



FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Western SoMa Community Plan, Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels, and 350 Eighth Street Project

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
CASE NOS. 2008.0877E AND 2007.1035E
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2009082031



SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING
DEPARTMENT

	Draft EIR Publication Date:	JUNE 20, 2012
	Draft EIR Public Hearing Date:	JULY 26, 2012
	Draft EIR Public Comment Period:	JUNE 20, 2012 TO AUGUST 6, 2012
	Final EIR Certification Date:	DECEMBER 6, 2012



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Planning Commission Motion 18756

HEARING DATE: December 6, 2012

Hearing Date: December 6, 2012
Case Nos.: 2008.0877E and 2007.1035E
Project Address: **Western SoMa Community Plan, Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels
and 350 Eighth Street Project**
Zoning: Various
Block/Lot: Various
Project Sponsors: San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103
and
Archstone
Amir Massih, Group Vice President
807 Broadway, Suite 210
Oakland, CA 94607
Staff Contact: Andrea Contreras – (415) 575-9044
andrea.contreras@sfgov.org

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

ADOPTING FINDINGS RELATED TO THE CERTIFICATION OF A FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN, REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS AND 350 EIGHTH STREET PROJECT.

MOVED, that the San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") hereby CERTIFIES the Final Environmental Impact Report identified as Case Nos. 2008.0877E and 2007.1035E, Western SoMa Community Plan, Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels and 350 Eighth Street Project (hereinafter "Project"), based upon the following findings:

1. The City and County of San Francisco, acting through the Planning Department (hereinafter "Department") fulfilled all procedural requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Cal. Pub. Res. Code Section 21000 *et seq.*, hereinafter "CEQA"), the State CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Admin. Code Title 14, Section 15000 *et seq.*, (hereinafter "CEQA Guidelines") and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code (hereinafter "Chapter 31").
 - A. The Department determined that an Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter "EIR") was required and provided public notice of that determination by publication in a newspaper of general circulation on August 11, 2009.
 - B. On June 20, 2012, the Department published the Draft Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter "DEIR") and provided public notice in a newspaper of general circulation of the availability of the DEIR for public review and comment and of the date and time of the Planning Commission public

hearing on the DEIR; this notice was mailed to the Department's list of persons requesting such notice.

- C. Notices of availability of the DEIR and of the date and time of the public hearing were posted near the project site by Department staff on June 20, 2012.
 - D. On June 20, 2012, copies of the DEIR were mailed or otherwise delivered to a list of persons requesting it, to those noted on the distribution list in the DEIR, to adjacent property owners, and to government agencies, the latter both directly and through the State Clearinghouse.
 - E. Notice of Completion was filed with the State Secretary of Resources via the State Clearinghouse on June 20, 2012.
2. The Commission held a duly advertised public hearing on said DEIR on July 26, 2012 at which opportunity for public comment was given, and public comment was received on the DEIR. The period for acceptance of written comments ended on August 6, 2012.
 3. The Department prepared responses to comments on environmental issues received at the public hearing and in writing during the 48-day public review period for the DEIR, prepared revisions to the text of the DEIR in response to comments received or based on additional information that became available during the public review period, and corrected errors in the DEIR. This material was presented in a Comments and Responses document, published on November 21, 2012, distributed to the Commission and all parties who commented on the DEIR, and made available to others upon request at the Department.
 4. A Final Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter "FEIR") has been prepared by the Department, consisting of the DEIR, any consultations and comments received during the review process, any additional information that became available, and the Comments and Responses document all as required by law.
 5. Project EIR files have been made available for review by the Commission and the public. These files are available for public review at the Department at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, and are part of the record before the Commission.
 6. On December 6, 2012, the Commission reviewed and considered the FEIR and hereby does find that the contents of said report and the procedures through which the FEIR was prepared, publicized, and reviewed comply with the provisions of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.
 7. The Planning Commission hereby does find that the FEIR concerning File Nos. 2008.0877E and 2007.1035E, Western SoMa Community Plan, Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels and 350 Eighth Street Project reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the City and County of San Francisco, is adequate, accurate and objective, and that the Comments and Responses document contains no significant revisions to the DEIR, and hereby does CERTIFY THE COMPLETION of said FEIR in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines.

8. The Commission, in certifying the completion of said FEIR, hereby does find that the project described in the EIR:

A. Will result in the following significant and unavoidable project-specific environmental impacts:

- 1) The Draft Plan and Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels could indirectly result in the demolition of individual historic architectural resources or contributing resources to a historic district located in the Project Area, causing a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA *Guidelines* Section 15064.5.
- 2) The Draft Plan would cause traffic impact during a.m. and/or p.m. peak periods at the following three intersections:
 - i. Intersection of Fifth/Bryant/I-80 Eastbound on-ramp;
 - ii. Intersection of Sixth/Brannan/I-280 ramps; and
 - iii. Eighth/Harrison/I-80 Westbound off-ramp.
- 3) The Draft Plan's proposed transportation system improvements would remove on-street loading spaces along 12th Street that could not be relocated nearby and would thereby result in potential conflicts between trucks and other traffic.
- 4) Subsequent individual development projects in the Draft Plan Area and/or on the Adjacent Parcels could violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, and/or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria air pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.
- 5) The implementation of the Draft Plan and Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would expose new sensitive receptors to substantial levels of fine particulate matter and toxic air contaminants.
- 6) The implementation of the Draft Plan and Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would expose existing and future sensitive receptors to substantial new levels of fine particulate matter and toxic air contaminants from new vehicles and equipment.
- 7) The implementation of the Draft Plan and Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would result in construction-period emissions of criteria air pollutants from subsequent individual development projects that would contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation or result in a cumulatively considerable increase in criteria air pollutants.
- 8) The implementation of the Draft Plan and Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would expose sensitive receptors to substantial levels of toxic air contaminants generated by construction equipment.

- 9) Construction of the 350 Eighth Street Project would expose sensitive receptors to substantial levels of toxic air contaminants generated by construction equipment.
 - 10) The implementation of the Draft Plan and Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would create new shadow in a manner that would substantially affect outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas.
- B. Will contribute considerably to the following cumulative environmental impacts:
- 1) The implementation of the Draft Plan and Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels could encourage a development trend of demolition and alteration of historical resources, contributing considerably to significant cumulative historical resources impacts.
 - 2) The Draft Plan would contribute considerably to cumulative traffic impacts at a.m. and/or p.m. peak periods at the following three intersections:
 - i. Intersection of Fifth/Bryant/I-80 Eastbound on-ramp;
 - ii. Intersection of Sixth/Brannan/I-280 ramps; and
 - iii. Eighth/Harrison/I-80 Westbound off-ramp.
 - 3) The Draft Plan would contribute considerably to the exceedance of capacity utilization standards for Muni under cumulative conditions.
 - 4) The implementation of the Draft Plan, Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels and 350 Eighth Street Project would contribute considerably to a significant cumulative noise impact.
 - 5) The implementation of the Draft Plan, Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels and 350 Eighth Street Project would contribute considerably to cumulative air quality impacts from emissions of criteria air pollutants.
 - 6) The implementation of the Draft Plan, Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels and 350 Eighth Street would result in cumulative exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial levels of toxic air contaminants.
 - 7) The implementation of the Draft Plan and/or Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels could contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact on shadow conditions.
9. The Planning Commission reviewed and considered the information contained in the FEIR prior to approving the Project.

Motion No. 18756
Hearing Date: December 6, 2012

CASE NOS. 2008.0877E and 2007.1035E
Western SoMa Community Plan, Rezoning of
Adjacent Parcels and 350 Eighth Street Project

I hereby certify that the foregoing Motion was ADOPTED by the Planning Commission at its regular meeting of December 6, 2012.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jonas P. Ionin', with a vertical line extending downwards from the end of the signature.

Jonas P. Ionin
Acting Commission Secretary

AYES: Fong, Wu, Antonini, Borden, Hillis, Moore and Sugaya
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
ADOPTED: December 6, 2012

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Western SoMa Community Plan, Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels, and 350 Eighth Street Project

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
CASE NOS. 2008.0877E AND 2007.1035E
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2009082031

Changes from the Draft EIR text are indicated by a dot (●) in the left margin
(adjacent to page number for added pages and figures; adjacent to table number for tables).



SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING
DEPARTMENT

Draft EIR Publication Date:	JUNE 20, 2012
Draft EIR Public Hearing Date:	JULY 26, 2012
Draft EIR Public Comment Period:	JUNE 20, 2012 TO AUGUST 6, 2012
Final EIR Certification Date:	DECEMBER 6, 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Western SoMa Community Plan, Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels, and ● 350 Eighth Street Project Final EIR

	<u>Page</u>
List of Acronyms and Abbreviations	v
Summary	S-1
1. Introduction	1-1
A. Environmental Review	1-1
B. Purpose of this EIR	1-3
C. Organization of the Draft EIR	1-5
D. Public Participation	1-6
2. Project Description	2-1
A. Project Overview	2-1
B. Project Sponsor's Objectives	2-3
C. Background	2-4
D. Project Characteristics	2-5
Western SoMa Community Plan	2-5
Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels	2-20
350 Eighth Street Project	2-23
E. Intended Uses of the EIR	2-32
F. Approvals Required	2-32
3. Plans and Policies	3-1
A. San Francisco General Plan	3-1
B. Planning in the Project Area Vicinity	3-10
C. San Francisco Planning Code (Zoning)	3-14
4. Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures	4-1
A. Land Use	4.A-1
B. Aesthetics	4.B-1
C. Population and Housing	4.C-1
D. Cultural and Paleontological Resources	4.D-1
E. Transportation and Circulation	4.E-1
F. Noise and Vibration	4.F-1
G. Air Quality	4.G-1
H. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	4.H-1
I. Wind and Shadow	4.I-1
J. Recreation	4.J-1

	<u>Page</u>
4. Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures (continued)	
K. Public Services, Utilities, and Service Systems	4.K-1
L. Biological Resources	4.L-1
M. Geology and Soils	4.M-1
N. Hydrology and Water Quality	4.N-1
O. Hazards and Hazardous Materials	4.O-1
P. Mineral and Energy Resources	4.P-1
Q. Agricultural and Forest Resources	4.Q-1
5. Other CEQA Considerations	5-1
A. Growth-Inducing Impacts	5-1
B. Significant Unavoidable Impacts	5-2
C. Significant Irreversible Changes	5-4
D. Areas of Known Controversy and Issues to be Resolved	5-5
6. Alternatives	6-1
A. Introduction	6-1
B. Proposed Project Alternative Analysis	6-2
C. Environmentally Superior Alternative	6-30
D. Alternatives Considered and Rejected	6-31
● 7. Comments and Responses	7-1
● 8. Report Preparers	8-1
A. EIR Authors	8-1
B. EIR Consultants	8-1
C. Project Sponsors	8-2
● 9. Appendices	
A. Notice of Preparation	A-1
B. Western SoMa Community Plan Policies and Objectives	B-1
● C. Attachments 1, 2 and 3	C-1

List of Figures

2-1 Project Area Location and Component Boundaries	2-2
2-2 Existing and Proposed Western SoMa Community Plan Area Use Districts	2-9
2-3 Proposed Transportation Improvements	2-13
2-4 Existing and Proposed Western SoMa Community Plan Area Height and Bulk Districts	2-16
2-5 Existing and Proposed Adjacent Parcels Use Districts	2-21
2-6 350 Eighth Street Project – Site Plan	2-26
2-7 350 Eighth Street Project –Below-Grade Garage Plan	2-27
2-8 350 Eighth Street Project –Upper Level Plans	2-28
2-9 350 Eighth Street Project – Harrison and Eighth Elevations	2-29
2-10 350 Eighth Street Project – Gordon and Ringold Elevations	2-30
4.A-1 Existing Land Uses	4.A-2
4.B-1 Viewpoint Map	4.B-3
4.B-2 Street Views	4.B-5
4.B-3 View of Project Area Buildings	4.B-6
4.B-4 Views of Older and Contemporary Residential Buildings	4.B-7
4.B-5 Views of the Adjacent Parcels	4.B-9
4.B-6 Views to Surrounding Neighborhoods	4.B-13
4.B-7 Views of 350 Eighth Street Project Site	4.B-15

	<u>Page</u>
List of Figures (continued)	
4.B-8 Visual Simulation of the Proposed 350 Eighth Street Project from Eighth Street South of Harrison Street	4.B-24
4.B-9 Visual Simulation of the Proposed 350 Eighth Street Project from Ninth and Harrison Streets	4.B-25
4.D-1 Western SoMa Light Industrial and Residential Historic District	4.D-19
4.D-2 Western SoMa Historic Architectural Resources and Districts	4.D-21
4.E-1 LOS Intersection Locations	4.E-6
4.F-1 Noise Measurement Locations	4.F-7
4.F-2 Streets Subject to Daily Average Traffic Noise Levels in Excess of 60 Decibels	4.F-8
4.F-3 Traffic Noise Map	4.F-9
4.F-4 Arts and Entertainment Establishments	4.F-10
4.F-5 Land Use Compatibility Chart for Community Noise	4.F-13
4.G-1a Cancer Risks from Caltrain	4.G-39
4.G-1b Cancer Risks from Caltrain	4.G-40
4.N-1 Flood-Prone Area	4.N-4
6-1 Greater Growth Alternative – Opportunity Sites	6-22

List of Tables

S-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures for the Western SoMa Community Plan and Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels	S-12
S-2 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures for the 350 Eighth Street Project	S-52
S-3 Comparison of the Environmental Impacts of the Project to the Impacts of the Alternatives	S-81
2-1 350 Eighth Street Project Characteristics	2-24
4-1 Summary of Baseline (2008) and 2030 Assumptions for the Project Area	4-4
4.C-1 Housing Production Targets, 1999-June 2006 and Actual Production, 1999-2006	4.C-4
4.C-2 Existing Population and Employment in the Project Area	4.C-4
4.C-3 Existing and Anticipated Households, Population, and Employment in the Project Area	4.C-13
4.C-4 Housing Demand Associated with Proposed Project Employment Growth	4.C-19
4.E-1 Intersection Level of Service (LOS) Conditions Weekday AM and PM Peak Hours Existing, Existing Plus Draft Plan, Existing Plus Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels, Existing Plus 350 Eighth Street Project, and 2030 Cumulative	4.E-21
4.F-1 Typical Sound Levels Measured in the Environment	4.F-2
4.F-2 Existing Noise Environment at Project Site Vicinity	4.F-5
4.F-3 Existing and Projected Peak-Hour Traffic Noise Levels Along Roadways in the Project Area Vicinity	4.F-18
4.F-4 Typical Construction Noise Levels	4.F-23
4.F-5 Typical Noise Levels from Construction Equipment	4.F-23
4.F-6 Vibration Velocities for Construction Equipment	4.F-26
4.G-1 Summary of San Francisco Air Quality Monitoring Data (2007-2011)	4.G-2
4.G-2 State and Federal Ambient Air Quality Standards	4.G-12
4.G-3 Air Quality Significance Thresholds	4.G-20
4.G-4 Consistency of the Draft Plan with Transportation Control Measures of the 2010 Clean Air Plan	4.G-29
4.G-5 350 Eighth Street Project Construction Exhaust Emissions Estimates	4.G-54
4.G-6 350 Eighth Street Project Estimated Daily Regional Emissions (2016)	4.G-59

	<u>Page</u>
List of Tables (continued)	
4.G-7 Health Risks at the 350 Eighth Street Project Site (with Truck Route Signage)	4.G-63
4.G-8 Cumulative Health Risks at Maximally Exposed Off-Site Receptor (with Truck Route Signage)	4.G-67
4.H-1 Greenhouse Gas Reduction Measures in California Air Resources Board Scoping Plan	4.H-5
4.H-2 City Greenhouse Gas Regulations Applicable to the Proposed 350 Eighth Street Project	4.H-21
4.M-1 Active Faults in the Vicinity of the Project Area	4.M-3
6-1 Comparison of Projections Between Proposed Project and Alternatives	6-6
6-2 Greater Growth Alternative Opportunity Sites	6-23
6-3 Comparison of the Environmental Impacts of the Project to the Impacts of Alternatives	6-32

