

CHAPTER V

Mitigation and Improvement Measures

There are several items required by law that would serve to mitigate potential significant impacts; they are summarized here for informational purposes. These measures include: no use of mirrored glass on the building to reduce glare, as per City Planning Commission Resolution 9212; limitation of construction-related noise levels, pursuant to the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the San Francisco Police Code, 1972); compliance with Section 3407 of the San Francisco Building Code, Work Practices for Lead-Based Paint on Pre-1979 Buildings and Steel Structures; and observance of State and federal OSHA safety requirements related to handling and disposal of other hazardous materials, such as asbestos.

Mitigation Measures included in the Initial Study are indicated by an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures

Land Use

Mitigation Measure A-1: Western SoMa Rezoning

The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors could ensure that the community planning process currently under way in Western SoMa places a priority on the maintenance of land use to controls to accommodate PDR uses and restricts potentially incompatible uses, such as residential and office development, to minimize conflicts with existing and potential future PDR businesses. Specifically, the land use controls adopted for Western SoMa could incorporate, at a minimum, no net loss of land currently designated for PDR uses, restrict non-PDR uses on industrial (or other PDR-designated) land, and incorporate restrictions on potentially incompatible land uses proximate to PDR zones. (See also Improvement Measure D-4, p. 524.)

The above measure is judged to be infeasible, because the outcome of the community-based Western SoMa planning process cannot be known at this time. Moreover, the above measure could be seen to conflict with other City policy goals, including the provision of affordable housing.

Transportation

Traffic

Mitigation Measure E-1: Traffic Signal Installation

De Haro/Division/King. To mitigate the 2025 No Project traffic impacts, a traffic signal would need to be installed. With a new signal, the average delays at the intersection would decrease, and the intersection would operate at LOS C.

Rhode Island/16th Streets. To mitigate the 2025 No Project impacts, a traffic signal would need to be installed. With this change, the average vehicle delay would decrease, and the intersection would operate at LOS A.

Rhode Island/Division Streets. To mitigate the 2025 No Project impacts, a traffic signal would need to be installed. With this change, the average vehicle delay would decrease, and the intersection would operate at LOS C. There are a number of proposed developments in the immediate vicinity of this intersection that would contribute to growth in future traffic volumes and increased delays, most noticeably the proposed 801 Brannan Street project, and the One Henry Adams Street project. Implementation of a signal at this intersection could be linked to these and other proposed development projects.

25th/Indiana. Installation of a traffic signal at this intersection would mitigate the 2025 No Project impacts. Weekday p.m. peak hour operating conditions would improve at this intersection to LOS B. It is anticipated that implementation of a signal at this intersection would be linked to development that is anticipated to occur within the Eastern Neighborhoods area, or would be signalized by the MTA when warranted if signalization is not required as mitigation for new development in the area.

Mitigation Measure E-2: Intelligent Traffic Management

As a mitigation measure to reduce congestion with the Eastern Neighborhoods, particularly during peak periods, implement Intelligent Traffic Management Systems (“ITMS”) strategies. Examples of potential measures include:

- Prioritize and expand the implementation of San Francisco’s Integrated Transportation Management System (SFGO) program in critical Eastern Neighborhood corridors.
- Promote the use of smart parking technology to reduce excessive driving in search of parking spaces.
- Establish progressive metering of traffic through coordination of traffic lights and signals.

Mitigation Measure E-3: Enhanced Funding

As a mitigation measure to adequately address the growth in automobile traffic generated by the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning, ensure that sufficient operating and capital funding is secured for congestion management programs to make more efficient use of ramps, streets and parking, as well as funding to sustain alternative transportation (transit, bicycle,

pedestrian) networks and programs that provide incentives for drivers to use these modes. Potential funding strategies are described in Mitigation Measure E-5.

Mitigation Measure E-4: Intelligent Traffic Management

As a mitigation measure to reduce the incentive to drive to destinations within the Eastern Neighborhoods, manage parking programs and supply of on-street and off-street parking. Mitigation may be achieved through some or all of the following measures:

- Implement parking policies that favor short-term parking and progressive parking rate structures to discourage commuter and long-term parking.
- Manage on-street parking through a residential permit process to discourage long-term employee and visitor parking in residential areas of the Eastern Neighborhoods.
- Reduce the provision of off-street parking for commercial, institutional and recreational uses by addressing demand through cash-out parking programs, car-sharing, bike-sharing, station cars, emergency-ride-home programs, peak parking pricing, and unbundled commercial or institutional parking to facilitate and reduce the relative cost of using alternative modes of transportation.

Additional measures that would reduce traffic impacts are described below in mitigation measures for transit, including Mitigation Measures E-7, E-11, and E-12.

Transit

Mitigation Measure E-5: Enhanced Transit Funding

As a mitigation measure to adequately serve increased transit demand generated by the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning, ensure that sufficient operating and capital funding is secured. Mitigation may be achieved through some or all of the following measures:

- Establish an impact fee to supplement the current Transit Impact Development Fee on all new residential and non-residential development in the Eastern Neighborhoods.
- Establish other fee-based sources of revenue such as, for example, parking benefit districts.
- Establish a congestion-charge scheme for downtown San Francisco, with all or a portion of the revenue collected going to support improved transit service on lines that serve downtown and the Eastern Neighborhoods.
- Seek grant funding for specific capital improvements from regional, state and federal sources.

Mitigation Measure E-6: Transit Corridor Improvements

As a mitigation measure to accommodate project transit demand, provide improved transit service in corridors that are affected by new transit trips generated by the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning and area plans. Corridors may include Mission Street between 14th and Cesar Chavez Streets, 16th Street between Mission and Third Streets, Bryant

Street or other parallel corridor between Third and Cesar Chavez Streets, a north-south corridor through portions of SoMa west of Fifth Street, and service connecting Potrero Hill with SoMa and downtown. Mitigation may be achieved through some or all of the following measures:

- Reduce headways on transit lines serving the Eastern Neighborhoods, so that capacity utilization factors meet Muni’s capacity utilization standard of 85 percent. Candidate lines for changes to headways include those along the east-west corridors in the Mission District, especially where these corridors connect with BART and connect with the Showplace Square/Potrero Hill and Central Waterfront neighborhoods (such as the 22-Fillmore and 48-Quintara), along the north-south corridors that serve the eastern half of the Mission District and Showplace Square/Potrero Hill neighborhoods (such as the 9-San Bruno and the 27-Bryant), and lines linking the Market Street subway with East SoMa, with Mission Bay, and with Showplace Square. On some lines where peak load demand would be the greatest, peak period headways may be reduced by half (for example, on the 22-Fillmore and 9-San Bruno).
- Decrease travel times and improve reliability on transit lines through a variety of means, including transit-only lanes, transit signal priority, transit “queue jumps,” lengthening of spacing between stops, and establishment of limited or express service.
- On key routes expected to carry a significant portion of new ridership generated by the Eastern Neighborhood rezoning and area plans (such as the 22-Fillmore between Market Street and the Central Waterfront, and the 9-San Bruno along Potrero Avenue) develop “premium” service such as a Bus Rapid Transit line or a corridor enhanced with high-level transit preferential treatments.

