all buildings or steel structures on which original construction was completed prior to 1979 (which are assumed to have lead-based paint on their surfaces, unless demonstrated otherwise through laboratory analysis), and to the interior of residential buildings, hotels, and childcare centers. There are no specific requirements in Section 3407 for removal of interior lead-based paint for other types of building uses. The project contractor indicates that it would use best management practices in removing lead-based paint, if encountered. Removal and disposal of building materials that contain lead-based paint would be conducted under regulations for transport and disposal of hazardous waste. Therefore, project-related impacts related to lead-based paint would be less than significant.

Asbestos

Asbestos-containing materials may be found in debris generated from interior demolition during renovation. The removal of asbestos-containing materials could generate debris that would have to be handled according to existing regulations. Section 19827.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, adopted January 1, 1991, requires that local agencies not issue demolition or alteration permits until an applicant has demonstrated compliance with notification requirements under applicable federal regulations regarding hazardous air pollutants, including asbestos. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is vested by the California legislature with authority to regulate airborne pollutants, including asbestos, through both inspection and law enforcement, and is to be notified ten days in advance of any proposed demolition or abatement work.

Notification includes the names and addresses of operations and persons responsible; description and location of the structure to be demolished/altered including size, age and prior use, and the approximate amount of friable asbestos; scheduled starting and completion dates of demolition or abatement; nature of planned work and methods to be employed; procedures to be employed to meet BAAQMD requirements; and the name and location of the waste disposal site to be used.
The BAAQMD randomly inspects asbestos removal operations. In addition, the BAAQMD will inspect any removal operation about which a complaint has been received.

The local office of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration must be notified of asbestos abatement to be carried out. Asbestos abatement contractors must follow state regulations contained in 8CCR1529 and 8CCR341.6 through 341.14 where there is asbestos-related work involving 100 square feet or more of asbestos containing material. Asbestos removal contractors must be certified as such by the Contractors Licensing Board of the State of California. The owner of the property where abatement is to occur must have a Hazardous Waste Generator Number assigned by and registered with the Office of the California Department of Health Services in Sacramento. The contractor and hauler of the material are required to file a Hazardous Waste Manifest which details the hauling of the material from the site and the disposal of it. Pursuant to California law, the Department of Building Inspection would not issue the required permit until the applicant has complied with the notice requirements described above.

Polychlorinated Biphenyls and Other Building Materials

Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) may be present in fluorescent lighting fixtures and old electrical equipment. Removal and disposal of equipment that could contain PCBs would be conducted under regulations for transport and disposal of hazardous waste. Thus, any project-related impacts due to the presence of PCBs on the Masonic Center as part of the proposed renovation project would be less than significant.

The project contractor would be required to comply with applicable regulations and procedures for handling, removal, transport and disposal of hazardous materials that are established as a part of the permit review process. For the reasons discussed above, project impacts related lead-based paint, PCBs, asbestos or other potential hazardous materials would be less than significant, and this topic will not be addressed in the EIR.

Impact HZ-2: The proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within a quarter-mile of a school. (Less than Significant) (Criterion 16c)

One elementary school (K-8), the Cathedral School for Boys at 1275 Sacramento Street and its pre-school/daycare facility, is located one block north of the Masonic Center. The Academy of Arts University leases one building at 1055 Pine Street located within one and one-half blocks (.06 mile) of the Center site that is used for a student gym, clubhouse, lounge, and an office. The Academy students are high-school graduates, typically 18 year of age or older and are not school-aged children who are more vulnerable to hazardous emissions. No new schools are planned for
the area; however, the Academy of Arts University is considering expansion of student housing in six existing buildings within a quarter mile of the Masonic Center (Study Area 6) as part of its IMP. No new school classroom facilities are proposed in Study Area 6.

No hazardous emissions or handling of hazardous materials currently occurs at the Masonic Center, and would not occur with implementation of the proposed renovation project.