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

AB	Assembly Bill
ABAG	Association of Bay Area Governments
AC Transit	Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District
ADRP	Archeological Data Recovery Plan
AMP	Archeological Monitoring Plan
ARB	California Air Resources Board
ARDTP	Archeological Research Design and Treatment Plan
ATP	Archeological Testing Plan
BAAQMD	Bay Area Air Quality Management District
BART	Bay Area Rapid Transit District
BCDC	San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission
C&D	Construction and Demolition
CAP	Clean Air Plan
CDMG	California Division of Mines and Geology (now CA Geological Survey)
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CGS	California Geological Survey
CIE	Cultural/Institutional/Educational
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level
CO	Carbon Monoxide
CO ₂	Carbon Dioxide
CO ₂ -eq	Carbon Dioxide-equivalent
CSD	Combined Sewer Discharge
CU	Conditional Use
dB	Decibel
dBA	A-Weighted Decibel
DBI	San Francisco Department of Building Inspection
DEIR	Draft Environmental Impact Report
DPH	San Francisco Department of Public Health
DPM	Diesel Particulate Matter
DPR	California Department of Parks and Recreation
DPW	San Francisco Department of Public Works
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
ERO	Environmental Review Officer (of the Planning Department)
FAR	Floor Area Ratio
FARR	Final Archeological Resources Report
GW	Gigawatt (1 billion watts)
GWh	Gigawatt-Hour
GFA	Gross Floor Area
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
HABS	Historic American Buildings Survey
HCD	California Department of Housing and Community Development
KW	Kilowatt (1,000 watts)
KWh	Kilowatt-Hour

Ldn	Day-Night Noise Level
LEED®	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design
LOS	Level of Service (measure of traffic or other transportation operations)
mgd	Million Gallons per Day
MIPS	Management, Information, and Professional Services
MLD	Most Likely Descendant
mph	Miles per Hour
MTA	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
MTC	Metropolitan Transportation Commission
MRZ	Mineral Resource Zone
MUG	Mixed-Use General
MUO	Mixed-Use Office
MW	Megawatt (1 million watts)
MX	Mixed (Use), as in RED MX district
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAHC	California Native American Heritage Commission
NC-T	Neighborhood Commercial Transit
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NO ₂	Nitrogen Dioxide
NO _x	Nitrogen Oxides
NOP	Notice of Preparation
NWIC	Northwest Information Center
OHP	State of California Office of Historic Preservation
OPR	Governor's Office of Planning and Research
PDA	Priority Development Area
PDR	Production, Distribution, and Repair
PM	Particulate Matter
PM _{2.5}	Particulate Matter 2.5 microns or less in diameter
PM ₁₀	Particulate Matter 10 microns or less in diameter
ppb	Parts per Billion
ppm	Parts per Million
pphm	Parts per Hundred Million
RCD	Regional Commercial District
RED	Residential Enclave District
RHNA	Regional Housing Needs Assessment
RHNP	Regional Housing Needs Plan
ROG	Reactive Organic Gases
RSD	Residential Service District
SAAQS	State Ambient Air Quality Standards
SALI	Service, Arts, Light Industrial
SB	Senate Bill
SCH	State Clearinghouse (in the Governor's Office of Planning and Research)
SFCTA	San Francisco County Transportation Authority
SFD	San Francisco City Datum
SFPUC	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
SFUSD	San Francisco Unified School District
SLI	Service/Light Industrial

SLR	Service/Light Industrial/Residential
SO ₂	Sulfur Dioxide
SoMa	South of Market
SRO	Single-Room Occupancy
SSO	Service/Secondary Office
SUD	Special Use District
TACs	Toxic Air Contaminants
TB-DTR	Transbay Downtown Residential
TDM	Transportation Demand Management
TDR	Transferrable Development Rights
TIDF	Transit Impact Development Fee
v/c ratio	Volume-to-Capacity Ratio
µg/m ³	Micrograms per Cubic Meter

SUMMARY

This environmental impact report (EIR) chapter provides a brief summary of the findings of the EIR regarding the *Western SoMa Community Plan*¹ (Draft Plan), Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels, and 350 Eighth Street project, and their potential environmental consequences. The chapter includes a summary of the project description, the level of environmental analysis, the environmental impacts and mitigation measures identified in this EIR, alternatives to the Proposed Project and their comparative environmental effects, and areas of controversy and issues to be resolved.

This summary should not be relied upon for a thorough understanding of the Proposed Project, individual impacts, and mitigation measures. Please refer to Chapter 1 for a more complete description of the level of environmental analysis, Chapter 2 for a more complete description of the Proposed Project, Chapter 4 for a more complete description of associated impacts and mitigation measures, and Chapter 6 for a more complete description of identified alternatives to the Proposed Project and the comparative impacts.

A. Project Description

The Proposed Project consists of three components: (1) adoption of the *Western SoMa Community Plan* (Draft Plan); (2) the rezoning of 46 parcels, comprising 35 lots,² proximate to the Draft Plan boundary in order to reconcile their use districts with those of the neighboring properties (Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels); and (3) a mixed-use project proposed at 350 Eighth Street within the Western SoMa Community Plan Area (Draft Plan Area), consisting of approximately 444 dwelling units, approximately 33,650 square feet of commercial space, approximately 8,150 square feet of light industrial/artist space, and approximately 1,350 square feet of community space.

Draft Western SoMa Community Plan

The first component of the Proposed Project is adoption of the *Western SoMa Community Plan* as an element of the *San Francisco General Plan*. The Draft Plan Area comprises approximately 298 acres³ in the western portion of the South of Market and is surrounded by the Civic Center, Tenderloin, East SoMa, Showplace Square, Mission District, and Hayes Valley neighborhoods. The Draft Plan Area boundary is

¹ San Francisco Planning Department and Western SoMa Citizens Planning Task Force, *Western SoMa Community Plan, Proposal for Adoption*, Fall 2011, http://commissions.sfplanning.org/soma/FinalPlan_optimized.pdf

² One lot has been subdivided as part of a residential condominium project and contains 11 distinct Assessor Block parcels. The term “lot” refers to a tract of developable land, whereas the term “parcel” refers to developed individual units that have access to sewer, water, and electricity services (i.e., condominium units).

³ This area is inclusive of public rights-of-way within the Draft Plan Area. Excluding the public rights-of-way, the Draft Plan Area parcels make up approximately 206 acres.

irregularly shaped and consists of two connected areas: one (“north of Harrison Street”) roughly bounded by 13th Street to the east, Bryant Street to the south, Seventh Street to the west, and Minna Street to the north, and the second area (“south of Harrison Street”), roughly bounded by Townsend Street to the south, Fourth Street to the east, Harrison Street to the north, and Seventh Street to the west.

The various components of the Draft Plan, which are analyzed throughout this EIR, include:

- Increases and decreases in building heights on selected parcels due to proposed height and bulk district reclassifications;
- Increases and decreases in density on selected parcels due to proposed use district reclassifications that replace density standards with other mechanisms to account for density, such as building envelope controls; and
- Streetscape improvements along designated streets and intersections, including installation of signalized pedestrian crossings; sidewalk extensions and corner bulbouts; gateway treatments such as signage and lighting; physical roadway features such as enhanced hardscape area, landscaped islands and colored textured pavement; public realm greening amenities (i.e., street trees and planted medians); and other pedestrian enhancements (i.e., street furniture and public restrooms).

Land Use Policies and Controls

The Draft Plan proposes to amend the existing Western SoMa Special Use District (SUD) by implementing new planning policies and controls for land use, urban form, building height and design, street networks, and open space. The overarching goal of the Draft Plan is to maintain the mixed-use character of the Draft Plan Area and preserve existing housing while promoting new residential (including affordable housing) and resident-serving uses in the proposed residential districts, mainly Residential Enclave Districts (REDs) (including a new RED Mixed designation, or RED MX, that would permit some non-residential uses), mostly north but a few south of Harrison Street. This goal would be achieved by expanding all of the existing REDs, which currently exist north of Harrison Street, and creating new REDs in other locations, both north and south of Harrison Street.

The majority of Draft Plan Area is currently within the Service/Light Industrial/Residential (SLR) and Service/Light Industrial (SLI) use districts. Other use districts that exist within the Draft Plan Area include Light Industrial (M-1), Service/Secondary Office (SSO), Residential Service District (RSD), REDs, and Public Districts. The Draft Plan proposes that much of the area north of Harrison Street currently zoned SLR would be designated as a new Western SoMa Mixed Use General (W SoMa MUG) use district. Similar to the MUG district established through the Eastern Neighborhoods planning process, the W SoMa MUG district would permit residential uses and support a flexible mix of smaller neighborhood-serving retail, commercial and industrial/production, distribution, and repair (PDR) uses. Large-scale commercial uses, loft-style live/work spaces, and research and development facilities would not be permitted. Along Folsom Street east of 10th Street, a new Folsom Neighborhood Commercial Transit (NC-T) use district, similar to other NC-T districts citywide, would allow residential and limited institutional, office, and retail uses, along with small accessory entertainment uses and small hotels. On Ninth and 10th Streets, a new W SoMa Regional Commercial District (RCD) would permit uses similar to those allowed in NC districts but would encourage more office use. Also north of Harrison Street, several existing REDs would be increased in size and new REDs would be created. New RED MX districts would

also be established, which would allow not only residential uses but also a limited mix of supportive uses such as retail and light manufacturing, using appropriate buffers to allow incompatible uses to exist in proximity to one another and requiring a Conditional Use authorization.

South of Harrison Street, much of the land zoned SLI would be newly designated W SoMa Service, Arts, Light Industrial (W SoMa SALI). This district, between Harrison and Bluxome Streets and Fourth and 13th Streets, is intended to protect and facilitate the expansion of existing light industrial, commercial, manufacturing, and arts uses. New residential or office uses would not be permitted, although general retail and industrial/PDR uses would be allowed. A new W SoMa Mixed Use Office (W SoMa MUO) district on the north side of Townsend Street would promote smaller-scale office uses, digital media and “high-tech” uses, retail and light industrial/PDR uses. The W SoMa MUO would differ from the existing SSO and SLI districts in the Draft Plan Area and from other MUO districts throughout the city in that no residential uses would be permitted within this district. Both the W SoMa SALI and W SoMa MUO districts would also permit new entertainment uses outside buffer areas around newly designated and proximate RED and RED MX districts. New RED and RED MX districts would be the only areas that would accommodate housing south of Harrison Street.

One of the major goals of the Draft Plan is to create a “complete neighborhood” that maintains residential uses in appropriate areas with a proximate mix of neighborhood services while at the same time minimizing conflicts between residential and other uses. The channeling of residential uses into designated new and expanded RED districts and RED MX district areas is intended to support this goal. The Draft Plan also focuses on strengthening “high-tech”-related business opportunities that would meet local and broader strategic employment needs. This goal is supported by designating a portion of Folsom Street as a new NC-T district and by designating the lots along the northern side of Townsend Street within the Draft Plan Area boundaries as the new W SoMa MUO district. In addition, the Draft Plan retains existing controls for formula retail uses (defined in Planning Code Section 703.3) that restrict clustering, integrate them with non-formula retail uses, and discourage auto-oriented formula retail uses north of Interstate 80.

Housing

The Draft Plan acknowledges that residential uses are an important part of the Western SoMa neighborhood. The Draft Plan also recognizes the need to protect the existing REDs that break up the otherwise large SoMa blocks while identifying appropriate parcels where new residential uses could be introduced without disrupting the existing neighborhood pattern or residential services and amenities. Accordingly, through Administrative Code amendments, the Draft Plan proposes to ensure that infrastructure improvements keep pace with growth and development and that new projects pay impact fees and provide public amenities to offset the burden placed by new development on City services. The Draft Plan also requires annual reporting to ensure that the prescribed and historical proportion of below market rate (BMR) housing units to market rate units and the jobs-to-total-housing-units ratio are maintained.

Transportation and the Street Network

The Draft Plan contains a number of goals promoting walking and bicycling as alternatives to the single-occupancy vehicle, improving the pedestrian experience in alleys, promoting safety through the use of traffic calming measures, limiting freight and service vehicles within residential districts, and de-emphasizing auto-oriented uses on neighborhood-serving streets and along Folsom Street. Changes in circulation that would accompany the Draft Plan include the following.

Circulation Changes Receiving Project-Level Analysis in this EIR (As Explained Below)

1. Posting of “truck route” signs on Ninth, 10th, Harrison, and Bryant Streets in the Draft Plan Area.
2. Installation of new signalized mid-block pedestrian crossings on Folsom Street.
3. Installation of new signalized mid-block pedestrian crossings on Minna and Natoma Streets.
4. Installation of streetscape and traffic calming improvements on Minna, Natoma, and Ringold Streets.

Circulation Changes Receiving Program-Level Analysis in this EIR (As Explained Below)

5. Installation of sidewalk extensions/bulb-outs on Folsom Street.
6. Installation of gateway treatments at and in vicinity of freeway off-ramps.
7. Installation of public realm greening and pedestrian enhancements along Folsom Street and 12th Street.

Urban Design and Built Form

Building height limits within the Draft Plan Area currently range from 30 to 130 feet, although much of the Draft Plan Area lies within the 50-X height and bulk district (50-foot height limit, no bulk limit) and most structures are one to three stories (or approximately 15 to 35 feet) tall. In general, the Draft Plan would increase heights throughout the Draft Plan Area by approximately 5 to 15 feet. However, within some proposed zoning districts, like the REDs, the Draft Plan proposes height decreases of 10 feet, with about 10 lots in the northwestern corner of the Draft Plan Area proposed for height limit decreases of up to 90 feet. North of Harrison Street, the Draft Plan proposes to change the prevailing 50-X height and bulk district to a combination of 55-X and 55-X/65-B height and bulk districts to encourage active uses at the ground level. The existing height limits within the RED and RED MX districts would be reduced from 50 feet to 40 feet. South of Harrison Street, the 30-X height and bulk district would be maintained, while the 40-X and 50-X height and bulk districts would be modified to 40-X/55-X height and bulk in the W SoMa SALI district. The proposed REDs south of Harrison Street would all have a 40-X height and bulk district. Along Townsend Street, the Draft Plan proposes to increase height limits from 65-X to 85-K in order to “establish a mid-rise business corridor on Townsend Street designated for office uses and an explicit preference for 21st Century high tech and digital-media uses” (Draft Plan Policy 1.2.3). In addition to height rezoning associated with new zoning districts, the Draft Plan would also amend height designations of a few isolated parcels within the Draft Plan Area.

Other changes proposed by the Draft Plan include requiring height limits and upper story setbacks in new construction to preserve historic street walls, maintain adequate light and air, and maximize solar access, and encouraging the preservation and expansion of rear yards throughout the Draft Plan Area but particularly within the proposed REDs. As a companion to the Draft Plan, the *Design Standards for Western SoMa Special Use District* provide detailed district-by-district project development and urban design standards. The Design Standards would be considered as an independent companion legislative action that would accompany plan implementation.

Social Heritage Preservation

One of the goals of the Draft Plan is to further identify and preserve the social heritage resources within the proposed Draft Plan Area, including individual structures and districts. Social heritage landscapes include resources that pertain to specific social and cultural movements or to groups that have made a contribution to the broad patterns of the city's history. These include the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered, and questioning/queer (LGBTQ) community and the Filipino community, which have long histories and established cultural traditions in the Draft Plan Area. To recognize, protect, and memorialize these resources, the Draft Plan proposes adoption of Filipino (SoMa Filipinas) and LGBTQ Special Use Districts.

Historic Preservation

Multiple opportunities exist within the Draft Plan Area for the adaptive reuse and rehabilitation of existing buildings, both formally designated historic resources and structures that could be deemed eligible for formal designation. In addition to applying the nationally recognized *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* to minimize impacts of reusing and rehabilitating these structures, policies and objectives of the Draft Plan, along with its associated Design Standards, if adopted, could be applied in order to minimize impacts on historic and identified social heritage resources.