Mitigation Measure E-7: Transit Accessibility

As a mitigation measure to enhance transit accessibility, establish a coordinated planning process to link land use planning and development in the Eastern Neighborhoods to transit and other alternative transportation mode planning in the eastern portion of the City. Mitigation may be achieved through some or all of the following measures:

- Implement the service recommendations from the Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP), which is currently in progress. The TEP will focus on near-term and medium-term transit improvements.
- Implement recommendations of the Better Streets Plan that are designed to make the pedestrian environment safer and more comfortable for walk trips throughout the day, especially in areas where sidewalks, crosswalks and other realms of the pedestrian environment are notably unattractive and intimidating for pedestrians and discourage walking as a primary means of circulation. This includes traffic calming strategies in areas with fast-moving, one-way traffic, long blocks, narrow sidewalks and tow-away lanes, as may be found in much of South of Market.
- Implement building design features that promote primary access to buildings from transit stops and pedestrian areas, and discourage the location of primary access points to buildings through parking lots and other auto-oriented entryways.

- Implement key portions of the 2005 Bicycle Plan when it is ready for implementation, particularly along segments called out in the 2005 Bicycle Plan that close gaps in the bicycle network in the Eastern Neighborhoods.
- Develop Eastern Neighborhoods transportation implementation programs that manage and direct resources brought in through pricing programs and development-based fee assessments, as outlined above, to further the multimodal implementation and maintenance of these transportation networks.

Mitigation Measure E-8: Muni Storage and Maintenance

As a mitigation measure to ensure that Muni is able to service additional transit vehicles needed to serve increase demand generated by development in the rezoned areas in the Eastern Neighborhoods, provide maintenance and storage facilities. Mitigation may be achieved through some or all of the following measures:

- Provide a portion of the cost of expanding or constructing a bus facility that may be linked to the increased demand created by land use development pursuant to the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning and area plans.
- Employ transit-preferential treatments for non-revenue service where transit vehicle volumes are high, and where access to these facilities may be impaired by other traffic.

Mitigation Measure E-9: Rider Improvements

As a mitigation measure to make it easy and comfortable to use transit service in the Eastern Neighborhoods, provide improved passenger information and amenities. Mitigation may be achieved through some or all of the following measures:

- Provide “Next Bus” type passenger information for all lines at key stops.
- Provide for facilities that allow cross-agency sharing of real time arrival information for transit vehicle operators where regional and local feeder transit agencies connect, but where operators do not have visual contact with each other or with the complete connection path that transferring passengers must make (for example, between BART and feeder buses, such as the 53-Southern Heights, which terminates at the 16th Street BART station and the 67-Bernal Heights, which terminates at the 24th Street BART station).
- Provide accurate and usable passenger information and maps.
- Provide adequate light, shelter and spaces to sit at all stops, with enhanced amenities at key stops.
- Encourage the consolidation of sheltered, well-lit, Next-Bus-served ground floor land uses open to the public for extended hours (e.g., cafes, bookstores and institutional building lobbies) within immediate sightline/walking distance of major surface transit stations and stops to allow waiting transit customers options to sit in sheltered comfort, and to increase pedestrian activity and casual monitoring around the transit stations.

Mitigation Measure E-10: Transit Enhancement

As a mitigation measure to minimize delays to transit vehicles due to projected traffic congestion, provide improved transit service in corridors that are subject to traffic congestion induced at least in part by the land use growth due to Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning and area plans. Mitigation may be achieved through some or all of the following measures:

- Reduce headways on transit lines serving Eastern Neighborhoods, including those corridors that connect with BART, AC Transit, SamTrans, Golden Gate Transit and Caltrain, to reduce the overall transit travel time for regional trips that when made by automobiles add to the congestion in the street grid and freeway ramp system in the Eastern Neighborhoods.
- Prioritize and expand the use of Transit Preferential Street technologies to prioritize transit circulation in the Eastern Neighborhoods.
- Improve and expand the use of programs that increase transit rider awareness, real-time connectivity and transfer reliability, such as Next Bus, and the display of schedules and maps.

Mitigation Measure E-11: Transportation Demand Management

As a mitigation measure to minimize delays to transit vehicles due to projected traffic congestion and to encourage use of alternative modes of travel, including transit, implement collaborative management of workplace facilities, work hours, and transportation resources. Mitigation may be achieved through some or all of the following measures:

- ● Establish a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program in the Eastern Neighborhoods that could be designed to expand citywide, and that would coordinate programs promoting alternative means of transportation and reducing dependence on the automobile. Such a TDM program could support growth in transit usage where capacity is available and/or existing service appears to be underused, such as in the Folsom Street, Valencia Street, and South Van Ness Avenue corridors, and in the Mission Bay North area. A TDM program could include one or more of the following strategies:
 - ■ Require cash-out policies for all employers who are providing on-site parking or subscribe to a parking facility to provide employee parking.
 - ■ Require car-sharing and bike-sharing in developments near transit centers as a means of increasing incentives for residents and employees not to own or depend on automobiles.
- Promote the creation of on-site Transportation Management Associations at work sites to restrict employee parking, facilitate and encourage the use of transit passes, emergency-ride-home policies, and other promotions for alternative means of commuting, and to promote alternative work schedules for drivers that focus on making better use of off-peak roadway capacity.

Noise

Mitigation Measure F-1: Construction Noise (from Initial Study)

For subsequent development projects within proximity to noise-sensitive uses that would include pile-driving, individual project sponsors shall ensure that piles be pre-drilled wherever feasible to reduce construction-related noise and vibration. No impact pile drivers shall be used unless absolutely necessary. Contractors would be required to use pile-driving equipment with state-of-the-art noise shielding and muffling devices. To reduce noise and vibration impacts, sonic or vibratory sheetpile drivers, rather than impact drivers, shall be used wherever sheetpiles are needed. Individual project sponsors shall also require that contractors schedule pile-driving activity for times of the day that would minimize disturbance to neighbors.

Mitigation Measure F-2: Construction Noise (from Initial Study)

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

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

Implementation of Mitigation Measures F-1 and F-2 would reduce construction noise effects to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure F-3: Interior Noise Levels

For new development including noise-sensitive uses located along streets with noise levels above 60 dBA (Ldn), as shown in Figure 18, where such development is not already subject to the California Noise Insulation Standards in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, the project sponsor shall conduct a detailed analysis of noise reduction

- requirements. Such analysis shall be conducted by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering. Noise insulation features identified and recommended by the analysis shall be included in the design, as specified in the *San Francisco General Plan Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Community Noise* to reduce potential interior noise levels to the maximum extent feasible.

Mitigation Measure F-4: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses

To reduce potential conflicts between existing noise-generating uses and new sensitive receptors, for new development including noise-sensitive uses, the Planning Department shall require the preparation of an analysis that includes, at a minimum, a site survey to

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

Mitigation Measure F-5: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses

To reduce potential conflicts between existing sensitive receptors and new noise-generating uses, for new development including commercial, industrial or other uses that would be

- expected to generate noise levels in excess of ambient noise, either short-term, at nighttime, or as a 24-hour average, in the proposed project site vicinity, the Planning Department shall require the preparation of an analysis that includes, at a minimum, a site survey to identify potential noise-sensitive uses within 900 feet of, and that have a direct line-of-sight to, the project site, and including at least one 24-hour noise measurement (with maximum noise level readings taken at least every 15 minutes), prior to the first project approval action. The analysis shall be prepared by persons qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering and shall demonstrate with reasonable certainty that the proposed use would comply with the use compatibility requirements in the general plan and Police Code 2909, would not adversely affect nearby noise-sensitive uses, and that there are no particular circumstances about the proposed project site that appear to warrant heightened concern about noise levels that would be generated by the proposed use. Should such concerns be present, the Department may require the completion of a detailed noise assessment by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering prior to the first project approval action.