As discussed above in Impact HZ-1, the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials and hazardous waste during interior construction activities would be regulated and conducted under the requirements of the Department of Building Inspection, which would ensure that hazardous materials related to project renovations would not be released to the environment. Thus, the project’s impacts related to potential exposure of school-aged children at nearby schools to hazardous substances during renovation activities would be less than significant, and no further analysis of this topic is required in the EIR.

Impact HZ-3: The proposed project would not be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites which could result in a significant hazard to the public or the environment. (Not Applicable) (Criterion 16d)

The proposed project is not located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (the Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List (or Cortese List)). Therefore, the proposed renovation project would have no impact, and no further analysis of this topic is required.

Impact HZ-4: The proposed project would not impair or interfere with implementation of an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan or expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving fires. (Less than Significant) (Criteria 16g and 16h)

The proposed project would not change the existing traffic circulation network in the vicinity of the Masonic Center. The proposed project would increase the maximum number of attendees at events in the Auditorium by up to 134 additional attendees per event (a 4.2 percent increase) and the number of events per year in the Auditorium by 85 (about a 37 percent increase). During events, the increased attendance and frequency of events at the Center could contribute to local traffic congestion, if an emergency evacuation were required in the Nob Hill area. As under existing conditions, the proposed project would contribute to existing local congestion that occurs when there are simultaneous events or functions at nearby venues such as Grace Cathedral and

---

10 The Academy of Arts University is considering expansion of student housing in six existing buildings within a quarter mile of the Masonic Center (Study Area 6) as part of its IMP; no new classroom school facilities are proposed in Study Area 6.

11 Department of Toxic Substances Control and California Environmental Protection Agency, Website accessed on November 11, 2011:
the five hotels located one to four blocks east and northeast of the Masonic Center. Increased local traffic congestion and possible interference with adequate emergency access will be addressed in the Transportation and Circulation section of the EIR.

The City and County of San Francisco ensures fire safety primarily through provisions of the San Francisco Building and Fire Codes, and does not have an adopted emergency response plan. As required by the San Francisco Building Code and Fire Code for assembly uses, the Masonic Center has established procedures for emergency evacuation in case of a fire or other emergencies. Also, as required by the April 2012 CU authorization, Live Nation has prepared an event Operations Manual for the project sponsor that includes procedures to administer first aid, and conduct emergency evacuations during events. For all events with over 1,250 attendees, Live Nation maintains a first-aid office, staffed on-site by an emergency medical technician (EMT) under contract to Live Nation. These procedures would continue with the proposed project.

Because the project sponsor would be required to comply with the City’s Building and Fire Code requirements for emergency evacuation, and as under existing conditions would continue to implement first-aid and emergency evacuation procedures required by the April 2012 CU authorization, the proposed renovation project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving fires, nor would it impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. Therefore, this topic will not be discussed in the EIR.

Cumulative Impacts

Impact C-HZ-1: The proposed project in combination with other past, present or reasonably foreseeable projects in the site vicinity would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. (Less than Significant)

As discussed in Impacts HZ-1, HZ-2, and HZ-3, above, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to the use, transport, or handling of hazardous materials during renovation activities, and would not have hazard-related impacts during project operation. Hazardous material impacts typically occur in a local or site-specific context versus a cumulative context combined with other development projects. Reasonably foreseeable cumulative development within a quarter mile of the Masonic Center involves reuse of existing buildings by the Academy of Art University for student housing. The reuse of existing buildings would have the potential to disturb existing contamination during renovation and a low potential for use of hazardous materials in their operations. Like the proposed project, cumulative development would be subject to the same regulatory oversight as the proposed project. This includes

112 April 2012 CU Authorization, Condition No. 27.
regulatory requirements for transporting hazardous materials and disposing of hazardous waste. Compliance with these regulations would minimize the cumulative projects’ potential to expose persons and the environment to hazardous materials. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. The impact of the project on hazardous materials, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would be less than significant, and will not be addressed in the EIR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES— Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Encourage activities which result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use these in a wasteful manner?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact ME-1: The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource or a locally important mineral resource recovery site. (No Impact) (Criteria 17a and 17b)