The Design Standards identify standards for the adaptive reuse of historic structures, as well as in-fill development in the National and California Register-eligible Western SoMa Light Industrial and Residential Historic District. The purpose of the Design Standards is to maintain the integrity of the eligible historic district and provide guidance for projects proposed within the Draft Plan Area boundaries. The Design Standards are divided into three subsections; 1) Standards for Façade Alterations, 2) Design Standards for Additions to Historic Properties, and 3) Design Standards for New Infill Construction. These three guidelines apply to the individually-significant and contributing resources within the eligible historic district. These Design Standards are based on the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings* (Secretary's Standards). The Secretary's Standards provide guidance for working with historic properties, and have been adopted by the Historic Preservation Commission to evaluate proposed rehabilitative work on historic properties.

Open Space

Although the Western SoMa community has access to large spaces for recreation outside the Draft Plan Area, such as the waterfront and Yerba Buena Gardens, it lacks neighborhood parks to serve Draft Plan Area residents. The Draft Plan does not identify specific parks or recreational facilities that would be developed as part of the rezoning effort but does seek to address deficiencies in open space and recreational facility space through various goals and implementation measures. The Draft Plan also calls for improving existing open space, while partnering with private development in the creation of privately owned but publicly accessible open spaces, such as gardens and roofs. The Draft Plan would be implemented in line with the principles and guidelines of the Better Streets Plan and SoMa Alley Improvement Program. The Draft Plan calls for the San Francisco Department of Public Works (DPW) to coordinate with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) to facilitate future improvements to Western SoMa's public amenities such as alleys, sidewalks, stoops, corners, and interior paths, thereby breaking up the large scale of the existing blocks and parcels. Some of these improvements, described above under "Transportation and the Street Network," are analyzed in Section 4.E, Transportation and Circulation, and are part of the overall project analyzed in this EIR. The Draft Plan calls for coordinating new development fees with other agencies so that funds can be appropriately delegated and also calls for maintaining new and existing parks and open spaces.

Other Draft Plan Elements

The Draft Plan contains a number of other elements that are intended to improve the social and economic conditions within the Draft Plan Area but are not expected to result in direct impacts on the physical environment. They include preserving and encouraging arts and entertainment; providing community facilities (such as human service, child care, education, cultural institutions, recreational facilities, etc.); emphasizing the diverse neighborhood economy and balancing this with growing pressures to provide additional housing; and increasing safety and public welfare by, among other things, encouraging uses that have a meaningful connection to the community and have "eyes on the street."

Draft Plan's Relationship to Other Plans and Regulations

The proposed *Western SoMa Community Plan* is intended to be adopted as an element of the *San Francisco General Plan*, and would replace the 1990 South of Market Plan in the Draft Plan Area. The Draft Plan also includes an "implementation package" that would entail revisions to the Planning Code, changes to the Planning Code's Zoning Maps (including height and bulk maps and, potentially, maps of special use districts and/or preservation districts), and changes to the text and maps of the *San Francisco General Plan*.

Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels

The second component of the Proposed Project is the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels, a "cleanup" rezoning of 46 parcels comprising 36 lots adjacent to the Draft Plan Area. The Adjacent Parcels are located on the south side of Mission Street, between Seventh and 11th Streets. The Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would reconcile the use districts of these parcels with those of the neighboring properties and make them consistent with the zoning of the opposing block façades. The existing zoning of the Adjacent Parcels is Heavy Commercial (C-M) and SLR. Under the Proposed Project, the Adjacent Parcels would be rezoned as

downtown General Commercial (C-3-G) along the south side of Mission Street between Ninth and 11th Streets and Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Office (MUO) along the south side of Mission Street between Seventh and Ninth Streets. No changes in existing height and bulk limits would occur. The Adjacent Parcels are not included in the Draft Plan Area because the Draft Plan Area coincides with the adopted Western SoMa SUD.

350 Eighth Street Project

The third component of the Proposed Project is the implementation of a mixed-use project consisting of residential, commercial, light-industrial, and arts-related uses at 350 Eighth Street, on a parcel surrounded by Harrison, Eighth, Ringold, and Gordon Streets (within the Draft Plan Area). The 350 Eighth Street parcel (Block 3756, Lots 3 and 15) is approximately 144,000 square feet (3.3 acres) in size and is currently used by the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway, and Transportation District as a bus parking and inspection yard. It is occupied by a large paved lot and three small, single-story structures, which would be demolished to accommodate the proposed mixed-use development. (Golden Gate Transit buses would move to a lot under the Interstate 80 freeway as part of the new Transit Center project.)

Proposed Land Uses

The 350 Eighth Street project site would be redeveloped with approximately 444 dwelling units, approximately 33,650 square feet of commercial space, approximately 8,150 square feet of loft-style space suitable for light industrial use and artists' studios, and approximately 1,350 square feet of community space. The commercial uses would be located on the ground level in buildings along Harrison and Eighth Streets and on four levels of a building at the corner of Harrison and Gordon Street, while the light industrial and art-related uses would be located on lower levels in buildings along Gordon Street. Residential uses would take up the majority of the 350 Eighth Street project site and would be located within multiple levels and buildings, including structures in the middle of the block. The project would also include about 14,172 square feet of open space, parts of which (including a small pocket park at the intersection of Eighth and Ringold Streets) would be publicly accessible. The proposed community center would be south of and next to the pocket park. The proposed project would include seven buildings ranging from four to six stories, or 53 to 65 feet tall, distributed around and within an oval-shaped internal roadway. Off-street parking, primarily below grade, would accommodate approximately 436 vehicles.

Proposed Access

Pedestrian access to the project site would be available on all sides. Access to the project's below-grade parking would be via ramps from Harrison Street. Auto access to a proposed internal driveway within the project site would be from a two-way driveway on Eighth Street (with an additional driveway on Harrison Street). A small number of individual garage spaces would have access from Ringold Street. Two truck loading spaces and four van loading spaces would be provided within the internal roadway. These spaces would be on-street and therefore would not be enclosed.

Proposed Architectural Style and Landscaping

The proposed buildings would be constructed in a contemporary style intended to embrace the existing aesthetic of the surrounding buildings. The project would require excavation of approximately 64,050 cubic yards of soil to accommodate the below-grade garage level that would encompass the entire project site.

As currently proposed, the buildings that would comprise the 350 Eighth Street project would be finished with a variety of exterior materials that would divide the façades both vertically and horizontally into smaller visual elements. Exterior materials would include cement plaster (stucco), wood siding, painted metal panels, and various forms of glazing, including areas of glass curtain wall (glass surface covering structural framing) on all four street façades, translucent glass covering the ground floor at the corner of Eighth and Harrison Streets, and fritted (frosted or otherwise etched or marked) glass that would clad the commercial building at the corner of Harrison and Gordon Streets. The proposed project would include street trees, in accordance with Planning Code requirements, and landscaping around the internal roadway and also within courtyards in the center of the project site.

Zoning and Relationship to Draft Plan

The 350 Eighth Street parcel is within a SLR use district, which allows the mix of uses proposed by the project, some requiring a CU authorization. As part of the *Western SoMa Community Plan*, this parcel would be rezoned to W SoMa MUG, which would also allow residential, smaller neighborhood-serving retail, office, light industrial, and arts-related uses, some permitted as principal uses and others requiring a CU authorization. The project sponsor would seek a Planning Code Section 134(e) rear yard modification, and CU authorization for parking and the community center use.

● The project site is also within a 40-X height and bulk district (40-foot height limit, no bulk limit). Under the Draft Plan, the site would be reclassified to 55-X/65-B height and bulk classification. The tallest proposed buildings would be 65 feet, consistent with the proposed height classification.

If the *Western SoMa Community Plan* were not adopted as proposed, the 350 Eighth Street site would remain within the existing SLR use district and existing 40-X height and bulk district. The proposed residential, commercial, and art-related uses and density would be allowed in the SLR district. In this circumstance, however, the 350 Eighth Street project would require a height reclassification (text and map amendments) to allow for the proposed building heights of up to 65 feet. The project would also require exceptions from rear yard and open space requirements, absent implementation of the Draft Plan.

Construction and Occupancy

The construction of the 350 Eighth Street project is expected to begin in 2013 and would be completed in approximately 36 months. Occupancy is anticipated in 2016.

Approvals Required

Implementation of the Proposed Project would require the following approvals and other actions (with acting bodies shown in *italics*).

Approvals Required for All Project Components

- Adoption of CEQA findings. (*Planning Commission*)

Approvals Required for *Western SoMa Community Plan*

- Amendment of the *San Francisco General Plan* to conform to the concepts of the *Western SoMa Community Plan*, as outlined above. (*Planning Commission recommendation; Board of Supervisors approval*)
- Determination of consistency of the Draft Plan and accompanying new and revised use and height and bulk districts and bulk districts (implementing rezoning) with the *San Francisco General Plan* and Planning Code Section 101.1 Priority Policies. (*Planning Commission*)
- Amendment of the Planning Code and the Zoning Maps to change mapped use districts and height limits throughout the *Western SoMa Community Plan Area*. (*Planning Commission recommendation; Board of Supervisors approval*)
- Adoption of *Design Standards for Western SoMa Special Use District*. (*Planning Commission recommendation; Board of Supervisors approval*)
- Adoption of Filipino (SoMa Filipinas) and LGBTQ Special Use Districts. (*Planning Commission recommendation; Board of Supervisors approval*)
- Amendment of the Administrative Code to include a Western SoMa Implementation Matrix. (*Planning Commission recommendation; Board of Supervisors approval*)
- Adoption of the *Western SoMa Community Stabilization Policy*. (*Planning Commission recommendation; Board of Supervisors approval*)

Approvals Required for Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels

- Determination of consistency with the *San Francisco General Plan* and Planning Code Section 101.1 Priority Policies. (*Planning Commission*)
- Amendment of the Planning Code and the Zoning Maps to change mapped use districts for the Adjacent Parcels. (*Planning Commission recommendation; Board of Supervisors approval*)

Approvals Required for 350 Eighth Street Project

- CU and/or Section 329 authorization for large site development requirements, with exceptions for height extending to 65 feet, rear yard configuration, unenclosed loading, and parking exceeding principally permitted amounts. (*Planning Commission*)
- National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Activity Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Runoff Associated with Construction Activity. (*Regional Water Quality Control Board*)
- Demolition and building permits. (*Department of Building Inspection*)
- Approval of new water, sewer, and street light utility connections. (*San Francisco Public Utilities Commission*)
- Approval of any proposed curb or street modifications. (*Sustainable Streets Division of San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [MTA]*)

- In the absence of adoption of the *Draft Plan* and associated Planning Code and Zoning Map amendment adoptions, the project sponsors of 350 Eighth Street Project would be required to obtain a site-specific height increase. (*Planning Commission recommendation; Board of Supervisors approval*)

B. Project-Level and Program-Level Analysis

This EIR contains both “program”-level EIR analysis pursuant to CEQA *Guidelines* Section 15168 and project-level EIR analysis. A program EIR is appropriate for a project that will involve a series of actions that are (1) related geographically, (2) logical parts in a chain of contemplated actions, (3) connected as part of a continuing program, and (4) carried out under the same authorizing statute or regulatory authority and have similar environmental impacts that can be mitigated in similar ways (CEQA *Guidelines* Section 15168). The use of a program EIR allows the Lead Agency (the San Francisco Planning Department, on behalf of the City) to provide an occasion for a more exhaustive consideration of effects and alternatives than would be practical in an EIR on an individual action; ensures consideration of cumulative impacts that might be slighted in a case-by-case analysis; avoids duplicative reconsideration of basic policy considerations; allows the Lead Agency to consider broad policy alternatives and program-wide mitigation measure at an early time, when the agency has greater flexibility to deal with basic problems or cumulative impacts, and allows for a reduction in paperwork. Accordingly, this EIR studies the Draft Plan (including the proposed transportation and streetscape improvements) and the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels at a programmatic level of review, presenting reasonable assumptions about the overall types and levels of activities that the City anticipates under the *Western SoMa Community Plan* and the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels and describing their associated environmental impacts.

The EIR includes project-level analysis of the 350 Eighth Street project, which focuses on the development application for the 350 Eighth Street project submitted to the San Francisco Planning Department by Archstone on September 30, 2011.⁴ As such, this EIR also contains more detailed analysis to specifically address the effects associated with this individual proposal.

Components in the Proposed Project have been classified in the following categories for the purpose of the environmental review:

- *Components analyzed at the program level:* Land use and zoning controls that involve changes to the Planning Code and the *San Francisco General Plan* (General Plan); implementation of the *Design Standards for Western SoMa Special Use District*; implementation of transportation and streetscape improvements #5 through #7 proposed as part of the Draft Plan (see discussion above under “Draft Western SoMa Community Plan”).
- *Components analyzed at the project level:* 350 Eighth Street project and implementation of transportation and streetscape improvements #1 through #4 proposed as part of the Draft Plan (see discussion above under “Draft Western SoMa Community Plan”).

⁴ Although an Environmental Evaluation application for the 350 Eighth Street project was submitted in 2009, the 350 Eighth Street project has been revised since that date. Therefore, this EIR relies on the architectural plans submitted to the San Francisco Planning Department as part of the Conditional Use authorization submittal on September 30, 2011.

C. Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This EIR analyzes the potential environmental effects of the proposed *Western SoMa Community Plan*, Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels, and 350 Eighth Street project, as identified in the Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (NOP), issued August 11, 2009 (Appendix A of this EIR).

Table S-1 on p. S-12 presents a summary of the significant adverse environmental effects (“significant impacts” or “significant effects”) and mitigation measures identified in the EIR for the Draft Plan and Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels, along with mitigation measures identified to reduce those impacts to less-than-significant levels, where applicable. **Table S-2** on p. S-52 provides the same information for the proposed 350 Eighth Street project.

There are several measures required by law that would serve to avoid potential significant impacts; they are summarized here for informational purposes. These measures include prohibition on the 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 Planning Code Section 139, Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings; compliance with Section 3424 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 Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) safety requirements related to handling and disposal of other hazardous materials, such as asbestos. Because compliance with existing law would obviate any potential impacts related to the above issues, neither significant impacts nor mitigation measures are identified in connection with these issues.

D. Significant Unavoidable Impacts

In accordance with Section 21067 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Sections 15040, 15081, and 15082 of the CEQA *Guidelines*, the purpose of this section is to identify impacts that could not be eliminated or reduced to less-than-significant levels by mitigation measures included as part of the Proposed Project, or by other mitigation measures that could be implemented, as included in Chapter 4, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures. This section is subject to final determination by the San Francisco Planning Commission as part of the CEQA finding for the EIR. If necessary, this chapter will be revised in the Final EIR to reflect the findings of the Planning Commission.

Cultural and Paleontological Resources

- Impact CP-1:** The implementation of the Draft Plan and Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels (individually and in combination) could indirectly result in the demolition of individual historic architectural resources or contributing resources to a historic district located in the Project Area, causing a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.
- Impact C-CP-1:** The implementation of the Draft Plan and Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, could encourage a development trend of demolition and alteration of historical resources, contributing considerably to significant cumulative historical resources impacts.