Mitigation Measure F-6: Open Space in Noisy Environments

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

Implementation of Mitigation Measures F-3 through F-6 would reduce noise effects of project traffic and potential noise-related incompatibility impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Air Quality

Mitigation Measure G-1: Construction Air Quality (from Initial Study)

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

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

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

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

- Sweep streets (with water sweepers using reclaimed water if possible) at the end of each day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent paved roads.

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

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

The “optional” dust-control measures supplement the “basic” and “enhanced” programs to address site-specific issues. They include:

- Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto streets, or wash off trucks and equipment leaving the site.
- Install windbreaks, or plant tree/vegetative wind breaks at windward side(s) of construction areas.
- Suspend excavation and grading activity when winds (instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph.

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

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

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

Mitigation Measure G-2: Air Quality for Sensitive Land Uses

- Within the Eastern Neighborhoods, new residential development that is proposed within 500 feet of the I-80, US 101, and I-280 freeways, or at any other location where total daily traffic volumes from all roadways within 500 feet of such location exceed 100,000 vehicles, shall, as part of its CEQA review, include an analysis of PM_{2.5} and shall, if warranted based on the results, incorporate upgraded ventilation systems to minimize exposure of future residents to PM_{2.5} (which includes DPM and other pollutant emissions, as well as odors). The analysis shall employ either site-specific modeling of PM_{2.5} concentrations or other acceptable methodology to determine whether the average annual concentration of PM_{2.5} from the roadway sources within 500 feet would exceed the threshold, or action level, of 0.2 micrograms per cubic meter. For the purpose of this mitigation measure, PM_{2.5} serves as a proxy for pollutant exposures from roadway vehicles that is amenable to both exposure analysis and the setting of a significance threshold. According to the Department of Public Health, this threshold, or action level, has been shown to result in an increase of approximately 0.28 percent in non-injury mortality, or an increase of approximately 20 “excess deaths” per year (e.g., deaths that would occur sooner than otherwise expected) per one million population in San Francisco. If the incremental annual average concentration of PM_{2.5} (from roadway sources only) were to exceed 0.2 micrograms per cubic meter at the project site, the project sponsor shall be required to install a filtered air supply system to maintain all residential units under positive pressure when windows are closed. The ventilation system, whether a central HVAC (heating, ventilation and possibly air conditioning) or a unit-by-unit filtration system, shall include high-efficiency filters meeting minimum efficiency reporting value (MERV) 13, per American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) Standard 52.2 (equivalent to approximately ASHRAE Standard 52.1 Dust Spot 85%). Air intake systems for HVAC shall be placed based on exposure modeling to minimize roadway air pollution sources. The ventilation system shall be designed by an engineer certified by ASHRAE, who shall provide a written report documenting that the system offers the best available technology to minimize outdoor to indoor transmission of air pollution. In addition to installation of air filtration, the project sponsor shall present a plan that ensures ongoing maintenance plan for the ventilation and filtration systems. The project sponsor shall also ensure the disclosure to buyers and renters regarding the findings of the analysis and consequent and inform occupant’s proper use of any installed air filtration. If active recreation areas such as playgrounds are proposed as part of any future residential development, such areas shall be located at least 500 feet from freeways, if feasible.
- Within the Eastern Neighborhoods, new residential development that is proposed within 1,000 feet of warehousing and distribution centers or other uses served by at least 100 trucks per day or 40 refrigerated trucks per day, or uses that generate toxic air contaminants (TACs) as part of everyday operations, the Planning Department shall require a screening-level health risk assessment or other comparable analysis prior to approval of such new

residential development to ensure that the lifetime cancer risk from DPM or other TACs emitted from the uses described above is less than 10 in one million, or that the risk can be reduced to less than 10 in one million through mitigation, such as air filtration described above.

- The above standard shall also apply to other sensitive uses such as schools, daycare facilities, and medical facilities. (It is noted that such facilities are somewhat more likely to employ central air systems than are residential developments.)

Mitigation Measure G-3: Siting of Uses that Emit DPM

To minimize potential exposure of sensitive receptors to diesel particulate matter (DPM), for new development including warehousing and distribution centers, commercial, industrial, or other uses that would be expected to be served by at least 100 trucks per day or 40 refrigerated trucks per day, based on the ARB *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook*, the Planning Department shall require that such uses be located no less than 1,000 feet from residential units and other sensitive receptors, including schools, children's day care centers, parks and playgrounds, hospitals, nursing and convalescent homes, and like uses.

Mitigation Measure G-4: Siting of Uses that Emit Other TACs

- For new development including commercial, industrial or other uses that would be expected to generate toxic air contaminants (TACs) as part of everyday operations, the Planning Department shall require the preparation of an analysis that includes, at a minimum, a site survey to identify residential or other sensitive uses within 1,000 feet of the project site, prior to the first project approval action. This measure shall be applicable, at a minimum, to the following uses: dry cleaners; drive-through restaurants; gas dispensing facilities; auto body shops; metal plating shops; photographic processing shops; textiles; apparel and furniture upholstery; leather and leather products; appliance repair shops; mechanical assembly cleaning; printing shops; hospitals and medical clinics; biotechnology research facilities; warehousing and distribution centers; and any use served by at least 100 trucks per day.
-

Implementation of Mitigation Measures G-2 through G-4 would reduce operational air quality impacts to a less-than-significant level, both with respect to diesel particulate and to other fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}).

Archeological Resources

Based on prior archeological documentation and the results of yet unpublished archeological field projects, it can be concluded that archeological resources eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources may be present within the study area and that the proposed project and its implementing regulations have a substantially greater potential to result in adverse effects to these resources than would be possible under the existing land use regulations. Implementation of the following mitigation measures can reduce the potential adverse effect on archeological resources of the project area to a less-than-significant level. Since this programmatic EIR does not analyze specific development projects in the project area, specific physical project evaluations would undergo individual environmental review in accord with these proposed mitigation measures.

The three archeological mitigation measures are described below together with the portion of the study area where they would be applicable.

Mitigation Measure J-1: Properties With Previous Studies

This measure would apply to those properties within the project area for which a final archeological research design and treatment plan (ARDTP) is on file at the Northwest Information Center and the Planning Department (Archeological Mitigation Zone A as shown in Figure 29 in Chapter IV). Properties (listed by Assessor Block) within the project area subject to this measure include the following:

East SoMa

- 3749 (bounded by Folsom, Harrison, Essex, Second Streets)
- 3762 (bounded by Harrison, Bryant, Fourth, Third Streets)

- 3763 (bounded by Harrison, Bryant, Third, Second Streets)
- 3764 (bounded by Harrison, Bryant, Second, First Streets)
- 3765 (bounded by Harrison, Bryant, First, Fremont Streets)
- 3766 (bounded by Harrison, Bryant, Beale, Fremont Streets)

Mission District

- 3531 (bounded by Division, 14th, Mission Street, South Van Ness Ave.)