All land in the City and County of San Francisco, including the project site, is an urbanized area and is designed Mineral Resource Zone 4 (MRZ-4) by the California Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG) under the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (CDMG, Open File Report 96-03 and Special Report 146 Parts I and II). This designation signifies that there is inadequate information available for assignment to any other MRZ, and the project site is not a designated area of significant mineral deposits. Since the project site does not contain any known mineral resources, and the proposed renovation would not include any excavation, the proposed project would not adversely affect mineral resources, either directly or indirectly. Moreover, the project would not 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. The implementation of the proposed project would not result in the loss of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. Therefore, these topics will not be addressed further in the EIR.
Impact ME-2: The proposed project would not encourage activities which result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use these in a wasteful manner. *(Less than Significant)* (Criterion 17c)

Construction would require electricity to operate construction equipment such as hand tools and lighting. Construction vehicles and equipment would primarily use diesel fuel, and construction workers (approximately 30 per day) would use gasoline and diesel to travel to the site. Since proposed renovations do not involve major demolition or major new building construction, construction activities would be relatively minor and would not be expected to use large amounts of energy or fuel, or to use energy in a wasteful manner. These topics will not be discussed further in the EIR.

Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, the Building Code, requires that remodel projects of existing buildings meet certain energy and water conservation standards, including implementation of practices such as installation of energy-efficient lighting (including light emitting diode), and low-flow toilets.

Proposed renovations include installation of state-of-the-art, energy-efficient, in-house lighting and sound systems. Fixtures, equipment, and appliances in the existing catering kitchen would be replaced in the new commercial kitchen with new energy-efficient models as necessary. In addition, proposed renovations would be designed to incorporate water-conserving measures in the renovated and proposed new restrooms, and in the new commercial kitchen, as required by the California Building Code.

In accordance with the April 2012 CU authorization, the project sponsor provides electric power on the south side of California Street for event buses and performers’ buses to eliminate engine idling and the use of generators. The conditions also require that, if feasible, the project sponsor install electric power at other City-designated bus parking zones within one-half block of the Masonic Center. The use of these electrical outlets results in a small increase in electrical energy consumption, but also decreases the consumption of diesel fuel by event and performer bus operators due to engine idling and generators.

With proposed renovations, the number of events held at the Center on average would increase from 230 events to approximately 315 events, an increase of approximately 85 events per year. The increase in events would incrementally consume additional energy, fuel and water; however, the project would not use large amounts of these resources, or use them in a wasteful manner.

---

113 The Masonic Center provides electric power that allows buses to run necessary systems such as heating, air conditioning or appliances without idling the engine. Benefits include fuel savings, and elimination of air quality emissions and noise levels that would otherwise occur during bus idling. This is referred to as “shore” power in Condition 14 or the April 2012 CU authorization.

114 April 2012 CU authorization, Condition No. 15.
Therefore, the proposed project would have less-than-significant impacts on energy resources, and this topic will not be addressed in the EIR.

Cumulative Impacts

Impact C-ME-1: The proposed project in combination with other past, present or reasonably foreseeable projects in the site vicinity would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant impacts related to energy resources.  *(Less than Significant)*

As discussed in Impact ME-1, above, no known minerals exist at the Masonic Center site, and therefore the proposed project would not contribute to cumulative impacts on mineral resources.

In December 2002, the City adopted the *Electricity Resource Plan*, which includes strategies for maximizing energy efficiency, developing renewable power, and ensuring reliable power. In response to the Board of Supervisors’ guidance in their 2009 Ordinance 94-09, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission staff have developed an updated *Electricity Resource Plan*.\(^{115}\) This update identifies proposed recommendations to work towards achieving the broad policy goals laid out in the 2002 Plan. These efforts, together with conservation, will be part of the statewide effort to achieve energy sufficiency. As described above, the project-generated demand for electricity would be negligible in the context of overall demand within San Francisco and the state, and would not in and of itself require a major expansion of power facilities.