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
A. Land Use			
LU-1: Neither the implementation of the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would divide an established community.	LTS	None required.	
LU-2: Neither the implementation of the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would have a substantial impact on the existing character of the vicinity.	LTS	None required.	
C-LU: The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact on land use.	LTS	None required.	
B. Aesthetics			
AE-1: Neither the implementation of the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would substantially damage scenic resources or other features of the built or natural environment that contribute to a scenic public setting, or substantially degrade the existing visual character of the Project Area.	LTS	None required.	
AE-2: Neither the implementation of the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would substantially alter the public views currently experienced within the Project Area or have a substantial adverse effect on any scenic vistas.	LTS	None required.	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
B. Aesthetics (cont.)			
AE-3: Neither the implementation of the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would create new sources of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the vicinity of the Project Area, or that would substantially affect other people or properties.	LTS	None required.	
C-AE: The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact on visual resources.	LTS	None required.	
C. Population and Housing			
PH-1: Neither the implementation of the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would induce substantial population growth, either directly or indirectly.	LTS	None required.	
PH-2: Neither the implementation of the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would displace a large number of housing units or people or necessitate the construction of replacement housing.	LTS	None required.	
C-PH: The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to cumulative impact on population and housing.	LTS	None required.	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
D. Cultural and Paleontological Resources			
<p>CP-1: The implementation of the Draft Plan and Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels (individually and in combination) could indirectly result in the demolition of individual historic architectural resources or contributing resources to a historic district located in the Project Area, causing a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA <i>Guidelines</i> Section 15064.5.</p>	SUM	<p>M-CP-1a: Documentation of a Historical Resource. To document the buildings more effectively, sponsors of individual projects that would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource through demolition shall prepare Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS)-level photographs and an accompanying HABS Historical Report, which shall be maintained onsite, as well as in the appropriate repositories. The contents of the report shall include an architectural description, historical context, and statement of significance, per HABS Historical Report Standards. The report shall be reviewed by the San Francisco Planning Department's Preservation staff for completeness. In addition, copies of the photographs and report shall be made available to the following repositories, at minimum: San Francisco History Center at the San Francisco Public Library, San Francisco Architectural Heritage, and the San Francisco Planning Department. This mitigation measure would create a collection of preservation materials that would be available to the public and inform future research. In this way, documentation of the affected properties and presentation of the findings to the community could reduce the impact on historical resources. Although implementation of this mitigation measure may reduce impacts on historical resources, it would not lessen the effects to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>M-CP-1b: Oral Histories. For projects that would demolish a historical resource for which Planning Department preservation staff determined that such a measure would be effective and feasible, the project sponsor shall undertake an oral history project that includes interviews of people such as residents, past owners, or former employees. The project shall be conducted by a professional historian in conformance with the Oral History Association's Principles and Standards (http://alpha.dickinson.edu/oha/pub_eg.html). In addition to transcripts of the interviews, the oral history project shall include a narrative project summary report containing an introduction to the project, a methodology description, and brief summaries of each conducted interview. Copies of the completed oral history project shall be submitted to the San Francisco Public Library or other interested historical institution. Although implementation of this mitigation measure may reduce impacts on historical resources, it is not expected to lessen the effects to less-than-significant levels.</p>	SUM

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
D. Cultural and Paleontological Resources (cont.)			
CP-1 (cont.)		M-CP-1c: Interpretive Program. For projects that would demolish a historical resource for which Planning Department preservation staff determined that such a measure would be effective and feasible, the project sponsor shall work with a Historic Preservation Technical Specialist or other qualified professional to institute an interpretive program on-site that references the property's history and the contribution of the historical resource to the broader neighborhood or historic district. An example of an interpretive program may be the creation of historical exhibits, incorporating a display featuring historic photos of the affected resource and a description of its historical significance, in a publicly accessible location on the project site. Although implementation of this mitigation measure may reduce impacts on historical resources, it is not expected to lessen the effects to less-than-significant levels.	
CP-2: Neither the implementation of the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would lead to the construction of incompatible new buildings adjacent to, or major alterations of, historic architectural resources in the Project Area, or those immediately adjacent to it, and no substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA <i>Guidelines</i> Section 15064.5 would occur.	LTS	None required.	
CP-3: The Draft Plan would result in streetscape improvements within a historic district, but would not affect the district's integrity of setting in a way that could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA <i>Guidelines</i> Section 15064.5.	LTS	None required.	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
D. Cultural and Paleontological Resources (cont.)			
<p>CP-4: Neither the implementation of the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to CEQA <i>Guidelines</i> Section 15064.5.</p>	SM	<p>M-CP-4a: Project-Specific Preliminary Archeological Assessment. Project sponsors wishing to obtain building permits from the City are required to undergo environmental review pursuant to CEQA. The San Francisco Planning Department, as the Lead Agency, requires an evaluation of the potential archeological effects of a proposed individual project. Pursuant to this evaluation, the San Francisco Planning Department has established a review procedure that may include the following actions, carried out by the Department archeologist or by a qualified archeological consultant, as retained by the project sponsor.</p> <p>This archeological mitigation measure may apply to any project involving any soils-disturbing or soils-improving activities including excavation, utilities installation, grading, soils remediation, compaction/chemical grouting to a depth of five (5) feet or greater below ground surface and located within those properties within the Draft Plan Area or on the Adjacent Parcels for which no archeological assessment report has been prepared.</p> <p>Projects to which this mitigation measure applies shall be subject to Preliminary Archeology Review (PAR) by the San Francisco Planning Department archeologist, or a Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Study (PASS) shall be prepared by an archeological consultant with from the pool of qualified archeological consultants maintained by the Planning Department archeologist. The PASS shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine the historical uses of the project site based on any previous archeological documentation and Sanborn maps; • 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 on the California Register; • Determine if 19th or 20th century soils-disturbing activities may have adversely affected the identified potential archeological resources; • Assess potential project effects in relation to the depth of any identified potential archeological resource; • Provide a conclusion that assesses whether any California Register-eligible archeological resources could be adversely affected by the proposed project and recommends appropriate further action. 	LTS

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
D. Cultural and Paleontological Resources (cont.)			
CP-4 (cont.)		<p>Based on the PAR or PASS, the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) shall determine if an Archeological Research Design Treatment Plan (ARDTP) shall be required to more definitively identify the potential for California Register-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 ARDTP shall be determined in consultation with the ERO and consistent with the standards for archeological documentation established by the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) for purposes of compliance with CEQA (OHP <i>Preservation Planning Bulletin</i> No. 5).</p> <p>M-CP-4b: Procedures for Accidental Discovery of Archeological Resources. This mitigation measure is required to avoid any potential adverse effect on accidentally discovered buried or submerged historical resources as defined in <i>CEQA Guidelines</i> Section 15064.5(a)(c).</p> <p>The project sponsor shall distribute the San Francisco Planning Department archeological resource “ALERT” sheet to the project prime contractor; to any project subcontractor (including demolition, excavation, grading, foundation, pile driving, etc. firms); and to utilities firms involved in soils-disturbing activities within the project site. Prior to any soils-disturbing activities being undertaken, each contractor is responsible for ensuring that the “ALERT” sheet is circulated to all field personnel, including machine operators, field crew, pile drivers, and supervisory personnel. The project sponsor shall provide the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) with a signed affidavit from the responsible parties (prime contractor, subcontractor(s), and utilities firms) to the ERO confirming that all field personnel have received copies of the “ALERT” sheet.</p> <p>Should any indication of an archeological resource be encountered during any soils-disturbing activity of the project, the project head foreman and/or project sponsor shall immediately notify the ERO and shall immediately suspend any soils-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the discovery until the ERO has determined what additional measures should be undertaken.</p>	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
D. Cultural and Paleontological Resources (cont.)			
CP-4 (cont.)		<p>If the ERO determines that an archeological resource may be present within the project site, the project sponsor shall retain the services of an archeological consultant from the pool of qualified archeological consultants maintained by the San Francisco Planning Department archeologist. The archeological consultant shall advise the ERO as to whether the discovery is an archeological resource, retains sufficient integrity, and is of potential scientific/historical/cultural significance. If an archeological resource is present, the archeological consultant shall identify and evaluate the archeological resource. The archeological consultant shall make a recommendation as to what action, if any, is warranted. Based on this information, the ERO may require, if warranted, specific additional measures to be implemented by the project sponsor.</p> <p>Measures might include preservation in situ of the archeological resource, an archeological monitoring program, or an archeological testing program. If an archeological monitoring program or archeological testing program is required, it shall be consistent with the Environmental Planning (EP) division guidelines for such programs. The ERO may also require that the project sponsor immediately implement a site security program if the archeological resource is at risk from vandalism, looting, or other damaging actions.</p> <p>The project archeological consultant shall submit a Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archeological resource and describes the archeological and historical research methods employed in the archeological monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the final report.</p> <p>Copies of the Draft FARR shall be sent to the ERO for review and approval. Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one copy and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Environmental Planning Division of the Planning Department shall receive one bound copy, one unbound copy, and one unlocked, searchable PDF copy on a CD of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National</p>	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
D. Cultural and Paleontological Resources (cont.)			
CP-4 (cont.)		Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest or interpretive value, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution from that presented above.	
CP-5: Neither the implementation of the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature.	LTS	None required.	
CP-6: Neither the implementation of the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	LTS	None required.	
CP-7: Construction activity in the Draft Plan Area and/or on the Adjacent Parcels would not result in substantial damage to historic architectural resources.	SM	M-CP-7a: Protect Historical Resources from Adjacent Construction Activities. The project sponsor of a development project in the Draft Plan Area and on the Adjacent Parcels shall consult with Planning Department environmental planning/preservation staff to determine whether adjacent or nearby buildings constitute historical resources that could be adversely affected by construction-generated vibration. For purposes of this measure, nearby historic buildings shall include those within 100 feet of a construction site if pile driving would be used in a subsequent development project; otherwise, it shall include historic buildings within 25 feet if heavy equipment would be used on the subsequent development project. (No measures need be applied if no heavy equipment would be employed.) If one or more historical resources is identified that could be adversely affected, the project sponsor shall incorporate into construction specifications for the proposed project a requirement that the construction contractor(s) use all feasible means to avoid damage to adjacent and nearby historic buildings. Such methods may include maintaining a safe distance between the construction site and the historic buildings (as identified by the Planning Department preservation staff), using construction techniques that reduce vibration, appropriate excavation shoring methods to prevent movement of adjacent structures, and providing adequate security to minimize risks of vandalism and fire.	LTS

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
D. Cultural and Paleontological Resources (cont.)			
CP-7 (cont.)		<p>M-CP-7b: Construction Monitoring Program for Historical Resources. For those historical resources identified in Mitigation Measure M-CP-7a, and where heavy equipment would be used on a subsequent development project, the project sponsor of such a project shall undertake a monitoring program to minimize damage to adjacent historic buildings and to ensure that any such damage is documented and repaired. The monitoring program, which shall apply within 100 feet where pile driving would be used and within 25 feet otherwise, shall include the following components. Prior to the start of any ground-disturbing activity, the project sponsor shall engage a historic architect or qualified historic preservation professional to undertake a pre-construction survey of historical resource(s) identified by the San Francisco Planning Department within 125 feet of planned construction to document and photograph the buildings' existing conditions. Based on the construction and condition of the resource(s), the consultant shall also establish a maximum vibration level that shall not be exceeded at each building, based on existing condition, character-defining features, soils conditions, and anticipated construction practices (a common standard is 0.2 inch per second, peak particle velocity). To ensure that vibration levels do not exceed the established standard, the project sponsor shall monitor vibration levels at each structure and shall prohibit vibratory construction activities that generate vibration levels in excess of the standard.</p> <p>Should vibration levels be observed in excess of the standard, construction shall be halted and alternative construction techniques put in practice, to the extent feasible. (For example, pre-drilled piles could be substituted for driven piles, if feasible based on soils conditions; smaller, lighter equipment might be able to be used in some cases.) The consultant shall conduct regular periodic inspections of each building during ground-disturbing activity on the project site. Should damage to either building occur, the building(s) shall be remediated to its pre-construction condition at the conclusion of ground-disturbing activity on the site.</p>	
C-CP-1: The implementation of the Draft Plan and Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, could encourage a development	SUM	Implement Mitigation Measures M-CP-1a , Documentation of a Historical Resource, Mitigation Measure M-CP-1b , Oral Histories, and Mitigation Measure M-CP-1c , Interpretive Program.	SUM

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
D. Cultural and Paleontological Resources (cont.)			
trend of demolition and alteration of historical resources, contributing considerably to significant cumulative historical resources impacts.			
C-CP-3: The Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 and/or human remains, and therefore would not contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact.	SM	Implement Mitigation Measure M-CP-4a , Project-Specific Preliminary Archeological Assessment; Mitigation Measure M-CP-4b , Procedures for Accidental Discovery of Archeological Resources; and Mitigation Measure M-CP-9 , Archeological Testing Plan.	LTS
E. Transportation and Circulation			
TR-1a: The Draft Plan would cause levels of service at the intersection of Fifth/Bryant/I-80 Eastbound on-ramp to deteriorate during the p.m. peak hour, thereby conflicting with an applicable congestion management program that establishes measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.	SU	None feasible.	
TR-1b: The Draft Plan would cause levels of service at the intersection of Sixth/Brannan/I-280 ramps to deteriorate during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours, thereby conflicting with an applicable congestion management program that establishes measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.	SU	None feasible.	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
E. Transportation and Circulation (cont.)			
TR-1c: The Draft Plan would cause levels of service at the intersection of Eighth/Harrison/I-80 Westbound off-ramp to deteriorate during the p.m. peak hour, thereby conflicting with an applicable congestion management program that establishes measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.	SUM	<p>M-TR-1c: Optimization of Signal Timing at the Eighth/Harrison/I-80 Westbound off-Ramp Intersection. The signal timing at Eighth/Harrison/I-80 Westbound off-ramp intersection during the weekday p.m. peak period shall be optimized by changing the signal cycle from 60 to 90 seconds and implementing signal timing durations similar to those at the intersection of Fifth/Harrison/I-80 Westbound off-ramp. With implementation of this mitigation measure, the intersection would operate at LOS D during the p.m. peak hour, thereby reducing impacts at this intersection to a less-than significant-level. Implementation of this mitigation measure would be the responsibility of MTA and would require coordination with Caltrans to ensure that I-80 off-ramp operations and upstream or downstream intersections are not adversely affected.</p> <p>I-TR-1: Transportation Demand Management Strategies for Future Development Projects. To reduce vehicle trip generation by subsequent development projects in the Draft Plan Area and on Adjacent Parcels, those such projects that would generate more than 3,500 daily vehicle trips, or would emit criteria pollutants in excess of one or more applicable significance thresholds, as determined by the Environmental Review Officer, shall develop and implement a Transportation Demand Management plan as part of project approval.</p> <p>TDM strategies identified in the TDM plan shall include a minimum of the following, or other measures, as determined applicable by the Planning Department, applicable to the proposed project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify on-site transportation manager who would be responsible for orienting new residents or employees about transportation options, updating transportation information at display/kiosk, coordination of ridesharing, provision of transit passes, etc; • Include in the price of rental/Home Owners Association fee a monthly Muni Fast Pass; • Provide a transportation kiosk/display in commercial or residential lobby, or other highly visible location, with regularly updated information about transportation choices; • Provide and maintain pool of bicycles for building residents; • Provide on-site bicycle rental/loaner bicycles to retail/commercial employees and hotel guests for local travel; 	SUM

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
E. Transportation and Circulation (cont.)			
TR-1c (cont.)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide additional Class 1 bicycle parking spaces for resident or retail/commercial employee use; • Provide bicycle parking (valet or Class 1 secure parking) for hotel guests; • Provide Class 2 bicycle parking for retail/commercial and residential visitor use; • Require retail/commercial employees to pay for on-site parking; • Reduce amount of on-site vehicle parking for retail/commercial and residential land uses; • Provide information on website (e.g., retail and/or commercial businesses, museums, hotels) about how to access the building via transit, walking, and bicycling; • Provide on-site, and/or with reservation sale of one, three, and seven-day Muni Passports and/or pre-loaded Clipper Cards for hotels; and/or • Offer other transit, ridesharing, bicycling, and walking incentives for employees. 	
TR-1d: The Draft Plan would not cause levels of service at 17 out of the 20 local intersections to deteriorate, and would therefore not conflict with any applicable congestion management programs, plans, ordinances or policies establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system at those locations.	LTS	None required.	
TR-1e: Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would not cause levels of service at any of the local intersections to deteriorate, and would therefore not conflict with any applicable congestion management programs, plans, ordinances or policies establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.	LTS	None required.	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
E. Transportation and Circulation (cont.)			
TR-2: Neither the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would cause exceedance of the capacity utilization standards for Muni lines or regional transit providers, or cause a substantial increase in delays or operating costs; thus, neither the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.	LTS	None required.	
TR-3: Neither the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would result in a loading demand that could not be accommodated within on-site and nearby on-street loading facilities; thus, neither the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.	LTS	None required.	
TR-4: The Draft Plan's proposed transportation system improvements would remove on-street loading spaces along Folsom Street that could be located nearby, but would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.	SM	M-TR-4: Provision of New Loading Spaces on Folsom Street. This mitigation measure shall apply to any removal of yellow commercial vehicle freight loading spaces, assuming that the need for the truck loading spaces remains at the locations where these truck loading spaces would be removed. To avoid any potential adverse effect from the sidewalk extensions and bulb-out improvements on loading, the project sponsors of individual projects within the Project Area shall coordinate with MTA to install new loading spaces, of equal length, on the same block and side-of-the-street at locations where yellow commercial vehicle loading spaces are removed. This would ensure that an equally convenient supply of on-street loading would be provided to compensate for any space that would be removed. With implementation of the mitigation measure, the impact on loading operations on Folsom Street would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.	LTS