Showplace Square/Potrero Hill

- 3780 (bounded by Seventh, Bryant, Brannan, Eighth Streets)
- 3781 (bounded by Eighth, Bryant, Brannan, Ninth Streets)
- 3782 (bounded by Ninth, Brannan, Division, Eighth Streets)
- 3783 (bounded by Eighth, Brannan, Townsend, Seventh Streets)
- 3910 (bounded by San Bruno, Division, Alameda Avenues, Vermont Street)
- 3915 (bounded by San Bruno, Alameda Avenues, Vermont, 15th Streets)
- 3935 (bounded by San Bruno Avenue, Vermont, 15th, 16th Streets)

Any project resulting in soils-disturbance of 2.5 feet or greater below existing grade proposed within the AMM-A shall be required to submit to the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) for review and approval an addendum to the respective ARD/TP prepared by a qualified archeological consultant with expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archeology. The addendum to the ARD/TP shall evaluate the potential effects of the project on CEQA-significant archeological resources with respect to the site- and project-specific information absent in the ARD/TP. The addendum report to the ARD/TP should have the following content:

- 8) Summary: Description of subsurface effect of the proposed project and of previous soils-disturbing activities;
- 9) Historical Development: If demographic data for the project site is absent in the discussion in the ARD/TP, the addendum shall include new demographic data regarding former site occupants;
- 10) Identification of potential archeological resources: Discussion of any identified potential prehistoric or historical archeological resources;
- 11) Integrity and Significance: Eligibility of identified expected resources for listing to the CRHR; Identification of applicable Research Themes/Questions (in the ARD/TP) that would be addressed by the expected archeological resources that are identified;
- 12) Impacts of Proposed Project;
- 13) Potential Soils Hazards: Update discussion for proposed project;
- 14) Archeological Testing Plan (if archeological testing is determined warranted): the Archeological Testing Plan (ATP) shall include:
 - B) Proposed archeological testing strategies and their justification
 - B) Expected archeological resources
 - C) For historic archeological resources
 - a) Historic address or other location identification
 - b) Archeological property type
 - D) For all archeological resources
 - a) Estimate depth below the surface
 - b) Expected integrity
 - c) Preliminary assessment of eligibility to the CRHR
 - E) ATP Map

- a) Location of expected archeological resources
- b) Location of expected project sub-grade impacts
- c) Areas of prior soils disturbance
- d) Archeological testing locations by type of testing
- f) Base map: 1886/7 Sanborn Fire Insurance Co. map

Mitigation Measure J-2: Properties with No Previous Studies

This measure would apply to those properties within the project area for which no archeological assessment report has been prepared or for which the archeological documentation is incomplete or inadequate to serve as an evaluation of potential effects on archeological resources under CEQA (CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5(a)(1)(3) and (c)(1)(2)),²³⁴ with the exception of those properties within Archeological Mitigation Zone B as shown in Figure 29 in Chapter IV, for which Mitigation Measure J-3, below, is applicable). That is, this measure would apply to the entirety of the study area outside of Archeological Mitigation Zones A and B.

For projects proposed outside Archeological Mitigation Zones A and B, a Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Study must be prepared by an archeological consultant with expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archeology. The Sensitivity Study should contain the following:

- 1) Determine the historical uses of the project site based on any previous archeological documentation and Sanborn maps;
- 2) Determine types of archeological resources/properties that may have been located within the project site and whether the archeological resources/property types would potentially be eligible for listing in the CRHR;
- 3) Determine if 19th or 20th century soils-disturbing activities may adversely affected the identified potential archeological resources;
- 4) Assess potential project effects in relation to the depth of any identified potential archeological resource;
- 5) Conclusion: assessment of whether any CRHP-eligible archeological resources could be adversely affected by the proposed project and recommendation as to appropriate further action.

Based on the Sensitivity Study, the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) shall determine if an Archeological Research Design/Treatment Plan (ARD/TP) shall be required to more definitively identify the potential for CRHP-eligible archeological resources to be present within the project site and determine the appropriate action necessary to reduce the potential effect of the project on archeological resources to a less than significant level. The scope of the ARD/TP shall be determined in consultation with the ERO and consistent with the standards for archeological documentation established by the Office of Historic

²³⁴Incomplete archeological documentation may lack site-specific identification of potential archeological resources, a historical context or site history discussion, an assessment of prior soils disturbance, an evaluation of eligibility to the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) of potential archeological resources, or specific information about site occupants.

Preservation for purposes of compliance with CEQA, in Preservation Planning Bulletin No. 5).

Mitigation Measure J-3: Mission Dolores Archeological District

This measure would apply to any project within the Mission Dolores Archeological District (Archeological Mitigation Zone B as shown in Figure 29 in Chapter IV) involving installation of foundations, construction of a sub-grade or partial sub-grade structure including garage, basement, etc, grading, soils remediation, installation of utilities, or any other activities resulting in soils disturbance of 2.5 feet or greater below existing grade.

Based on the presence of archeological properties of a high level of historical, ethnic, and scientific significance within the Mission Dolores Archeological District, the following measure shall be undertaken to avoid any significant adverse effect from soils disturbing activities on buried archeological resources. The project sponsor shall retain the services of a qualified archeological consultant having expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archeology. At the direction of the ERO, the archeology consultant may be required to have acceptable documented expertise in California Mission archeology. The scope of the archeological services to be provided may include preparation of an ARD/TP. The archeological consultant shall undertake an archeological testing program as specified herein. In addition, the consultant shall be available to conduct an archeological monitoring and/or data recovery program if required pursuant to this measure. The archeological consultant's work shall be conducted in accordance with this measure at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer (ERO). All plans and reports prepared by the consultant as specified herein shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment, and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Archeological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction of the project for up to a maximum of four weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of construction can be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce to a less than significant level potential effects on a significant archeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Sect. 15064.5 (a)(c).

Archeological Testing Program. The archeological consultant shall prepare and submit to the ERO for review and approval an archeological testing plan (ATP). The archeological testing program shall be conducted in accordance with the approved ATP. The ATP shall identify the property types of the expected archeological resource(s) that potentially could be adversely affected by the proposed project, the testing method to be used, and the locations recommended for testing. The purpose of the archeological testing program will be to determine to the extent possible the presence or absence of archeological resources and to identify and to evaluate whether any archeological resource encountered on the site constitutes an historical resource under CEQA.

At the completion of the archeological testing program, the archeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings to the ERO. If based on the archeological testing program the archeological consultant finds that significant archeological resources may be present, the ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant shall determine if additional measures are warranted. Additional measures that may be undertaken include additional archeological testing, archeological monitoring, and/or an archeological data

recovery program. If the ERO determines that a significant archeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the proposed project, at the discretion of the project sponsor either:

- C) The proposed project shall be re-designed so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archeological resource; or
- D) A data recovery program shall be implemented, unless the ERO determines that the archeological resource is of greater interpretive than research significance and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible.