Thus, the proposed project would not have a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts on energy resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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?

Impact AF-1: The proposed project would not convert farmland or forest land to non-farm or non-forest use, nor would it conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses or forest land. *(No Impact)* *(Criteria 18a-18e)*

The proposed project is located within a developed and wholly urbanized area of San Francisco. The California Department of Conservation’s Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program identifies the site and all of San Francisco as “Urban and Built-up Land.” There are no farmlands or forest land identified in San Francisco; thus, the project site has no agriculture and forest resources. Because the project site does not include agricultural uses and is not zoned for such uses, the proposed project would not convert any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use. The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses or a Williamson Act contract. Also, the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for forest land or timberland or result in the rezoning of forest land or timberland. The proposed renovation project would not involve other changes to the existing environment that could result in conversion of farmland or forest use to non-forest use. Thus, this topic will not be discussed in the EIR.

---

19. **MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**—

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The EIR will address potential impacts, including cumulative impacts, related to land use and land use planning, transportation and circulation, noise, and public services (police protection, fire protection and emergency services).

---

**F. MITIGATION AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES**

For topics analyzed fully in this Initial Study, the proposed renovation project would have less-than-significant impacts without mitigation measures or no impacts. Therefore, no mitigation or improvements measures have been identified.

---

**G. ALTERNATIVES**

Alternatives to the proposed project that could reduce or eliminate significant environmental effects will be analyzed in the EIR. This will include the No Project Alternative. The EIR will include a discussion of alternatives that were considered and the basis for their rejection, and will identify an Environmentally Superior Alternative.
H. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this Initial Study:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, no further environmental documentation is required.

Bill Wycko
Environmental Review Officer
for
John Rahaim
Director of Planning
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APPENDIX B: APRIL 2012 CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
Appendix B - Conditions of Approval
April 24, 2012

PERFORMANCE

1. **Validity and Expiration.** The authorization and right vested by virtue of this action is valid for three years from the effective date of the Motion. The approved use must be commenced within three years of the approval of this Conditional Use authorization. The Planning Commission may, in a public hearing, consider the revocation of the approvals granted if the use has not commenced within three (3) years of the date of the Motion approving the Project.

PARKING AND TRAFFIC

2. **Parking Requirement.** The Project Sponsor shall make available to the general public within the Masonic Center garage no less than number of off-street parking spaces required by Planning Code Section 151 for "theater or auditorium" uses (a minimum of 1 parking space per 8 patron occupancy for the first 1,000 patrons, plus 1 space per 10 patrons above 1,000 patrons in the Auditorium). The number of spaces shall not be reduced or otherwise be made unavailable for the use of the Masonic Center due to monthly leases or other arrangements.

3. **Parking Fee.** There shall be a fixed parking fee for events with more than 1,250 ticketed attendees.

4. **Pre-Paid Parking.** The Project Sponsor shall offer pre-paid parking to event attendees who purchase tickets in advance of the event date through an on-line ticket service. Such pre-paid parking passes shall specify the location of the garage for which the ticket has been paid (either the Masonic Center garage or any other nearby garage that enters into a cooperating agreement with the Project Sponsor for pre-paid parking) and the location of the garage’s entrance.

5. **Bicycle Parking.** The Project Sponsor shall provide not less than 26 Class I or Class II bicycle parking spaces at the property, consistent with Planning Code Section 155.2.

6. **Pine Street Access.** The Project Sponsor shall allow access to the Masonic Center garage through the Pine Street loading dock prior to events for holders of pre-paid parking tickets in order to reduce vehicle queuing on California Street. The Pine Street loading dock shall also be used for exiting from the garage after events.