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
E. Transportation and Circulation (cont.)			
TR-5: The Draft Plan's proposed transportation system improvements would remove on-street loading spaces along 12 th Street that could not be located nearby and would thereby result in potential conflicts between trucks and other traffic.	SU	None feasible.	
TR-6: Neither the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would result in inadequate emergency access.	LTS	None required.	
TR-7: Neither the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.	LTS	None required.	
TR-8: Construction under the Draft Plan and Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels, including construction of individual future projects, would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.	LTS	None required.	
C-TR-1a: The Draft Plan, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects would cause levels of service at local intersections to deteriorate and would conflict with an applicable congestion management programs as well as plans, ordinances or policies establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.	SUM	Implement Mitigation Measure M-TR-1c , Optimization of Signal Timing at the Eighth/Harrison/I-80 Westbound Off-Ramp Intersection.	SUM

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
E. Transportation and Circulation (cont.)			
C-TR-1b: The Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels and/or 350 Eighth Street project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects would not cause levels of service at local intersections to deteriorate and would not conflict with an applicable congestion management programs as well as plans, ordinances or policies establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.	LTS	None required.	
C-TR-2: The Draft Plan, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would contribute considerably to exceedance of the capacity utilization standards for Muni under cumulative conditions.	SUM	<p>M-C-TR-2: Impose Development Impact Fees to Offset Transit Impacts. Additional transit capacity would be required in order to reduce the corridor impacts identified above for the Draft Plan, and reduce capacity utilization to levels below the 85 percent capacity utilization threshold. In order to increase capacity, however, additional funding would have to be identified, either from public or private sources, or a combination, thereof, potentially including project sponsors of individual development projects within the Draft Plan Area. Sponsors of development projects within the Draft Plan Area could be subject to a fair share fee that would pay for augmenting transit capacity. These funds would be used to purchase and operate additional transit vehicles, or if necessary, to reduce the corridor impacts, execute large-scale upgrades to transit network capacity.</p> <p>Adoption of the <i>Western SoMa Community Plan</i> is anticipated to be accompanied by development impact fees, such as those adopted for the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan and Market/Octavia Area Plan. Funds are expected to be generated from a delineated portion of the impact fees that would be generated with implementation of the Draft Plan. However, it is not known whether or how much additional funding would be generated for transit service improvements, and no other definite funding sources have been identified. As a result, the Draft Plan's contribution to the 2030 Cumulative capacity utilization exceedances for Muni operations would remain significant and unavoidable.</p>	SUM

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
E. Transportation and Circulation (cont.)			
C-TR-3: The Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not cause exceedance of the capacity utilization standards for Muni lines or regional transit providers.	LTS	None required.	
F. Noise and Vibration			
NO-1: Neither the implementation of the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the <i>San Francisco General Plan</i> or Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the Police Code) or result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels, nor would the Project Area be substantially affected by existing noise levels as a result of these project components.	SM	<p>M-NO-1a: Interior Noise Levels for Residential Uses. For new development including noise-sensitive uses located along streets with noise levels above 60 dBA (Ldn), 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 of future individual developments within the Project Area 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 <i>San Francisco General Plan</i> Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Community Noise to reduce potential interior noise levels to the maximum extent feasible. Additional noise attenuation features may need to be incorporated into the building design where noise levels exceed 70 dBA (Ldn) to ensure that acceptable interior noise levels can be achieved.</p> <p>M-NO-1b: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses. To reduce potential conflicts between existing noise-generating uses and new sensitive receptors, for new residential development and development that includes other noise-sensitive uses (primarily, residences, and also including schools and child care, religious, and convalescent facilities and the like), the San Francisco 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 average and maximum noise level readings taken so as to be able to accurately describe maximum levels reached during nighttime hours) 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</p>	LTS

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
F. Noise and Vibration (cont.)			
NO-1 (cont.)		<p>certainty that Title 24 standards, where applicable, can be met, and that there are no particular circumstances about the individual project site that appear to warrant heightened concern about noise levels in the vicinity. Should the Planning Department conclude that such concerns be present, the San Francisco Planning 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.</p> <p>M-NO-1c: 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 24-hour average, in the proposed project site vicinity, the San Francisco Planning Department shall require the preparation of an analysis that includes, at a minimum, a site survey to identify potential noise-sensitive uses (primarily, residences, and also including schools and child care, religious, and convalescent facilities and the like) within two blocks 900 feet of, and that have a direct line-of-sight to, the project site, and at least one 24-hour noise measurement (with average and maximum noise level readings taken so as to be able to accurately describe maximum levels reached during nighttime hours), 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 San Francisco General Plan and Police Code Section 2909, that the proposed use would not adversely affect nearby noise-sensitive uses, and that there are no particular circumstances about the project site that appear to warrant heightened concern about noise levels that would be generated by the proposed use. Should the Planning Department conclude that such concerns be present, the San Francisco Planning 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, and may require implementation of site-specific noise reduction features or strategies.</p>	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
F. Noise and Vibration (cont.)			
NO-1 (cont.)		M-NO-1d: Open Space in Noisy Environments. To minimize effects on development in noisy areas, for new development including noise-sensitive uses (primarily, residences, and also including schools and child care, religious, and convalescent facilities and the like), the San Francisco Planning Department shall, through its building permit review process, in conjunction with noise analysis required pursuant to Mitigation Measure M-NO-1c, 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. Implementation of this measure shall be undertaken consistent with other principles of urban design.	
NO-2: Construction activities in the Draft Plan Area and on Adjacent Parcels would not expose persons to temporary increases in noise levels substantially in excess of ambient levels.	SM	<p>M-NO-2a: General Construction Noise Control Measures. To ensure that project noise from construction activities is minimized to the maximum extent feasible, the sponsor of a subsequent development project shall undertake the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sponsor of a subsequent development project shall require the general contractor to ensure that equipment and trucks used for project construction use the best available noise control techniques (e.g., improved mufflers, equipment redesign, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures and acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds, wherever feasible). • The sponsor of a subsequent development project shall require the general contractor to locate stationary noise sources (such as compressors) as far from adjacent or nearby sensitive receptors as possible, to muffle such noise sources, and to construct barriers around such sources and/or the construction site, which could reduce construction noise by as much as 5 dBA. To further reduce noise, the contractor shall locate stationary equipment in pit areas or excavated areas, if feasible. • The sponsor of a subsequent development project shall require the general contractor to use impact tools (e.g., jack hammers, pavement breakers, and rock drills) that are hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible to avoid 	LTS

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
F. Noise and Vibration (cont.)			
NO-2 (cont.)		<p>noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools. Where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust shall be used, along with external noise jackets on the tools, which could reduce noise levels by as much as 10 dBA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The sponsor of a subsequent development project shall include noise control requirements in specifications provided to construction contractors. Such requirements could include, but not be limited to, performing all work in a manner that minimizes noise to the extent feasible; undertaking the most noisy activities during times of least disturbance to surrounding residents and occupants, as feasible; and selecting haul routes that avoid residential buildings inasmuch as such routes are otherwise feasible. Prior to the issuance of each building permit, along with the submission of construction documents, the sponsor of a subsequent development project shall submit to the San Francisco Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection (DBI) a list of measures to respond to and track complaints pertaining to construction noise. These measures shall include: (1) a procedure and phone numbers for notifying DBI, the Department of Public Health, and the Police Department (during regular construction hours and off-hours); (2) a sign posted on-site describing noise complaint procedures and a complaint hotline number that shall be answered at all times during construction; (3) designation of an on-site construction complaint and enforcement manager for the project; and (4) notification of neighboring residents and non-residential building managers within 300 feet of the project construction area at least 30 days in advance of extreme noise-generating activities (defined as activities generating noise levels of 90 dBA or greater) about the estimated duration of the activity. <p>M-NO-2b: Noise Control Measures During Pile Driving. For individual projects within the Draft Plan Area and Adjacent Parcels that require pile driving, a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures shall be completed under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant. These attenuation measures shall include as many of the following control strategies as feasible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The sponsor of a subsequent development project shall require the construction contractor to erect temporary plywood noise barriers along the boundaries of 	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
F. Noise and Vibration (cont.)			
NO-2 (cont.)		<p>the project site to shield potential sensitive receptors and reduce noise levels by 5 to 10 dBA, although the precise reduction is a function of the height and distance of the barrier relative to receptors and noise source(s);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sponsor of a subsequent development project shall require the construction contractor to implement “quiet” pile-driving technology (such as pre-drilling of piles, sonic pile drivers, and the use of more than one pile driver to shorten the total pile driving duration), where feasible, in consideration of geotechnical and structural requirements and conditions; • The sponsor of a subsequent development project shall require the construction contractor to monitor the effectiveness of noise attenuation measures by taking noise measurements; and • The sponsor of a subsequent development project shall require that the construction contractor limit pile-driving activity to result in the least disturbance to neighboring uses. <p>Additionally, if pile driving would occur within proximity to historical resources, project sponsors would be required to incorporate Mitigation Measures M-CP-7a, Protect Historical Resources from Adjacent Construction Activities, and Mitigation Measure M-CP-7b, Construction Monitoring Program for Historical Resources, discussed in Section 4.D, Cultural and Paleontological Resources.</p>	
NO-3: Neither the implementation of the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would expose people to or generate excessive groundborne vibration.	SM	Implement Mitigation Measures M-NO-2a , General Construction Noise Control Measures, and Mitigation Measure M-NO-2b , Noise Control Measures During Pile Driving.	LTS
NO-4: The proposed street network improvements would not result in a substantial permanent, temporary, or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project Area above levels without these improvements.	LTS	None required.	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
F. Noise and Vibration (cont.)			
C-NO: The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would contribute considerably to a significant cumulative noise impact.	SUM	Implement the following: Mitigation Measures M-NO-1a , Interior Noise Levels for Residential Uses; Mitigation Measures M-NO-1b , Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses; Mitigation Measure M-NO-1c , Siting of Noise-Generating Uses; and Mitigation Measure M-NO-1d , Open Space in Noisy Environments.	SUM
G. Air Quality			
AQ-1: Neither the implementation of the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the <i>2010 Clean Air Plan</i> , violate an air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.	LTS	None required.	
AQ-2: Subsequent individual development projects in the Draft Plan Area and/or on the Adjacent Parcels (individually and in combination) could violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, and/or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.	SUM	<p>M-AQ-2: Transportation Demand Management Strategies for Future Development Projects. To reduce vehicle trip generation by subsequent development projects in the Draft Plan Area and on Adjacent Parcels, those such projects that would generate more than 3,500 daily vehicle trips, or would emit criteria pollutants in excess of one or more applicable significance thresholds, as determined by the Environmental Review Officer, shall develop and implement a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan as a requirement of project approval.</p> <p>TDM strategies identified in the TDM plan shall include at a minimum the following measures, or other equally or more effective measures, as determined applicable by the Planning Department:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify an on-site transportation manager who shall be responsible for orienting new residents or employees about transportation options, updating transportation information at display/kiosk, coordination of ridesharing, provision of transit passes, etc; 	SUM

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
G. Air Quality (cont.)			
AQ-2 (cont.)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include in the price of rental/Home Owners Association fee a monthly Muni Fast Pass; • Provide a transportation kiosk/display in the commercial or residential lobby, or other highly visible location, with regularly updated information about transportation choices; • Provide and maintain a pool of bicycles for building residents; • Provide on-site bicycle rental/loaner bicycles to retail/commercial employees and hotel guests for local travel; • Provide additional Class 1 bicycle parking spaces for resident or retail/commercial employee use; • Provide bicycle parking (valet or Class 1 secure parking) for hotel guests; • Provide Class 2 bicycle parking for retail/commercial and residential visitor use; • Require retail/commercial employees to pay for on-site parking; • Reduce amount of on-site vehicle parking for retail/commercial and residential land uses; • Provide information on website (e.g., retail and/or commercial businesses, museums, hotels) about how to access the building via transit, walking, and bicycling; • Provide on-site, and/or with reservation sale of one, three, and seven-day Muni Passports and/or pre-loaded Clipper Cards for hotels; and/or • Offer other transit, ridesharing, bicycling, and walking incentives for employees. 	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
G. Air Quality (cont.)			
AQ-3: The implementation of the Draft Plan and Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels (individually and in combination) would expose new sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of fine particulate matter (PM _{2.5}) and toxic air contaminants (TACs).	SUM	<p>M-AQ-3: Reduction in Exposure to Toxic Air Contaminants for New Sensitive Receptors. To reduce the potential health risk to new sensitive receptors resulting from exposure to roadways, stationary sources, and other non-permitted sources of fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) and toxic air contaminants (TACs), the Planning Department shall require analysis of potential site-specific health risks for all projects that would include sensitive receptors, based on criteria as established by the San Francisco Planning Department, as such criteria may be amended from time to time. For purposes of this measure, sensitive receptors are considered to include housing units; child care centers; schools (high school age and below); and inpatient health care facilities, including nursing or retirement homes and similar establishments.</p> <p>Development projects in the Draft Plan Area and on the Adjacent Parcels that would include sensitive receptors shall undergo, during the environmental review process and no later than the first project approval action, an analysis of potential health risks to new sensitive receptors, consistent with methodology approved by the San Francisco Planning Department, to determine if health risks from pollutant concentrations would exceed applicable significance thresholds as determined by the Environmental Review Officer.</p> <p>If one or more thresholds would be exceeded at the site of the subsequent project where sensitive receptors would be located, the project (or portion of the project containing sensitive receptors, in the case of a mixed-use project) shall be equipped with filtration systems with a Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV) rating of 13 or higher, as necessary to reduce outdoor-to-indoor infiltration of air pollutants by 80 percent. The ventilation system shall be designed by an engineer certified by the American Society of Heating, Refrigeration and Air-Conditioning Engineers, who shall provide a written report documenting that the system offers the best available technology to minimize outdoor to indoor transmission of air pollution. The project sponsor shall present a plan to ensure ongoing maintenance of ventilation and filtration systems and shall ensure the disclosure to buyers and/or renters regarding the findings of the analysis and inform occupants as to proper use of any installed air filtration.</p>	SUM