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

- The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the AMP reasonably prior to any project-related soils disturbing activities commencing. The ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant shall determine what project activities shall be archeologically monitored. In most cases, any soils- disturbing activities, such as demolition, foundation removal, excavation, grading, utilities installation, foundation work, driving of piles (foundation, shoring, etc.), site remediation, etc., shall require archeological monitoring because of the risk these activities pose to potential archaeological resources and to their depositional context;
- The archeological consultant shall advise all project contractors to be on the alert for evidence of the presence of the expected resource(s), of how to identify the evidence of the expected resource(s), and of the appropriate protocol in the event of apparent discovery of an archeological resource;
- The archeological monitor(s) shall be present on the project site according to a schedule agreed upon by the archeological consultant and the ERO until the ERO has, in consultation with project archeological consultant, determined that project construction activities could have no effects on significant archeological deposits;
- The archeological monitor shall record and be authorized to collect soil samples and artifactual/ecofactual material as warranted for analysis;
- If an intact archeological deposit is encountered, all soils-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit shall cease. The archeological monitor shall be empowered to temporarily redirect demolition/excavation/pile driving/construction activities and equipment until the deposit is evaluated. If in the case of pile driving activity (foundation, shoring, etc.), the archeological monitor has cause to believe that the pile driving activity may affect an archeological resource, the pile driving activity shall be terminated until an appropriate evaluation of the resource has been made in consultation with the ERO. The archeological consultant shall immediately notify the ERO of the encountered archeological deposit. The archeological consultant shall make a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archeological deposit, and present the findings of this assessment to the ERO.

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

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

The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements:

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

Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects. The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and Federal laws. This shall include immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the Coroner's determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (Pub. Res. Code Sec. 5097.98). The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and MLD shall make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of, with appropriate dignity, human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects (CEQA Guidelines, Sec. 15064.5(d)). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects. If non-Native American human remains are encountered, the archeological consultant, the ERO, and the Office of the Coroner shall consult on the development of a plan for appropriate analysis and recordation

of the remains and associated burial items since human remains, both Native American and non-Native American, associated with the Mission Dolores complex (1776-1850s) are of significant archeological research value and would be eligible to the CRHR.

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

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

Implementation of one of the above mitigation measures, as applicable to a particular subsequent development project, would ensure that any potential effects on subsurface archeological resources would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Historical Resources

Mitigation Measure K-1: Interim Procedures for Permit Review in the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area

Below is a set of proposed interim building permit review policies developed to provide additional protection for potential historic resources within the Plan Area while the historic resources survey is being completed. Once the historic resources survey is endorsed and the Plan is amended to incorporate the results these policies described below will expire and the Preservation Policies in the Area Plan would become effective. These policies are intended to outline how the Neighborhood Planning Unit of the Planning Department will review building permit applications and other permit applications reviewed by the Planning Department and/or Commission for projects within the Plan Area during this interim period.

- A. All proposed new construction within the entire Plan Area over 50 feet, or 10 feet taller than adjacent buildings, built before 1963 shall be forwarded to the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board for review and comment.

This applies to all construction that will result in an increased building envelope with a height that is equal to or exceeds 50 feet or an increased building envelope with a height 10 feet taller than adjacent age-eligible buildings as measured by the Planning Code. The

Landmarks Board will review proposals at their regularly scheduled public hearings occurring on the first and third Wednesday of every month. The Board's comments will be forwarded to Planning Department for incorporation into the project's final submittal and in advance of any required final hearing before the Planning Commission.

- B. All cases for properties constructed prior to 1963 that propose demolition or major alteration within the Plan Area shall be forwarded to the Landmarks Board.

When a proposed building permit application may affect a potential or known historic resource, the Department requires the applicant to file an Environmental Evaluation Application or an Environmental Exemption Evaluation. The purpose of said evaluation is to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). For the purpose of implementing this provision, a "major alteration" is defined as one for which the Department requires the applicant to file either an Environmental Exemption Evaluation or an Environmental Evaluation Application. A summary of the process is found in the Planning Department's *Preservation Bulletin 16*. When an application is filed with the Major Environmental Analysis Unit of the Planning Department (MEA), the supporting Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) prepared by a qualified professional consultant is forwarded to a Preservation Technical Specialist within the Neighborhood Planning Unit for review. At that time copies of the application and HRE will be forwarded to the members of the Landmarks Board for comment. The Board's comments will be forwarded to Planning Department for incorporation into the project's final environmental evaluation document.

- C. All permit applications that propose exterior modifications to the street facade(s) of historic resources (as defined in *Preservation Bulletin 16*) within the Plan Area will be presented to the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board.

All building permit applications for exterior modifications to historic resources (exclusive of maintenance or repair permits as defined in Planning Code Section 1005(e)(3), meaning: "any work, the sole purpose and effect of which is to correct deterioration, decay or damage, including repair of damage caused by fire or other disaster"), such as re-roofing, or replacement front stairs) within the Plan Area will be reviewed by a Preservation Technical Specialist, or will be reviewed and approved under their supervision. Depending on the amount of the proposed change some permits might be able to be approved at the Planning Information Center (PIC) by a Preservation Technical Specialist. Commercial storefront alterations are included in this requirement.

- D. A Preservation Technical Specialist shall review or be consulted on all applications for proposed alterations to buildings constructed before 1963 within the Plan Area.

In cases where major alterations are proposed for age-eligible structures within the Plan Area, review by a Preservation Technical Specialist will be required. Review will take into consideration policies of the Plan Area, as well as the preservation of significant architectural features, significant trees, as well as other code-mandated regulations.

- E. Neighborhood Association Block Book Notations (BBN) for all building permit activities reviewed by Planning Department.

The Planning Department will register all of the neighborhood associations affected by the Area Plan for Block Book Notations (BBN). Each association will be asked to select the block(s) of their interest within the plan area, and the Department will notify them by mail or phone when a permit application is submitted to the Department for review. The Department will hold the building permit application for a period of 10 days for review by all interested parties.

Mitigation Measure K-2: Amendments to Article 10 of the Planning Code Pertaining to Vertical Additions in the South End Historic District (East SoMa)

The proposed amendments to Appendix I to Article 10 of the Planning Code would reduce potential adverse effects to contributory structures within the South End Historic District.

Vertical additions proposed for individual buildings within the South End Historic District must reflect an understanding of the relationship of the buildings with the other contributing buildings within the District. Where allowable, vertical additions should be compatible with the historic building, yet not imitate or replicate existing features. Every effort should be made to minimize the visibility of any addition proposed on a structure within the District and property owners should consult early in the process with a Planning Department Historic Preservation Technical Specialist when developing a proposal.

- Additions will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis and any proposed addition should be located in an inconspicuous location and not result in a substantial change to the form or character of the historic building. A vertical addition may be approved, depending on how the addition impacts the building and its relative visibility from the surrounding public rights-of-way within the District. The Planning Department evaluates all proposals for properties identified under Article 10 of the Planning Code for compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards*. Based on these Standards, Department staff uses the following criteria when reviewing proposals for vertical additions:

The structure respects the general size, shape, and scale of the features associated with the property and the district and the structure is connected to the property in a manner that does not alter, change, obscure, damage, or destroy any of the character-defining features of the property and the district.

- The design respects the general historic and architectural characteristics associated with the property and the district without replicating historic styles or elements that will result in creating a false sense of history. For more information regarding the character-defining features of the South End historic District, please refer to Appendix I of Article 10, Section 6 (Features) of the Planning Code.