7. **Traffic Management.** The Project Sponsor shall minimize vehicular queuing on California Street by use of the following strategies events with more than 1,250 ticketed patrons:

   - Increase traffic staffing inside the California Street garage entrance to increase the rate of vehicular entry to the garage.
   - Position security personnel (including San Francisco Police Department services when warranted) outside the garage to assist with controlling and directing traffic, including directing patrons to other nearby garages if and when the Masonic Center garage is full.
• Convert the center lane of the existing garage entrance ramp to a second inbound lane to increase queuing room within the garage.

• Event staff shall ensure that U-turns are prevented and that the cable car lane is free-flowing.

8. **Overflow Parking.** The Project Sponsor shall consult with nearby public garages to inform arriving patrons that those garages can be used to park for performances and events when the Center’s garage is full.

9. **Loading Zone.** The Project Sponsor shall apply for designation of a truck and bus loading zone and passenger zone for drop-off by taxis and other vehicles and additional garage queuing for the approximately 185-foot long curb zone on California Street between the entrance to the Center garage and Gramercy Tower (1177 California Street) driveway, to be in effect only prior to and during events at the Masonic Center. The drop-off zone shall be sufficient to accommodate a minimum of three taxis or private vehicles dropping off passengers at one time.

10. **Loading on California Street.** The Project Sponsor shall seek a special event “no parking” permit from the Police Department whenever it anticipates loading or bus operations on California Street and direct trucks to park in that zone. No double-parking of trucks shall be permitted. The Project Sponsor may load and unload from the California Street curb only stage sets, performance equipment, and related materials associated with specific events. Pursuant to the regulations of the Department of Building Inspection, a sign shall be posted on the access ramp during loading and unloading operations that notifies disabled persons of the duration of the loading and provides specific information about alternative means of disabled access into the building, which alternative access shall be maintained at all times during loading and unloading operations on California Street. After the conclusion of unloading activities, trucks using the California Street curb loading zone shall depart the premises, park off-site, and not return for loading until near the conclusion of the performance. No overnight curb parking of trucks shall be permitted on California Street.

11. **Loading Noise.** To minimize noise during loading and unloading operations on California Street, the Project Sponsor shall install prior to loading and unloading activities a resilient surface material, such as rubber or vinyl, on truck ramps, pavement, sidewalk and the ramp and incorporate transition strips between different surfaces and shall direct that truck engines be turned off except when moving the vehicle or functions that require engine power are occurring, such as lowering or raising of hydraulic ramps.

12. Personnel conducting loading and unloading activities on California Street shall be instructed to minimize the volume of conversation and prohibit the playing of amplified music outside the building during loading and unloading, particularly during nighttime hours.

13. **Performer Bus Parking.** During the one and one-half hour period prior to the start of events, no more than two performer buses shall park on the south side of California Street, so that the remainder of the 185-foot long curbside area is available for attendee unloading and loading and vehicle queuing into the garage. The Project Sponsor shall direct any additional buses to park in other bus parking zone(s) the City chooses to designate near the corner of California and Taylor Streets, such as on Taylor Street adjacent to Huntington Park or on the north side of California Street. The Project Sponsor shall make best available efforts to evaluate and demonstrate to the Zoning Administrator the physical and operational feasibility of storing performer buses at nearby off-street parking facilities during events.
14. **“Shore” Power.** The Project Sponsor shall provide electric power on the south side of California Street for event buses in order to ensure the quiet and clean powering of these vehicles and shall direct that all performer buses parking at this zone connect to this electric power and not run their engines or generators.

15. The project sponsor shall seek permission from the appropriate City agency or adjacent property owners to install electric power adjacent to any other City-designated bus parking zone that is within ½ block of the property, if feasible, so that, if there is a feasible method of providing electric power, the Project Sponsor shall direct performer buses to connect to this electric power and not run their engines or generators.