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
G. Air Quality (cont.)			
AQ-4: The implementation of the Draft Plan and Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels (individually and in combination) would expose existing and future sensitive receptors to substantial levels of fine particulate matter (PM _{2.5}) and toxic air contaminants (TACs) from new vehicles and equipment.	SUM	M-AQ-4: Siting of Uses that Emit PM_{2.5} or DPM and Other TACs. To minimize potential exposure of sensitive receptors to diesel particulate matter (DPM), from new development that includes uses that would be expected to generate substantial levels of toxic air contaminants (TACs) as part of everyday operations, whether from stationary or mobile sources, the San Francisco Planning Department shall require, during the environmental review process, but not later than the first project approval action, the preparation of an analysis by a qualified air quality specialist that includes, at a minimum, a site survey to identify residential or other sensitive receptors within 1,000 feet of the project site, and assessment of the health risk from all potential stationary and mobile sources of TACs generated by the project. For purposes of this measure, sensitive receptors are considered to include housing units; child care centers; schools (high school age and below); and inpatient health care facilities, including nursing or retirement homes and similar establishments. If risks to nearby receptors are found to exceed applicable significance thresholds, then emissions controls shall be required prior to project approval to ensure that health risks would not be significant. For example, for a backup diesel generator or other diesel-powered engine such as a fire pump, a newer diesel engine could be required. The BAAQMD requires a health risk screening analysis for Authority to Construct and Permit to Operate for new or modified sources under its authority. Where the cancer risk would exceed 1 in 1 million, BAAQMD requires implementation of Best Available Control Technology for Toxics (known as T-BACT). BAAQMD will not generally permit a stationary emissions source that results in a cancer risk greater than 10 in 1 million. T-BACT may consist of emission control equipment or operational restrictions.	SUM
AQ-5: Neither the implementation of the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels (individually or in combination) would result in construction-period dust emissions from subsequent individual development projects that would contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation or result in a cumulatively considerable increase in criteria pollutants, or expose sensitive receptors to substantial levels of construction dust.	LTS	None required.	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
G. Air Quality (cont.)			
AQ-6: The implementation of the Draft Plan and Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels (individually and in combination) would result in construction-period emissions of criteria air pollutants, including ozone precursors, from subsequent individual development projects that would contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation or result in a cumulatively considerable increase in criteria pollutants.	SUM	<p>M-AQ-6: Construction Emissions Minimization Plan for Criteria Air Pollutants. Subsequent development projects that may exceed the standards for criteria air pollutants shall be required to undergo an analysis of the project's construction emissions and if, based on that analysis, construction period emissions may be significant, the project sponsor shall submit a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan (Plan) to the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) for review and approval by an Environmental Planning Air Quality Specialist. The Plan for Criteria Air Pollutants (as well as TACs, see Impact AQ-7) shall be designed to reduce criteria air pollutant emissions to the greatest degree practicable.</p> <p>The Plan shall detail project compliance with the following requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All off-road equipment greater than 25 horsepower and operating for more than 20 total hours over the entire duration of construction activities shall meet the following requirements: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Where access to alternative sources of power are available, portable diesel engines shall be prohibited; b) All off-road equipment shall have: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Engines that meet or exceed either U.S. Environmental Protection Agency or California Air Resources Board Tier 2 off-road emission standards, <i>and</i> ii. Engines that are retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy (VDECS). c) Exceptions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Exceptions to A(1)(a) may be granted if the project sponsor has submitted information providing evidence to the satisfaction of the ERO that an alternative source of power is limited or infeasible at the project site and that the requirements of this exception provision apply. Under this circumstance, the sponsor shall submit documentation of compliance with A(1)(b) for onsite power generation. ii. Exceptions to A(1)(b)(ii) may be granted if the project sponsor has submitted information providing evidence to the satisfaction of the ERO 	SUM

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation												
G. Air Quality (cont.)															
AQ-6 (cont.)		<p>that a particular piece of off-road equipment with an ARB Level 3 VDECS is: (1) technically not feasible, (2) would not produce desired emissions reductions due to expected operating modes, (3) installing the control device would create a safety hazard or impaired visibility for the operator, or (4) there is a compelling emergency need to use off-road equipment that are not retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 VDECS and the sponsor has submitted documentation to the ERO that the requirements of this exception provision apply. If granted an exception to A(1)(b)(ii), the project sponsor must comply with the requirements of A(1)(c)(iii).</p> <p>iii. If an exception is granted pursuant to A(1)(c)(ii), the project sponsor shall provide the next cleanest pieces of off-road equipment as provided by the step down schedules in Table M-AQ-6 below.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">TABLE M-AQ-6 OFF-ROAD EQUIPMENT COMPLIANCE STEP DOWN SCHEDULE*</p> <table><tr><th>Compliance Alternative</th><th>Engine Emission Standard</th><th>Emissions Control</th></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>Tier 2</td><td>ARB Level 2 VDECS</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>Tier 2</td><td>ARB Level 1 VDECS</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>Tier 2</td><td>Alternative Fuel*</td></tr></table> <p>* How to use the table. If the requirements of (A)(1)(b) cannot be met, then the project sponsor would need to meet Compliance Alternative 1. Should the project sponsor not be able to supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 1, then Compliance Alternative 2 would need to be met. Should the project sponsor not be able to supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 2, then Compliance Alternative 3 would need to be met.</p> <p>** Alternative fuels are not a VDECS</p> <p>The project sponsor shall require the idling time for off-road and on-road equipment be limited to no more than two minutes, except as provided in exceptions to the applicable state regulations regarding idling for off-road</p>	Compliance Alternative	Engine Emission Standard	Emissions Control	1	Tier 2	ARB Level 2 VDECS	2	Tier 2	ARB Level 1 VDECS	3	Tier 2	Alternative Fuel*	
Compliance Alternative	Engine Emission Standard	Emissions Control													
1	Tier 2	ARB Level 2 VDECS													
2	Tier 2	ARB Level 1 VDECS													
3	Tier 2	Alternative Fuel*													

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
G. Air Quality (cont.)			
AQ-6 (cont.)		<p>and on-road equipment. Legible and visible signs shall be posted in multiple languages (English, Spanish, Chinese) in designated queuing areas and at the construction site to remind operators of the two minute idling limit.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The project sponsor shall require that construction operators properly maintain and tune equipment in accordance with manufacturer specifications. 3. The Plan shall include estimates of the construction timeline by phase with a description of each piece of off-road equipment required for every construction phase. Off-road equipment descriptions and information may include, but is not limited to: equipment type, equipment manufacturer, equipment identification number, engine model year, engine certification (Tier rating), horsepower, engine serial number, and expected fuel usage and hours of operation. For the VDECS installed: technology type, serial number, make, model, manufacturer, ARB verification number level, and installation date and hour meter reading on installation date. For off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall indicate the type of alternative fuel being used. 4. The Plan shall be kept on-site and available for review by any persons requesting it and a legible sign shall be posted at the perimeter of the construction site indicating to the public the basic requirements of the Plan and a way to request a copy of the Plan. The project sponsor shall provide copies of Plan as requested. <p>Reporting. Monthly reports shall be submitted to the ERO indicating the construction phase and off-road equipment information used during each phase including the information required in A(4). In addition, for off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall include actual amount of alternative fuel used.</p> <p>Within six months of the completion of construction activities, the project sponsor shall submit to the ERO a final report summarizing construction activities. The final report shall indicate the start and end dates and duration of each construction phase. For each phase, the report shall include detailed information required in A(4). In addition, for off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall include actual amount of alternative fuel used.</p>	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
G. Air Quality (cont.)			
AQ-6 (cont.)		Certification Statement and On-site Requirements. Prior to the commencement of construction activities, the project sponsor must certify (1) compliance with the Plan, and (2) all applicable requirements of the Plan have been incorporated into contract specifications.	
AQ-7 The implementation of the Draft Plan and Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels (individually and in combination) would expose sensitive receptors to substantial levels of toxic air contaminants (TACs) generated by construction equipment.	SUM	M-AQ-7: Construction Emissions Minimization Plan for Health Risks and Hazards. To reduce the potential health risk resulting from project construction activities, the project sponsor of each development project in the Draft Plan Area and on the Adjacent Parcels shall undertake a project-specific construction health risk analysis to be performed by a qualified air quality specialist, as appropriate and determined by the Environmental Planning Division of the San Francisco Planning Department, for diesel-powered and other applicable construction equipment, using the methodology recommended by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) and/or the San Francisco Planning Department. If the health risk analysis determines that construction emissions would exceed health risk significance thresholds identified by the BAAQMD and/or the San Francisco Planning Department, the project sponsor shall develop a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan for Health Risks and Hazards designed to reduce health risks from construction equipment to less-than-significant levels. All requirements in the Construction Emissions Minimization Plan must be included in contract specifications. The Construction Emissions Minimization Plan is described in Mitigation Measure M-AQ-6, Construction Emissions Minimization Plan for Criteria Air Pollutants.	SUM
AQ-8: Neither the implementation of the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels (individually and/or in combination) would expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors.	LTS	None required.	
AQ-9: The proposed street network improvements would not result in substantial emissions of criteria air pollutants or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	LTS	None required.	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
G. Air Quality (cont.)			
C-AQ-1: The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would contribute considerably to cumulative air quality impacts from emissions of criteria air pollutants.	SUM	Implement Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2 , Transportation Demand Management Strategies for Future Development and Mitigation Measure M-AQ-6 , Construction Emissions Minimization Plan for Criteria Air Pollutants.	SUM
C-AQ-2: The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would result in cumulative exposure of off-site sensitive receptors to substantial levels of toxic air contaminants (TACs).	SUM	Implement Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3 , Reduction in Exposure to Toxic Air Contaminants for New Sensitive Receptors, Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4 , Siting of Uses that Emit PM2.5 or DPM and Other TACs, and Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7 , Construction Emissions Minimization Plan for Health Risks and Hazards.	SUM
H. Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
C-GG-1: The Draft Plan and the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would be consistent with the City's GHG Reduction Strategy and the AB 32 Scoping Plan, and therefore would not result in cumulatively considerable GHG emissions.	LTS	None required.	
I. Wind and Shadow			
WS-1: Neither the implementation of the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of the Adjacent Parcels would alter wind in a manner that would substantially affect public areas.	SM	M-WS-1: Screening-Level Wind Analysis and Wind Testing. For projects within the Project Area, the Planning Department shall conduct the following review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Screening-Level Wind Analysis:</i> Any structure proposed within the Draft Plan Area or on the Adjacent Parcels over 80 feet in height shall be required to undergo screening-level wind impact analysis that would take into account the surrounding topography and building heights. As part of this analysis, a qualified wind expert shall review the proposed building plans as well as results of other 	LTS

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
I. Wind and Shadow (cont.)			
WS-1 (cont.)		<p>wind tests conducted nearby, if available. Based on this review, a determination shall be made as to whether wind hazards are expected as a result of project development. If not enough information is available to make a determination with relative certainty that no wind hazard criteria are expected, a project-level wind test shall be conducted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Project-Level Wind Test:</i> If the screening level wind analysis determines that the project may result in wind hazards, a project-level wind test shall be prepared by a qualified wind expert to determine impacts on pedestrian-level wind speeds. The methodology of a wind test shall be consistent with accepted San Francisco Planning Department practice. The project-level wind test shall be conducted and interpreted in a technical memorandum, with test results related to the Planning Code Section 148 hazard criterion. To satisfy the criteria of San Francisco Planning Code Section 148, two sets of wind tunnel test results shall be produced: one that indicates, for each test location, the wind speed that is exceeded 10 percent of the time, year-round; and another that indicates whether a wind speed of 26 miles per hour is exceeded for 1 full hour of the year. The former results would determine whether the project would meet the Planning Code's "comfort criteria," while the latter results would determine whether the project would cause an exceedance of the Planning Code's "hazard criterion." • <i>Design Modifications:</i> If a proposed structure is determined to result in significant wind impacts, modifications shall be incorporated into the project design to reduce these impacts so as not to cause ground-level wind currents to exceed the hazard level of 26 mph for a single full hour of the year. Modifications to reduce wind speeds could include one or more of the following: shifting the building's orientation; adding articulation, texturing, or setbacks along one or more of the façades; increasing the height and density of exterior landscaping and related structures; and adding more landscaping and screening structures. 	
WS-3: The implementation of the Draft Plan and Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels (individually and in combination) would create new shadow in a manner that would substantially affect outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas.	SU	None feasible.	SU

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
I. Wind and Shadow (cont.)			
C-WS-1: The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact on wind conditions.	LTS	None required.	
C-WS-2: The implementation of the Draft Plan and/or Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, could contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact on shadow conditions.	SU	None feasible.	SU
J. Recreation			
RE-1: Neither the implementation of the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of the Adjacent Parcels would increase the use of or physically degrade existing recreational facilities such that physical deterioration of those facilities would occur or be accelerated, or require construction or expansion of recreational facilities in a way that would adversely affect the environment.	LTS	None required.	
C-RE: The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to cumulative impact on recreation.	LTS	None required.	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
K. Public Services, Utilities and Service Systems			
PS-1: Neither the implementation of the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of the Adjacent Parcels would result in the need for new or physically altered fire protection or police facilities.	LTS	None required.	
PS-2: Neither the implementation of the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of the Adjacent Parcels would result in the need for new or physically altered school facilities.	LTS	None required.	
PS-3: Neither the implementation of the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of the Adjacent Parcels would require or result in the construction of substantial new water treatment facilities, and the City would have sufficient water supply available from existing entitlements.	LTS	None required.	
PS-4: Neither the implementation of the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of the Adjacent Parcels would require or result in the expansion or construction of new wastewater treatment or stormwater facilities, exceed capacity of the wastewater treatment provider when combined with other commitments, or exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.	LTS	None required.	
PS-5: With implementation of the Draft Plan and Rezoning of the Adjacent Parcels, the Project Area would continue to be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate solid waste generated by the Draft Plan and Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels and would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	LTS	None required.	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
K. Public Services, Utilities and Service Systems (cont.)			
C-PS: The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact on public services and utilities.	LTS	None required.	
L. Biological Resources			
BI-1: Neither the implementation of the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would result in a substantial adverse impact on species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) or United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).	SM	<p>M-BI-1a: Pre-Construction Special-Status Bird Surveys. Conditions of approval for building permits issued for construction within the Draft Plan Area or on the Adjacent Parcels shall include a requirement for pre-construction special-status bird surveys when trees would be removed or buildings demolished as part of an individual project. Pre-construction special-status bird surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist between February 1 and August 15 if tree removal or building demolition is scheduled to take place during that period. If bird species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act or the California Fish and Game Code are found to be nesting in or near any work area, an appropriate no-work buffer zone (e.g., 100 feet for songbirds) shall be designated by the biologist. Depending on the species involved, input from the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and/or United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) may be warranted. As recommended by the biologist, no activities shall be conducted within the no-work buffer zone that could disrupt bird breeding. Outside of the breeding season (August 16 – January 31), or after young birds have fledged, as determined by the biologist, work activities may proceed. Special-status birds that establish nests during the construction period are considered habituated to such activity and no buffer shall be required, except as needed to avoid direct destruction of the nest, which would still be prohibited.</p> <p>M-BI-1b: Pre-Construction Special-Status Bat Surveys. Conditions of approval for building permits issued for construction within the Draft Plan Area or on the Adjacent Parcels shall include a requirement for pre-construction special-status bat surveys by a qualified bat biologist when large trees (those with trunks over 12 inches in diameter) are to be removed, or vacant buildings or buildings used seasonally or not occupied, especially in the upper stories, are to be demolished. If</p>	LTS