The materials are compatible with the property or district in general character, color and texture.

As part of the Planning Department review process the project sponsor should conduct and submit an analysis that illustrates the relative visibility of a proposed vertical addition from within the District. As part of this analysis, sightline cross-sections and perspective drawings illustrating the proportionality and scale, as well as the visible extent of the addition from prescribed locations should be submitted.

When a district provides an opportunity for new construction through existing vacant parcels or by replacing non-contributing buildings, a sensitive design is of critical importance. Designers should look to the historic buildings within the district for design context. Contemporary design that respects the District's existing character-defining features without replicating historic designs is encouraged. The Department uses the following criteria when reviewing proposals for infill construction:

The structure respects the general size, shape, and scale of the character-defining features associated with the district and its relationship to the character-defining features of the immediate neighbors and the district.

The site plan respects the general site characteristics associated with the district.

The design respects the general character-defining features associated with the district
The materials are compatible with the district in general character, color, and texture.

Mitigation Measure K-3: Amendments to Article 10 of the Planning Code Pertaining to Alterations and Infill Development in the Dogpatch Historic District (Central Waterfront)

The proposed amendments to Appendix L to Article 10 of the Planning Code would reduce potential adverse effects to contributory structures within the Dogpatch Historic District.

Additions to existing buildings and new infill construction proposed within the Dogpatch Historic District must reflect an understanding of the relationship of the buildings with the contributing buildings within the District. Where allowable, additions and infill construction should be compatible with the historic building(s), yet not imitate or replicate existing features. For additions, every effort should be made to minimize the visibility of the new structure within the District. Infill construction should reflect the character of the district, including the prevailing heights of contributing buildings without creating a false sense of history. Property owners should consult early in the process with a Planning Department Historic Preservation Technical Specialist when developing a proposal.

- Additions will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis and any proposed addition should be located in an inconspicuous location and not result in a substantial change to the form or character of the historic building. A vertical addition may be approved, depending on how the addition impacts the building and its relative visibility from the surrounding public rights-of-way within the District. The Planning Department evaluates all proposals for properties identified under Article 10 of the Planning Code for compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards*. Based on these Standards, Department staff uses the following criteria when reviewing proposals for vertical additions:

The structure respects the general size, shape, and scale of the features associated with the property and the district and the structure is connected to the property in a manner that does not alter, change, obscure, damage, or destroy any of the character-defining features of the property and the district.

- The design respects the general historic and architectural characteristics associated with the property and the district without replicating historic styles or elements that will result in creating a false sense of history. For more information regarding the character-defining features of the Dogpatch Historic District, please refer to Appendix I of Article 10, Section 6 (Features) of the Planning Code.
-

The materials are compatible with the property or district in general character, color and texture.

As part of the Planning Department review process the project sponsor should conduct and submit an analysis that illustrates the relative visibility of a proposed vertical addition from within the District. As part of this analysis, sightline cross-sections and perspective drawings illustrating the proportionality and scale, as well as the visible extent of the addition from prescribed locations should be submitted.

When a district provides an opportunity for new construction through existing vacant parcels or by replacing non-contributing buildings, a sensitive design is of critical importance. Designers should look to the historic buildings within the district for design context. Contemporary design that respects the District's existing character-defining features without replicating historic designs is encouraged. The Department uses the following criteria when reviewing proposals for infill construction:

The structure respects the general size, shape, and scale of the character-defining features associated with the district and its relationship to the character-defining features of the immediate neighbors and the district.

The site plan respects the general site characteristics associated with the district.

The design respects the general character-defining features associated with the district.

The materials are compatible with the district in general character, color, and texture.

The only instance where a replication of an original design may be appropriate is the replacement of a missing structure in a row of identical houses.

While the preceding mitigation measures may reduce some potential impacts to historic resources implementation of these measures would not reduce the significant adverse impacts of the proposed Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans project to a less-than-significant level. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4 states that, "In some circumstances, documentation of an historical resource, by of historic narrative, photographs or architectural drawings, as mitigation for the effects of demolition of the resource will not mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effect on the environment would occur."

Hazardous Materials

● Mitigation Measure L-1: Hazardous Building Materials

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

Implementation of Mitigation Measure K-1 would reduce effects related to hazardous building materials to a less-than-significant level.

Improvement Measures

Population, Housing, Business Activity, and Employment

Improvement Measure D-1: Support for Local, Neighborhood-Serving Businesses

To help meet the housing needs of businesses in the Eastern Neighborhoods due to changing economic conditions brought about as a result of the proposed project and to offset changes in neighborhood character that contribute to gentrification and resultant displacement of existing residents, the City could develop programs to support locally owned or operated businesses, businesses that contribute to the cultural character of the area, and organizations and businesses that serve the needs of lower-income households may be required as part of a complementary plan—outside of land use regulations—to manage neighborhood economic development without a loss in valued neighborhood character in the Eastern Neighborhoods.

Improvement Measure D-2: Affordable Housing Production and Retention

To help offset the potential displacement of Eastern Neighborhoods residents who could sustain loss of employment as PDR businesses are displaced as an indirect effect of the proposed project, the City could undertake measures that require public investment to prioritize the City's response to affordable housing needs: identifying sites for permanently affordable housing and providing financial resources to acquire and develop that housing; increasing financial resources for subsidizing low and very low income housing in San Francisco.

Additional efforts to contend with potential residential displacement impacts would focus on increasing the housing supply for those such as larger households and families whose needs are not adequately met by the private market. Measures to be implemented as part of the proposed rezoning or new area plans could include: targeting new units, especially

below-market-rate units, to families and larger households by requiring a minimum number of bedrooms for a percentage of units in larger housing development projects; identifying areas where only affordable housing would be allowed; where new zoning regulations would increase density or height, requiring a higher percentage of affordable housing than otherwise required through the City's Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program; requiring off-site inclusionary affordable housing to be built within the same plan area in areas designated for housing; and increasing the incentives to build affordable housing on-site.

Improvement Measure D-3: Affordable Housing Sites

To help avoid the loss of potential sites in the Eastern Neighborhoods that could be feasible locations for future development of below-market-rate (BMR) housing, the Planning Commission could direct the creation of a process of regular reporting to the Planning Commission concerning such sites. Such a process could involve the Planning Department and the Mayor's Office of Housing, along with the Redevelopment Agency, presenting a quarterly report to the Planning Commission identifying a current inventory of locations within the Eastern Neighborhoods (and elsewhere in San Francisco, if feasible) that are under active consideration, with the agreement of the site owner, for development of affordable housing with City subsidy, either directly by a City agency or by a for-profit or non-profit housing developer. Based on the reported information, the Planning Commission could institute a policy under which the sponsor of any private development proposed on such a site would be requested to confer with the Mayor's Office of Housing (or other applicable City entity) to determine the feasibility of the City proceeding with the publicly subsidized BMR housing project, including through purchase or exchange of the site, and to report the results of such discussions to the Planning Commission. Implementation of this measure could lead to a reduction in the loss of sites on which development of City-subsidized BMR dwelling units would be feasible, while also providing some level of certainty that sites not listed on the current inventory were not likely candidates for City-funded BMR housing development.