16. **Overnight Bus Parking Prohibited.** Overnight curb parking of buses or habitable trailers for performers, support staff, or other associated with the operations or productions at the property shall not be permitted on either side of California Street. The Project Sponsor shall include in any contract or agreement, or rules or guidance given to any performers, support staff, or others associated with the operations or productions at the property a requirement to abide by this condition. The Project Sponsor shall remain responsible for compliance with this condition, regardless of such notice or contractual provisions.

**MONITORING - AFTER ENTITLEMENT**

17. **Enforcement.** Violation of any of the Planning Department conditions of approval contained in this Motion or of any other provisions of Planning Code applicable to this Project shall be subject to the enforcement procedures and administrative penalties set forth under Planning Code Section 176 or Section 176.1. The Planning Department may also refer the violation complaints to other city departments and agencies for appropriate enforcement action under their jurisdiction.

18. **Monitoring.** The Project requires monitoring of the conditions of approval in this Motion. The Project Sponsor or the subsequent responsible parties for the Project shall pay fees as established under Planning Code Section 351(e) (1) and work with the Planning Department for information about compliance.

19. **Revocation due to Violation of Conditions.** Should implementation of this Project result in complaints from interested property owners, residents, or commercial lessees which are not resolved by the Project Sponsor and found to be in violation of the Planning Code and/or the specific conditions of approval for the Project as set forth in Exhibit A of this Motion, the Zoning Administrator shall refer such complaints to the Commission, after which it may hold a public hearing on the matter to consider revocation of this authorization.

**OPERATION**

20. **Garbage, Recycling, and Composting Receptacles.** Garbage, recycling, and compost containers shall be kept within the premises and hidden from public view, and placed outside only when being serviced by the disposal company. Trash shall be contained and disposed of pursuant to garbage and recycling receptacles guidelines set forth by the Department of Public Works.

21. **Sidewalk Maintenance.** The Project Sponsor shall maintain the main entrance to the building and all sidewalks abutting the subject property in a clean and sanitary condition in compliance with the Department of Public Works Streets and Sidewalk Maintenance Standards.
22. **Noise Control.** The premises shall be adequately soundproofed or insulated for noise and operated so that incidental noise shall not be audible beyond the premises and fixed-source equipment noise shall not exceed the decibel levels specified in the San Francisco Noise Control Ordinance.

23. **Community Liaison.** Prior to issuance of a building permit to construct the project and implement the approved use, the Project Sponsor shall appoint a community liaison officer to deal with the issues of concern to owners and occupants of nearby properties. The Project Sponsor shall provide the Zoning Administrator with written notice of the name, business address, and telephone number of the community liaison. Should contact information change, the Zoning Administrator shall be made aware of such change. The community liaison shall report to the Zoning Administrator what issues, if any, are of concern to the community and what issues have not been resolved by the Project Sponsor. The community liaison shall make available, upon request, a list of future scheduled events which will be updated on a monthly basis.

24. **Notices Posted at Bars and Entertainment Venues.** Notices urging patrons to leave the establishment and neighborhood in a quiet, peaceful, and orderly fashion and to not litter or block driveways in the neighborhood, shall be well-lit and prominently displayed at all entrances to and exits from the establishment.

25. **Entertainment and Assembly.** The entertainment and assembly functions shall be performed within the enclosed building only. The building shall be adequately soundproofed or insulated for noise and operated so that incidental noise shall not be audible beyond the premises or in other sections of the building and fixed-source equipment noise shall not exceed the decibel levels specified in the San Francisco Noise Control Ordinance. Bass and vibrations shall also be contained within the enclosed structure. The Project Sponsor shall obtain all necessary approvals from the Entertainment Commission within a reasonable timeframe following project approval. The authorized entertainment use shall also comply with all of the conditions imposed by the Entertainment Commission.