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
L. Biological Resources (cont.)			
BI-1 (cont.)		active day or night roosts are found, the bat biologist shall take actions to make such roosts unsuitable habitat prior to tree removal or building demolition. A no-disturbance buffer shall be created around active bat roosts being used for maternity or hibernation purposes at a distance to be determined in consultation with the CDFG. Bat roosts initiated during construction are presumed to be unaffected, and no buffer would be necessary.	
BI-2: Neither the implementation of the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would be expected to interfere substantially with the movement of native resident special-status bird species or with established native resident or migratory special-status wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native special-status wildlife nursery sites.	LTS	<p>I-BI-2:Night Lighting Minimization. To further reduce the less-than-significant effects on birds from night lighting, the San Francisco Planning Department could encourage buildings developed pursuant to the Draft Plan and Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels to implement bird-safe building operations to prevent and minimize bird strike impacts, including but not limited to the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce building lighting from exterior sources by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minimizing amount and visual impact of perimeter lighting and façade up-lighting and avoid up-lighting of rooftop antennae and other tall equipment, as well as of any decorative features; - Installing motion-sensor lighting; and - Utilizing minimum wattage fixtures to achieve required lighting levels. • Reduce building lighting from interior sources by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dimming lights in lobbies, perimeter circulation areas, and atria; - Turning off all unnecessary lighting by 11:00 p.m. through sunrise, especially during peak migration periods (mid-March to early June and late August through late October); - Utilizing automatic controls (motion sensors, photo-sensors, etc.) to shut off lights in the evening when no one is present; - Encouraging the use of localized task lighting to reduce the need for more extensive overhead lighting; - Scheduling nightly maintenance to conclude by 11:00 p.m.; and - Educating building users about the dangers of night lighting to birds. 	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
L. Biological Resources (cont.)			
BI-3: Neither the implementation of the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would conflict with any applicable local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.	LTS	None required.	
C-BI: Implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not make a considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact on biological resources.	LTS	None required.	
M. Geology and Soils			
GE-1: In the event of a major earthquake in the region, groundshaking and/or localized liquefaction would not cause significant damage, destruction or injury to development anticipated under either the Draft Plan or the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels.	LTS	None required.	
GE-2: New development anticipated under the Draft Plan and the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would involve grading and other ground-disturbing construction activities but would not expose soils to significant erosion or loss of topsoil.	LTS	None required.	
GE-3: New development anticipated under the Draft Plan and the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels could be located on soils that are unstable or could become unstable, but it would not be subject to significant lateral spreading or subsidence.	LTS	None required.	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
M. Geology and Soils (cont.)			
GE-4: New development anticipated under the Draft Plan and the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels could be located on expansive soils, but would not create substantial risks to life or property.	LTS	None required.	
C-GE: Implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a significant cumulative geology and soils impact.	LTS	None required.	
N. Hydrology and Water Quality			
HY-1: Neither the implementation of the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would violate a water quality standard or a waste discharge requirement, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.	LTS	None required.	
HY-2: Neither the implementation of the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would 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.	LTS	None required.	
HY-3: Neither the implementation of the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would expose people, housing, or structures to substantial risk of loss due to flooding through placement of housing within a 100-year flooding zone as mapped	LTS	None required.	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
N. Hydrology and Water Quality (cont.)			
on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other authoritative flood hazard delineation map.			
HY-4: Neither the implementation of the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would result in substantial flooding as a result of problems caused by the elevation of structures relative to the hydraulic grade line in the sewers.	LTS	None required.	
C-HY: The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact related to hydrology and water quality.	LTS	None required.	
O. Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
HZ-1: Neither the implementation of the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would expose the public to hazardous building materials through the routine transport, use, or disposal of such materials during construction.	LTS	None required.	
HZ-2: Neither the implementation of the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would result in a reasonably foreseeable or accidental release of mercury or polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) in a way that would create a significant hazard to the public or environment.	SM	M-HZ-2: Hazardous Building Materials Abatement. The City shall condition future development approvals to require that the subsequent project sponsors ensure that any equipment containing polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) or mercury, 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 tube fixtures, which could contain mercury, are similarly removed intact 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.	LTS

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
O. Hazards and Hazardous Materials (cont.)			
HZ-3: Construction related to future development within the Draft Plan Area and on the Adjacent Parcels would not expose the public or the environment to unacceptable levels of known or newly discovered hazardous materials as a result of a site being located on a hazardous materials list site.	SM	<p>M-HZ-3: Site Assessment and Corrective Action. For any project that is not located bayward of the historic high tide line, the project sponsor shall ensure that a site-specific Phase I environmental site assessment is prepared prior to development. The site assessment shall include visual inspection of the property; review of historical documents; and review of environmental databases to assess the potential for contamination from sources such as underground storage tanks, current and historical site operations, and migration from off-site sources. The project sponsor shall ensure that the Phase I assessment and any related documentation is provided to the Planning Department's Environmental Planning (EP) division and, if required by EP, to Department of Public Health (DPH) for review and consideration of potential corrective action.</p> <p>Where the Phase I site assessment indicates evidence of site contamination, additional data shall be gathered during a Phase II investigation, including sampling and laboratory analysis of the soil and groundwater for the suspected chemicals to identify the nature and extent of contamination. If the level(s) of chemical(s) would create an unacceptable risk to human health or the environment, appropriate cleanup levels for each chemical, based on current and planned land use, shall be determined in accordance with accepted procedures adopted by the lead regulatory agency providing oversight (e.g., the Department of Toxic Substances Control [DTSC], the Regional Water Quality Control Board [RWQCB], or DPH). At sites where there are ecological receptors such as sensitive plant or animal species that could be exposed, cleanup levels shall be determined according to the accepted ecological risk assessment methodology of the lead agency, and shall be protective of ecological receptors known to be present at the site.</p> <p>If agreed-upon cleanup levels were exceeded, a remedial action plan or similar plan for remediation shall be prepared and submitted review and approval by the appropriate regulatory agency. The plan shall include proposed methods to remove or treat identified chemicals to the approved cleanup levels or containment measures to prevent exposure to chemicals left in place at concentrations greater than cleanup levels.</p>	LTS

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
O. Hazards and Hazardous Materials (cont.)			
HZ-3 (cont.)		Upon determination that a site remediation has been successfully completed, the regulatory agency shall issue a closure letter to the responsible party. For sites that are cleaned to levels that do not allow unrestricted land use, or where containment measures were used to prevent exposure to hazardous materials, the DTSC may require a limitation on the future use of the property. The types of land use restriction include deed notice, deed restriction, or a land use restriction that binds current and future owners. A risk management plan, health and safety plan, and possibly a cap maintenance plan could be required. These plans would specify procedures for preventing unsafe exposure to hazardous materials left in place and safe procedures for handling hazardous materials should site disturbance be required. The requirements of these plans and the land use restriction shall transfer to the new property owners in the event that the property is sold.	
HZ-4: Neither the implementation of the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan.	LTS	None required.	
HZ-5: Operations of facilities within the Draft Plan Area and on the Adjacent Parcels would not result in a significant impact involving the handling of general commercial/retail and household hazardous waste through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.	LTS	None required.	
C-HZ: The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact with respect to hazardous materials.	LTS	None required.	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE
WESTERN SOMA COMMUNITY PLAN AND REZONING OF ADJACENT PARCELS

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
P. Mineral and Energy Resources			
MN-1: Neither the implementation of the Draft Plan nor the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would result in wasteful consumption of fuel, water, or energy.	LTS	None required.	
C-MN: The implementation of the Proposed Project in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact related to fuel, water, or energy resources.	LTS	None required.	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-2
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE 350 EIGHTH STREET PROJECT

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
A. Land Use			
LU-3: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not divide an established community.	LTS	None required.	
LU-4: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not have a substantial impact on the existing character of the vicinity.	LTS	None required.	
C-LU: The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact on land use.	LTS	None required.	
B. Aesthetics			
AE-4: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas.	LTS	None required.	
AE-5: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not substantially degrade the visual character of the 350 Eighth Street project site and its surroundings nor damage any important scenic resources.	LTS	None required.	
AE-6: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not create new sources of substantial light and glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area or substantially affect other people or properties.	LTS	None required.	
C-AE: The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact on visual resources.	LTS	None required.	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE 350 EIGHTH STREET PROJECT

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
C. Population and Housing			
PH-3: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not induce substantial population growth, either directly or indirectly.	LTS	None required.	
PH-4: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not displace a large number of housing units or people or necessitate the construction of replacement housing.	LTS	None required.	
C-PH: The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a cumulative impact on population and housing.	LTS	None required.	
D. Cultural and Paleontological Resources			
CP-8: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project may lead to the construction of incompatible new buildings adjacent to historic district contributors located in the vicinity of the 350 Eighth Street project site, but this would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of any historical resources as defined in <i>CEQA Guidelines</i> Section 15064.5.	LTS	None required.	
CP-9: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.	SM	<p>M-CP-9: Archeological Testing Plan. Based on a reasonable presumption that archeological resources may be present within the 350 Eighth Street project site, the following measures shall be undertaken to avoid any significant adverse effect from the 350 Eighth Street project on buried or submerged historical resources.</p> <p>The project sponsor shall retain the services of an archeological consultant from the pool of qualified archeological consultants maintained by the Planning Department archeologist. The archeological consultant shall 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</p>	LTS

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE 350 EIGHTH STREET PROJECT

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
D. Cultural and Paleontological Resources (cont.)			
CP-9 (cont.)		<p>this measure. The archeological consultant's work shall be conducted in accordance with this measure and with the requirements of the project archeological research design and treatment plan (William Self Associates, <i>Final Archaeological Research Design and Treatment Plan for the 350 Eighth Street Project</i>, September 2011) at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer (ERO). In instances of inconsistency between the requirements of the project archeological research design and treatment plan and requirements of this archeological mitigation measure, the requirements of this archeological mitigation measure shall prevail. 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 less-than-significant levels potential effects on a significant archeological resource as defined in CEQA <i>Guidelines</i> Section 15064.5 (a) through (c).</p> <p><i>Consultation with Descendant Communities.</i> On discovery of an archeological site⁵ associated with descendant Native Americans or the Overseas Chinese, the ERO and an appropriate representative⁶ of the descendant group shall be contacted. The representative of the descendant group shall be given the opportunity to monitor archeological field investigations of the site and to consult with the ERO regarding appropriate archeological treatment of the site and recovered data from the site, and, if applicable, any interpretative treatment of the associated archeological site. A copy of the Final Archeological Resources Report shall be provided to the representative of the descendant group.</p> <p><i>Archeological Testing Program.</i> 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 could be adversely affected by the proposed project, the investigation method to be used, locations to be tested, and the justification for the selected</p>	

⁵ The term "archeological site" is intended here to minimally include any archeological deposit, feature, burial, or evidence of burial.

⁶ An "appropriate representative" of the descendant group is here defined to mean, in the case of Native Americans, any individual listed in the current Native American Contact List for the City and County of San Francisco maintained by the California Native American Heritage Commission and, in the case of the Overseas Chinese, the Chinese Historical Society of America.

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE 350 EIGHTH STREET PROJECT

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
D. Cultural and Paleontological Resources (cont.)			
CP-9 (cont.)		<p>investigation method(s) and locations,. The purpose of the archeological testing program shall be to identify and, to the extent possible, evaluate the legal significance (California Register/National Register eligibility) of any archeological resource(s) that may be adversely affected the project.</p> <p>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 what additional archeological investigation and mitigation measures are warranted. If the ATP determines that a legally significant archeological resource may be potentially affected by the project, the preferred mitigation shall be preservation in place consistent with the preservation strategies set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3)(A) and (B), including avoidance of the archeological site by project redesign; incorporation of the archeological site into open space; physical insulation of the archeological site, and deeding of the archeological site into a permanent conservation easement. If it has been satisfactorily demonstrated to the ERO that preservation in place of the archeological resource is infeasible through evaluation strategies including, but not necessarily limited to those noted in Guidelines Section 15126.6(b)(3)(B) and set forth above, an archeological data recovery program consistent with an ERO-approved archeological data recovery plan (ARDP) shall be implemented. Where the ERO determines that the archeological resource is (also) of high public interpretive value, an interpretive use plan shall be submitted to the ERO for review and approval.</p> <p><i>Archeological Monitoring Program.</i> If the ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant determines that an archeological monitoring program (AMP) shall be implemented, the archeological monitoring program shall minimally include the following provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.), and site remediation, shall require archeological monitoring because of the risk these activities pose to potential archaeological resources and to their depositional context. 	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE 350 EIGHTH STREET PROJECT

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
D. Cultural and Paleontological Resources (cont.)			
CP-9 (cont.)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The archeological consultant shall advise all project contractors of the need to be on the alert for evidence of the presence of the expected resource(s), ways to identify the evidence of the expected resource(s), and 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. <p>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.</p> <p><i>Archeological Data Recovery Program.</i> 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 shall 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</p>	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE 350 EIGHTH STREET PROJECT

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
D. Cultural and Paleontological Resources (cont.)			
CP-9 (cont.)		<p>would address the applicable research questions. Data recovery, in general, shall 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 non-destructive methods are practical.</p> <p>The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Field Methods and Procedures.</i> Descriptions of proposed field strategies, procedures, and operations. • <i>Cataloguing and Laboratory Analysis.</i> Description of selected cataloguing system and artifact analysis procedures. • <i>Discard and Deaccession Policy.</i> Description of and rationale for field and post-field discard and deaccession policies. • <i>Interpretive Program.</i> Consideration of an on-site/off-site public interpretive program during the course of the archeological data recovery program. • <i>Security Measures.</i> Recommended security measures to protect the archeological resource from vandalism, looting, and non-intentionally damaging activities. • <i>Final Report.</i> Description of proposed report format and distribution of results. • <i>Curation.</i> 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. <p><i>Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects.</i> 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) (Public Resources Code Section 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 <i>Guidelines</i> Section 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.</p>	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE 350 EIGHTH STREET PROJECT

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
D. Cultural and Paleontological Resources (cont.)			
CP-9 (cont.)		<p><i>Final Archeological Resources Report.</i> The archeological consultant shall submit a Draft Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO. The FARR shall evaluate 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.</p> <p>Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: the California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one copy; the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC; and the Environmental Planning Division of the Planning Department shall receive one bound copy, one unbound copy, and one unlocked, searchable PDF copy on CD, 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 high interpretive value of the resource, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution from that presented above.</p>	
CP-10: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature.	LTS	None required.	
CP-11: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not likely disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	LTS	None required.	
C-CP-2: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact on historical resources.	LTS	None required.	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE 350 EIGHTH STREET PROJECT

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
D. Cultural and Paleontological Resources (cont.)			
C-CP-3: The Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 and/or human remains, and therefore would not contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact.	SM	Implement Mitigation Measure M-CP-4a , Project-Specific Preliminary Archeological Assessment; Mitigation Measure M-CP-4b , Procedures for Accidental Discovery of Archeological Resources; and Mitigation Measure M-CP-9 , Archeological Testing Plan.	LTS
E. Transportation and Circulation			
TR-9: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not cause levels of service at local intersections to deteriorate to unacceptable levels and thus, would not conflict with an applicable congestion management program establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.	SM	Implement Mitigation Measure TR-1c , Optimization of Signal Timing at the Eighth/Harrison/I-80 Westbound Off-Ramp Intersection.	LTS
TR-10: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not cause exceedance of the capacity utilization standards for Muni lines or regional transit providers, and would not cause a substantial increase in delays or operating costs; thus, it would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.	LTS	None required.	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE 350 EIGHTH STREET PROJECT

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
E. Transportation and Circulation (cont.)			
TR-11: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not result in a loading demand that could not be accommodated within the proposed on-site and nearby on-street loading facilities. The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.	LTS	<p>I-TR-11a: Curb Modifications on Eighth and Harrison Streets. To minimize the potential for double parking of delivery vehicles, MTA should designate 40 feet of curb space on both Eighth Street and Harrison Street as yellow commercial vehicle loading/unloading zones to serve the ground floor commercial uses as well as the residential uses (e.g., Federal Express, UPS, and move-in and move-out operations). The 350 Eighth Street project sponsor should be required to request the curb change, and any modifications to curb regulations would need to be approved at a public hearing through the MTA.</p> <p>I-TR-11b: Coordination of Move-In and Move-Out Activities. To ensure that residential move-in and move-out activities do not impede Muni operations on Harrison Street or bicycle travel on Eighth Street, move-in and move-out operations, as well as larger deliveries should be scheduled and coordinated through building management. Curb parking should be reserved through the local station of the San Francisco Police Department.</p>	
TR-12: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities; nor would the 350 Eighth Street project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use.	LTS	I-TR-12: On-Street Parking Removal at Driveway. As an improvement measure to reduce the potential for conflicts between southbound bicyclists and vehicles traveling on Eighth Street and vehicles exiting the 350 Eighth Street Project driveway, on-street parking north of the project driveway could be removed. The removal of two or more on-street parking spaces on the west curb of Eighth Street north of the project driveway would improve the sight distance for vehicles exiting the project driveway and bicyclists and vehicles traveling on Eighth Street.	
TR-13: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not result in inadequate emergency access.	LTS	None required.	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE 350 EIGHTH STREET PROJECT