Improvement Measure D-4: Support for PDR Businesses

To reduce potential PDR displacement from the Eastern Neighborhoods, the City could ensure that planning efforts are undertaken to establish PDR use as a priority in other parts of the City: making land and affordable PDR building space part of the development plan for the Hunters Point Shipyard; securing surplus Port backlands for long-term PDR use; retaining PDR land and building supply in Western SoMa.

Other efforts to support PDR businesses and jobs in San Francisco would involve the Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development and other appropriate partners. Recommendations of the Back Streets Advisory Board for methods of providing affordable PDR building space and other tools to retain PDR business activity in San Francisco would be important components of a business support plan. Outreach efforts could be targeted to businesses in locations proposed for rezoning.

Improvement Measure D-5: Support for PDR Workers

To reduce the effects of job loss on PDR employees displaced as a result of the project indirectly causing displacement of PDR businesses, the City could undertake efforts under the coordination of the Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development, working

with appropriate state agencies and local community-based service providers. The intent of these efforts would be to identify and increase resources for workforce development that focus on appropriate job search, education, and training for displaced PDR workers. Because the locations of rezoning would be known, specific workforce development outreach efforts could be targeted to PDR businesses and workers in areas designated for rezoning.

Transportation

Improvement Measure E-1: Pedestrian Circulation

E.1.a. As an improvement measure to improve pedestrian conditions in the Eastern Neighborhoods, community-supported planning efforts as part of MTA's Livable Streets program should be conducted to identify specific improvements to enhance pedestrian travel and safety in each neighborhood.

E.1.b. As an improvement measure to facilitate completion of the sidewalk network in areas where substantial new development is projected to occur, property owners should be encouraged to develop improvement or assessment districts to fund improvements to the sidewalk network adjacent to parcels where new development is not anticipated to occur.

Noise

Improvement Measure F-1: Revision of City Noise Ordinance

To ensure congruency between the proposed mixed-use zoning districts that would permit residential uses alongside commercial and PDR uses, the City could update and revise its existing noise ordinance (Chapter 29 of the San Francisco Police Code) to encompass the proposed (and existing) mixed-use, neighborhood commercial, and Residential Transit-Oriented use districts, as well as the proposed Employment and Business Development (EBD) use district. Consistent with the provisions of the 1972 noise ordinance, the revisions might include a phase-in period for more stringent noise standards in districts being rezoned from industrial and heavy commercial to mixed-use districts. As part of the amendments to the noise ordinance, the City could evaluate whether receiving noise levels additional to or different than those currently included in the noise ordinance should be incorporated. The intent of this measure is not to lessen or weaken regulatory protections for environmental noise for new residential areas.

● Improvement Measure F-2: Pre-Occupancy Noise Measurements

- To ensure that noise assessment of new residential projects is adequately completed and, where applicable, noise attenuation features incorporated into project design are sufficient to reduce ambient noise to acceptable indoor noise levels, the City could develop a protocol to require sponsors/developers of residential projects to conduct pre-occupancy noise level measurements that would be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to issuance

of a certificate of occupancy. This protocol would apply, at a minimum, to development of noise-sensitive uses along streets with noise levels above 60 dBA (Ldn), as shown in DEIR Figure 18, where such development is not already subject to the California Noise Insulation Standards in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, and to new development that includes noise-sensitive uses where noise-generating uses are within 900 feet of, and have a direct line-of-sight to, the site of the noise-sensitive use. The protocol could be developed cooperatively by the Planning Department, Department of Building Inspection, and Department of Public Health, with review and/or enforcement, as appropriate, to be the responsibility of one or more of these departments.

● Parks, Recreation and Open Space

● Improvement Measure H-1: Support for Upgrades to Existing Recreation Facilities

- To help offset the potential for an accelerated deterioration of existing park and recreation facilities in Eastern Neighborhoods due to projected increases in population, the City should undertake measures to implement funding mechanisms for an ongoing program to repair, upgrade and adequately maintain park and recreation facilities to ensure the safety of the users.

● Improvement Measure H-2: Support for New Open Space

- To avoid the effects of overcrowding, overuse, and conflicts in recreational uses to existing park and recreation facilities in Eastern Neighborhoods, the City should set concrete goals for the purchase of sufficient land for public open space use in Eastern Neighborhoods. The City should set a goal of purchasing one neighborhood park in each Eastern Neighborhood.

CHAPTER VI

Significant Environmental Effects that Cannot Be Avoided if the Proposed Project Is Implemented

In accordance with Section 21067 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and with Sections 15040, 15081 and 15082 of the state CEQA Guidelines, potential impacts that could not be eliminated or reduced to an insignificant level are limited to effects on land use, historical resources, transportation and shadow.

Land Use

Option C, which would result in less PDR-only land than Options A or B and would rezone more existing PDR land and displace more existing PDR uses than the other two options, would result in a clear mismatch between the supply of and demand for PDR land and building space, with neither adequate land nor adequate building space being available without substantial changes in land use controls on Port land. Therefore, Option C would result in a significant adverse effect on the supply of land for PDR uses.

The No-Project scenario (No-Project alternative) would result in a significant impact on the cumulative supply of land for PDR uses, because, while it would avoid rezoning existing industrial and heavy commercial land to zones such as MUR and RTO that would permit housing as of right, it would also not create EBD districts that would be more protective of existing PDR uses than is the case for existing M and CM zones, which allow housing with Conditional Use authorization and where encroachment by housing and other “incompatible” uses would be expected to continue to adversely affect, in economic terms, PDR businesses.

Options A and B would result in a less-than-significant impact on PDR land and building space. Option B would at least potentially provide for an adequate supply of PDR land, if land at the former Hunters Point Shipyard is considered and if some increased amount of Port land could be used for non-maritime PDR uses. An adequate supply of building space, however, would appear to be contingent on economic forces well beyond the control of the proposed rezoning or area plans. The Socioeconomic Impacts report—which addressed Option B only—concluded, with respect to business activity in the Eastern Neighborhoods, “Over the longer term, the stabilization of a PDR land supply would result in a more diverse economic base and potentially more job

opportunities in a more diverse range of activities than otherwise expected without the rezoning.” The report found that there would be ongoing displacement of PDR uses with or without implementation of the proposed rezoning project, but that without the rezoning and its potentially stabilizing effects on PDR land use supply, “competition for land, incompatible land uses, and no regulation of demolition and displacement of PDR activity would result in an even less adequate supply of land and building space for PDR activities.” Therefore, Option B would result in a less-than-significant impact on the cumulative supply of land for PDR uses.

Option A would retain the most existing industrial land as PDR-only land, and would appear to provide an adequate supply of PDR land, based on the EPS-reported demand, assuming the use of former Shipyard land for PDR uses. Like Option B, however, there could be a shortfall of building space for PDR use. Therefore, Option A would result in a less-than-significant impact on the cumulative supply of land for PDR uses.

Transportation

No-Project Alternative

Under the No-Project option (future conditions without implementation of the proposed rezoning and area plans), cumulative significant impacts would occur due to background, non-project growth at the following intersections where no specific, feasible improvements are available to address the traffic impacts of the proposed rezoning under the rezoning options noted at the following intersections:

Third/King, Sixth/Brannan, Seventh/Harrison, Guerrero/Duboce, Mission/Otis/13th, South Van Ness/Howard/13th, Seventh/Bryant, Eighth/Bryant, Eighth/Harrison, Ninth/Bryant, Tenth/Division/Brannan/Potrero, Potrero/16th, Third/César Chávez, and Third/Evans.