26. **Lighting.** All Project lighting shall be directed onto the Project site and immediately surrounding sidewalk area only, and designed and managed so as not to be a nuisance to adjacent residents. Nighttime lighting shall be the minimum necessary to ensure safety, but shall in no case be directed so as to constitute a nuisance to any surrounding property.

27. **Event Operations Manual.** The Project Sponsor shall maintain, update over time, provide to event personnel, and make available to the Planning Department an event Operations Manual to include:

- A security plan to ensure neighborhood safety before, during and after performances, including in Huntington Park and near Grace Cathedral.

- A traffic control plan, including deployment of traffic control personnel outside the venue to assist patron unloading and loading, queuing into the garage, and enforcement of the Parking and Traffic, Loading and Performer Bus Parking conditions set forth below.

- Trash pick-up program within two hours after each event in the four blocks bounded by Sacramento, Jones, Pine and Mason Streets.

- Direction to event personnel to assure compliance with these conditions of approval.
28. **Patron Queuing.** All patrons queuing for events with general admission attendance shall occur within the Masonic Center property, including the main lobby and in the plaza fronting on California Street.

29. **Food and Beverage Service.** Food and beverage service is limited to service to patrons of on-site assembly and entertainment events within the Nob Hill Masonic Center. There shall be no operations of a restaurant, either full-service or self-service, open to members of the public who are not patrons of assembly or entertainment uses within the Masonic Center.

30. **Alcohol Sales.** Following the conclusion of the last intermission of an event, or one hour prior to the conclusion of an event within no intermission, a maximum of three concession stands may serve alcoholic beverages. One hour prior to the conclusion of an event, line markers shall be placed at the end of each of the lines. No patron approaching a line for a concession stand after the placement of the line marker will be served an alcoholic beverage, with the intent that alcohol service will conclude 45 minutes prior to the end of an event. There shall be no minimum purchase of alcohol required, and a maximum of two alcoholic beverages may be served per order.

31. **Police Department Review.** If an event has presented a pattern of safety and security problems in previous concert seasons or at other venues, then the Project Sponsor shall consult with the Police Department to determine whether the Project Sponsor can provide adequate safety and through utilization of its security personnel, contracted private security, and/or on-duty or off-duty Police officers. To the extent that the Chief of Police reasonably determines, based entirely on the ability to provide safety and security and not on the expressive content of the event, that the Project Sponsor cannot provide adequate safety and security for any proposed event or that the event’s historic pattern establishes that safety and security issues cannot be adequately handled at the venue regardless of the Project Sponsor’s security plan, the Chief of Police may order that the event shall not be held. This provision does not supersede any subsequent regulations regarding place of entertainment permits.

32. **Off-Duty Police Officers.** Project Sponsor shall comply with Administrative Code Section 10-B, and if off-duty officers are hired pursuant to subsections thereof, a minimum of two officers be hired for events with 1,250 or more presold tickets; if SFPD determines that more than two officers are required, the Project Sponsor shall provide the additional officers.

**MAXIMUM OCCUPANCY AND EVENTS**

33. **Occupancy.** No more than 3,282 patrons shall be permitted for events in the auditorium on the main floor level and mezzanine of the Masonic Center.

34. **Number of Events.** There shall be an annual maximum of 54 live entertainment events, and an annual maximum of 176 events not involving live entertainment, held at the Masonic Center. Notwithstanding these limitations, there shall be no limitations on the number of events that are attended by 250 patrons or fewer.

35. **Event Hours.** All events shall conclude by 11:00PM on weeknights (non-holiday Sunday-Thursday evenings) and 11:30PM on weekends (Friday, Saturday, and holiday evenings). Up to three events per year may extend until 1:00AM, subject to prior consultation with and approval by the San Francisco Police Department, the San Francisco Planning Department, and the Entertainment Commission a minimum of 30 days prior to the date of such an event.
Brett Bollinger  
San Francisco Planning Department  
Environmental Planning Division  
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400  
San Francisco, CA  94103  
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