Transit

Under future No-Project conditions, there would be a significant cumulative transit impacts at the Northwest, Southwest and Southeast Muni screenlines (Mission District and Showplace Square/Potrero Hill growth). Absent the identification of a new funding for Muni, to supplement the City’s Transit Impact Development Fee program for non-residential uses, it is unlikely that Muni would be able to accommodate projected transit demand within the Eastern Neighborhoods and the remainder of the City. Therefore, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

Proposed Project

Traffic

Under the proposed project, significant impacts would occur, with no feasible mitigation identified, at the following intersections under the rezoning option noted:

Option A

Seventh/Harrison, and Seventh/Brannan, Third/César Chávez, Third/Evans, and César Chávez/Evans.

Option B

Seventh/Harrison, 13th/Bryant, 13th/Folsom, South Van Ness/Howard/13th, Seventh/Brannan, Seventh/Townsend, Eighth/Bryant, Eighth/Harrison, Third/César Chávez, Third/Evans, César Chávez/Evans, and César Chávez/Pennsylvania/I-280.

Option C

13th/Bryant, South Van Ness/Howard/13th, Seventh/Brannan, Seventh/Townsend, Eighth/Brannan, Eighth/Bryant, Eighth/Harrison, Third/César Chávez, and César Chávez/Evans.

As a result, the proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts at these locations.

Transit

Based upon the change from 2025 No-Project conditions, increases in transit ridership under the No-Project Alternative would result in significant impacts on Muni service affecting lines 9, 10, 12, 14, 22, 26, 27, 47, 49, and 67. Each of the proposed rezoning options would also contribute, along with background (No-Project) growth, to significant cumulative impacts on Muni lines, with Option A significantly affecting two lines, Option B, three lines, and Option C, seven lines. Each of the three proposed rezoning options would also potentially contribute to significant cumulative transit impacts at the Northwest, Southwest and Southeast Muni screenlines.

Absent the identification of a new funding for Muni, to supplement the City's Transit Impact Development Fee program for non-residential uses, it is unlikely that Muni would be able to accommodate projected transit demand within the Eastern Neighborhoods and the remainder of the City. Therefore, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

Historical Resources

As the demolition of a historical resource generally cannot be fully mitigated to a less-than-significant level, the impact of demolition of buildings that are identified as historical resources would be considered a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans project, because such demolition could be anticipated to occur as a result of development secondary to project implementation. Mitigation identified in Chapter V, Mitigation Measures, could in some cases reduce the nature of the impact, but it is assumed that demolition of historical resources could not be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

Demolition of individual structures secondary to project implementation would not necessarily result in a significant adverse effect on a historic district within which buildings are located. However, for purposes of a conservative assessment, it is presumed that the demolition of one or more contributing resources to any of the existing or potential historic districts identified in this EIR, or, pending further research, on the concentration of historic industrial buildings in Showplace Square, would constitute a significant impact that could not be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation identified in Chapter V could in some cases reduce the nature or the degree of the impact on the district, but it is assumed that such effects would be significant and unavoidable.

While implementation of mitigation measures identified in Chapter V could reduce the nature or the degree of the potential effects on historical resources, for purposes of a conservative analysis, and pending completion of historical resources surveys for the entire project area, the impact is judged to be significant and unavoidable, as it is unlikely that no future development proposal in the Eastern Neighborhoods would result in demolition, alteration, or other changes to one or more historical resources such that the historical significance of those resources would be “materially impaired.”

Shadow

All future development in the project area would be subject to the Section 295 review process and the potential shadow impacts would be evaluated based on the guidelines of that code section. Future development in East SoMa would also be subject to Section 147 review and site-specific environmental analysis. Although the Planning Commission could not approve a project determined to have shadow impacts not determined insignificant under Section 295, it cannot be stated with certainty that compliance with Section 295 would mitigate all potential significant effects under CEQA. Moreover, under both the No-Project Alternative and each of the proposed rezoning options, redevelopment of certain sites near parks with buildings 40 feet or less in height, but taller than existing buildings, could result in new shadow impacts without triggering Section 295. Potential impacts from future proposed development would be evaluated on a

project-specific basis, and shadow effects could be limited through design of individual projects that takes into consideration shading effects on nearby parks. However, because the potential for new shadow, possibly in substantial amounts depending on subsequent individual proposal(s) that may be put forth, and because the feasibility of complete mitigation for potential new shadow impacts of currently unknown development proposals cannot be determined at this time, it cannot be concluded that this impact would be less than significant, and therefore the impact on this park is judged to be significant and unavoidable for all three rezoning options and for the No-Project Alternative.

Conclusions

The conclusions in this chapter are subject to final determination by the Planning Commission as part of its certification process for the EIR. The Final EIR will be revised, if necessary, to reflect the findings of the Planning Commission.

CHAPTER VII

Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Unlike most EIRs, this EIR contains no separate chapter analyzing alternatives to the proposed project. This is because this EIR does not analyze a preferred project; instead, this EIR evaluates Rezoning Options A, B, and C, as well as a future No-Project scenario (i.e., the circumstance in which none of the rezoning options is adopted), at an equal level of detail, as EIR alternatives, throughout this document.

Additional alternatives were considered and rejected during development of the rezoning options. As discussed further in Section III.B, Background (in Chapter III, Project Description), the *Rezoning Options Workbook* when published in 2003 included portions of the original Eastern Neighborhoods area that have been removed from the project as currently proposed. Both the western part of SoMa and the Bayview-Hunters Point neighborhood were part of this larger area. However, Western SoMa was removed from the project area by the Planning Commission in 2004, at the request of some members of that community, and is currently undergoing a separate planning process. Meanwhile, a separate planning effort was undertaken by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency for the Bayview-Hunters Point neighborhood, which culminated in the adoption by the Board of Supervisors in 2006 of the Bayview Hunters Point Area B Redevelopment Plan, following certification of an EIR on that plan. Accordingly, these areas are not included in the project area.²³⁵

These areas removed from consideration essentially constitute the alternatives considered during the planning process and rejected from further consideration.

As described in Chapter IV, the three rezoning options would have similar impacts, generally varying by degree. As identified in Chapter VI, Significant Unavoidable Effects, the key impact for which different significance conclusions are drawn is the issue of the supply of land for PDR uses. This EIR identifies a significant unavoidable land use impact relative to land supply for PDR uses for Option C and for the No-Project Alternative, while Options A and B are found to have a less-than-significant land use impact in this regard. In terms of other significant unavoidable impacts, Option A would result in significant effects at fewer intersections than would Options B or C (or the No-Project Alternative), and would result in lesser transit impacts

²³⁵ Information on Western SoMa is provided separately in Section IV.C, Population, Housing, Business Activity, and Employment because planning for this neighborhood is still under way.

than would Options B or C (or the No-Project Alternative). Option A would also result in potentially significant impacts on fewer historical resources than Options B or C.

As required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2), Option A is therefore identified as the Environmentally Superior Alternative.