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
E. Transportation and Circulation (cont.)			
TR-14: Construction of the proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not result in disruption of nearby streets, transit service, loading, or pedestrian and bicycle circulation; therefore, the 350 Eighth Street project would not conflict with any applicable plan, ordinance or policy related to these performance measures.	LTS	<p>I-TR-14: Construction Traffic Control Strategies. Any construction traffic occurring between 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 a.m. or between 3:30 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. would coincide with peak-hour traffic and could temporarily impede traffic and transit flow, although it would not be considered a significant impact. Limiting truck movements to the hours between 9:00 a.m. and 3:30 p.m. (or other times, if approved by the MTA) would minimize disruption of the general traffic flow on adjacent streets during the a.m. and p.m. peak periods.</p> <p>The 350 Eighth Street project sponsor and construction contractor(s) should meet with the Traffic Engineering Division of MTA, the Fire Department, Muni, the San Francisco Planning Department and other City agencies to determine feasible measures to reduce traffic congestion, including temporary bus stop relocation and other potential transit disruption and pedestrian circulation effects during construction of the project. The temporary parking demand by construction workers would need to be met on-site (once the garage element of the structure is complete), on-street or within other off-street parking facilities. Construction workers should be encouraged to take transit or carpool to the 350 Eighth Street project site.</p>	
C-TR-1b: The Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels and/or 350 Eighth Street project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects would not cause levels of service at local intersections to deteriorate and would not conflict with an applicable congestion management programs as well as plans, ordinances or policies establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.	LTS	None required.	
C-TR-4: The 350 Eighth Street project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not cause exceedance of the capacity utilization standards for Muni lines or regional transit providers.	LTS	None required.	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE 350 EIGHTH STREET PROJECT

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
F. Noise and Vibration			
NO-5: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the <i>San Francisco General Plan</i> or Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the Police Code) or result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels, nor would the 350 Eighth Street project site be substantially affected by existing noise levels as a result of this project component.	SM	M-NO-5: Noise Reduction for 350 Eighth Street Pocket Park. The project sponsor of the 350 Eighth Street project shall retain a qualified acoustical consultant to develop, as part of the project design specifications, a requirement to achieve the maximum feasible reduction in traffic noise at the proposed pocket park at Eighth and Ringold Streets. The sponsor shall consider, among other potential approaches, the installation of a transparent or planted noise barrier, or comparable noise-reduction feature(s) as may be determined acceptable to the San Francisco Planning Department, in consultation with the Department of Public Health, along the Eighth Street frontage of the pocket park, wrapping around the corner at Ringold Street and extending part of the way along the Ringold Street frontage.	LTS
NO-6: Construction of the 350 Eighth Street project could expose persons to temporary increases in noise levels substantially in excess of ambient levels.	SM	Implement Mitigation Measures M-NO-2a , General Construction Noise Control Measures and Mitigation Measure M NO-2b , Noise Control Measures During Pile Driving.	LTS
NO-7: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not expose people to or generate excessive groundborne vibration.	SM	Implement Mitigation Measure M-NO-2a , General Construction Noise Control Measures, discussed on page 4.F-24, and Mitigation Measure M-NO-2b , Noise Control Measures During Pile Driving, discussed on page 4.F-25.	LTS
C-NO: The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would result in a significant cumulative noise impact.	SUM	Implement Mitigation Measures M-NO-2a , General Construction Noise Control Measures and Mitigation Measure M NO-2b , Noise Control Measures During Pile Driving.	SUM
G. Air Quality			
AQ-10: Construction of the 350 Eighth Street project would not result in emissions of criteria air pollutants, including ozone precursors, that would contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation or result in a cumulatively considerable increase in criteria pollutants, and would not result in substantial construction dust.	LTS	None required.	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE 350 EIGHTH STREET PROJECT

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
G. Air Quality (cont.)			
AQ-11: Construction of the 350 Eighth Street project would expose sensitive receptors to substantial levels of toxic air contaminants (TACs) generated by construction equipment.	SUM	<p>M-AQ-11: Construction Emissions Minimization Plan. To reduce the potential health risk resulting from 350 Eighth Street project construction activities, the 350 Eighth Street project sponsor shall prepare a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan designed to reduce construction emissions by a minimum of 55 percent as compared to the emissions calculated in the emissions calculated in the analysis conducted for this EIR. Depending on the precise construction equipment used, this mitigation could likely be achieved through use of diesel equipment with newer, cleaner engines (such as those meeting the ARB and EPA Interim Tier 4 standards); installation of exhaust filters (ARB-certified Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control System, or VDECS; and/or use of certain equipment that is electrically powered or powered by non-diesel fuel such as propane or liquid natural gas (for example, for forklifts).</p> <p>All requirements in the Construction Emissions Minimization Plan must be included in contract specifications. The Construction Emissions Minimization Plan may include, but is not limited to, the following requirements designed to reduce construction-period emissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit idling times by either shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to two minutes; • Use Interim Tier 4 equipment where such equipment is available and feasible for use (the primary option); • Use equipment meeting Tier 2 or higher emissions standards; • Use other late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and add-on devices such as particulate filters; • Require that construction contractors not use diesel generators for construction purposes where feasible alternative sources of power are available (hydroelectric power, electric power, propane, etc), and that all diesel generators used for 350 Eighth Street project construction meet Tier 4 emissions standards; and/or • Employ other options as such become available. <p>The 350 Eighth Street project sponsor shall submit the Construction Emissions Minimization Plan (Plan) to the ERO for review and approval by an Environmental</p>	SUM

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE 350 EIGHTH STREET PROJECT

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
G. Air Quality (cont.)			
AQ-11 (cont.)		Planning Air Quality Specialist prior to the commencement of construction activities. Should the Construction Emissions Minimization Plan determine that it is infeasible to reduce construction-period emissions to below the 55 percent emissions reduction standard required, the plan must document, to the satisfaction of the Environmental Review Officer, that the sponsor has implemented all feasible mitigation measures to reduce construction emissions and why additional measures to meet the plan's performance standard are infeasible. It should be noted that, for specialty equipment types (e.g., drill rigs, shoring rigs and concrete pumps), it may not be feasible for construction contractors to modify their current, older equipment to accommodate the particulate filters, or for them to provide newer models with these filters pre-installed.	
AQ-12: Operation of the proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not conflict with the 2010 <i>Clean Air Plan</i> , violate or contribute to violation of an air quality standard, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment, either individually or cumulatively.	LTS	None required.	
AQ-13: Operation of the proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not result in emissions of carbon monoxide that would exceed state or federal standards, either individually or cumulatively.	LTS	None required.	
AQ-14: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not generate TACs that would affect on- or off-site receptors.	LTS	None required.	
AQ-15: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not expose sensitive receptors at the 350 Eighth Street project site to substantial levels of toxic air contaminants (TACs).	LTS	None required.	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE 350 EIGHTH STREET PROJECT

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
G. Air Quality (cont.)			
AQ-16: Operation of the proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.	LTS	None required.	
C-AQ-1: The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would contribute considerably to cumulative air quality impacts from emissions of criteria air pollutants.	SUM	Implement Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2 , Transportation Demand Management Strategies for Future Development, and Mitigation Measure M-AQ-6 , Construction Emissions Minimization Plan for Criteria Air Pollutants.	SUM
C-AQ-2: The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would result in cumulative exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial levels of toxic air contaminants (TACs).	SUM	Implement Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3 , Reduction in Exposure to Toxic Air Contaminants for New Sensitive Receptors, Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4 , Siting of Uses that Emit PM _{2.5} or DPM and Other TACs, and Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7 , Construction Emissions Minimization Plan for Health Risks and Hazards.	SUM
H. Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
C-GG-2: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project be consistent with the City's GHG Reduction Strategy and the AB 32 Scoping Plan, and therefore would not result in cumulatively considerable GHG emissions.	LTS	None required.	
I. Wind and Shadow			
WS-2: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not alter wind in a manner that would substantially affect public areas.	LTS	None required.	
WS-4: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not create new shadow in a manner that would substantially affect outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas.	LTS	None required.	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE 350 EIGHTH STREET PROJECT

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
I. Wind and Shadow (cont.)			
C-WS-1: The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact on wind conditions.	LTS	None required.	
C-WS-3: The implementation of the 350 Eighth Street project, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact on shadow conditions.	LTS	None required.	
J. Recreation			
RE-2: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not increase the use of or physically degrade existing recreational facilities such that physical deterioration of those facilities would occur or be accelerated, nor require construction or expansion of recreational facilities in a way that would adversely affect the environment.	LTS	None required.	
C-RE: The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to cumulative impact on recreation.	LTS	None required.	
K. Public Services, Utilities and Service Systems			
PS-6: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not result in the need for new or physically altered fire or police protection facilities.	LTS	None required.	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE 350 EIGHTH STREET PROJECT

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
K. Public Services, Utilities and Service Systems (cont.)			
PS-7: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not result in the need for new or physically altered school facilities.	LTS	None required.	
PS-8: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not require or result in the construction of substantial new water treatment facilities, and the City would have sufficient water supply available from existing entitlements.	LTS	None required.	
PS-9: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not require or result in the expansion or construction of new wastewater treatment or stormwater facilities, exceed capacity of the wastewater treatment provider when combined with other commitments, or exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.	LTS	None required.	
PS-10: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate solid waste generated by the project and would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	LTS	None required.	
C-PS: The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact on public services and utilities.	LTS	None required.	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE 350 EIGHTH STREET PROJECT

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
L. Biological Resources			
BI-4: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not result in a substantial adverse impact on species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) or United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).	SM	Implement Mitigation Measure M-BI-1a , Pre-Construction Special-Status Bird Surveys.	LTS
BI-5: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not interfere substantially with the movement of native resident special-status bird species or with established native resident or migratory special-status wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native special-status wildlife nursery sites.	LTS	None required.	
BI-6: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not conflict with any applicable local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.	LTS	None required.	
C-BI: Implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not make a considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact on biological resources	LTS	None required.	
M. Geology and Soils			
GE-5: In the event of a major earthquake in the region, groundshaking and/or localized liquefaction could cause damage, destruction, or injury to the 350 Eighth Street project and residents, but this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	None required.	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE 350 EIGHTH STREET PROJECT

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
M. Geology and Soils (cont.)			
GE-6: Development at the 350 Eighth Street project site would involve grading and other ground-disturbing construction activities that could expose soils to erosion and loss of topsoil, but this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	None required.	
GE-7: Development on the 350 Eighth Street project site could be located on soils that are unstable or could become unstable, but it would not be subject to significant lateral spreading or subsidence.	LTS	None required.	
M. Geology and Soils			
GE-8: The 350 Eighth Street project site could be located on expansive soils, but would not create significant risks to life or property.	LTS	None required.	
C-GE: Implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a significant cumulative geology and soils impact.	LTS	None required.	
N. Hydrology and Water Quality			
HY-5: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not violate a water quality standard or a waste discharge requirement, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.	LTS	None required.	
HY-6: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not 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.	LTS	None required.	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE 350 EIGHTH STREET PROJECT

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
N. Hydrology and Water Quality (cont.)			
HY-7: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not expose people, housing, or structures to substantial risk of loss due to flooding through placement of housing within a 100-year flooding zone as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other authoritative flood hazard delineation map.	LTS	None required.	
HY-8: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not result in substantial flooding as a result of problems caused by the elevation of structures relative to the hydraulic grade line in the sewers.	LTS	None required.	
C-HY: The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact related to hydrology and water quality.	LTS	None required.	
O. Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
HZ-6: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not expose the public to hazardous building materials through the routine transport, use, or disposal of such materials during construction.	LTS	None required.	
HZ-7: Demolition associated with the proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not be expected to result in a reasonably foreseeable or accidental release of mercury or PCBs in a way that would create a significant hazard to the public or environment.	SM	Implement Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2 , Hazardous Building Materials Abatement.	LTS

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE 350 EIGHTH STREET PROJECT

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
O. Hazards and Hazardous Materials (cont.)			
HZ-8: Construction related to the proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to unacceptable levels of known or newly discovered hazardous materials as a result of a site being located on a hazardous materials list site (Government Code Section 65962.5).	SM	<p>M-HZ-8: Site Assessment and Corrective Action. If potential exposure to vapors is suspected through determinations from the Phase I or Phase II work required by Mitigation Measure M-HZ-3, Site Assessment and Corrective Action, a screening evaluation shall be conducted in accordance with guidance developed by the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) in its <i>Final Guidance for Evaluation and Mitigation of Subsurface Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air</i> (October 2011) to estimate worst-case risks to building occupants from vapor intrusion using site-specific data and conservative assumptions specified in the guidance. If an unacceptable risk were indicated by this conservative analysis, then additional site data shall be collected and a site-specific vapor intrusion evaluation, including fate and transport modeling, shall be required to more accurately evaluate site risks. Should the site-specific evaluation identify substantial risks, then additional measures shall be required to reduce risks to acceptable levels. These measures could include remediation of site soil and/or groundwater to remove vapor sources, or, should this be infeasible, use of engineering controls such as a passive or active vent system and a membrane system to control vapor intrusion. Where engineering controls are used, a deed restriction shall be required, and shall include a description of the potential cause of vapors, a prohibition against construction without removal or treatment of contamination to approved risk-based levels, monitoring of the engineering controls to prevent vapor intrusion until risk-based cleanup levels have been met, and notification requirements to utility workers or contractors who may have contact with contaminated soil and groundwater while installing utilities or undertaking construction activities.</p> <p>The screening level and site-specific evaluations shall be conducted under the oversight of the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH), and methods for compliance shall be specified in the site mitigation plan prepared in accordance with this measure, and would be subject to review and approval by the DPH. The deed restriction, if required, shall be recorded at the San Francisco Office of the Assessor-Recorder after approval by the DPH and DTSC.</p>	LTS
HZ-9: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan.	LTS	None required.	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

TABLE S-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE 350 EIGHTH STREET PROJECT

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
O. Hazards and Hazardous Materials (cont.)			
HZ-10: Operation of the 350 Eighth Street project would not result in a significant impact involving the handling of general commercial/retail and household hazardous waste through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.	LTS	None required.	
C-HZ: The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact with respect to hazardous materials.	LTS	None required.	
P. Mineral and Energy Resources			
MN-2: The proposed 350 Eighth Street project would not result in wasteful consumption of fuel, water, or energy.	LTS	None required.	
C-MN: : The implementation of the Proposed Project in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact related to fuel, water, or energy resources.	LTS	None required.	

LTS – Less than Significant; SM – Significant but Mitigable; SU – Significant and Unavoidable; SUM – Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation

Transportation and Circulation

- Impact TR-1a:** The Draft Plan would cause levels of service at the intersection of Fifth/Bryant/I-80 Eastbound on-ramp to deteriorate during the p.m. peak hour, thereby conflicting with an applicable congestion management program that establishes measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.
- Impact TR-1b:** The Draft Plan would cause levels of service at the intersection of Sixth/Brannan/I-280 ramps to deteriorate during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours, thereby conflicting with an applicable congestion management program that establishes measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.
- Impact TR-1c:** The Draft Plan would cause levels of service at the intersection of Eighth/Harrison/I-80 Westbound off-ramp to deteriorate during the p.m. peak hour, thereby conflicting with an applicable congestion management program that establishes measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.
- Impact TR-5:** The Draft Plan's proposed transportation system improvements would remove on-street loading spaces along 12th Street that could not be located nearby and would thereby result in potential conflicts between trucks and other traffic.
- Impact C-TR-1a:** The Draft Plan, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects would cause levels of service at local intersections to deteriorate and would conflict with an applicable congestion management programs as well as plans, ordinances or policies establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.
- Impact C-TR-2:** The Draft Plan, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would contribute considerably to exceedance of the capacity utilization standards for Muni under cumulative conditions.

Noise and Vibration

- Impact C-NO:** The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would contribute considerably to a significant cumulative noise impact.

Air Quality

- Impact AQ-2:** Subsequent individual development projects in the Draft Plan Area and/or on the Adjacent Parcels (individually and in combination) could violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, and/or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.
- Impact AQ-3:** The implementation of the Draft Plan and Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels (individually and in combination) would expose new sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) and toxic air contaminants (TACs).

- Impact AQ-4:** The implementation of the Draft Plan and Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels (individually and in combination) would expose existing and future sensitive receptors to substantial levels of fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) and toxic air contaminants (TACs) from new vehicles and equipment.
- Impact AQ-6:** The implementation of the Draft Plan and Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels (individually and in combination) would result in construction-period emissions of criteria air pollutants, including ozone precursors, from subsequent individual development projects that would contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation or result in a cumulatively considerable increase in criteria pollutants.
- Impact AQ-7:** The implementation of the Draft Plan and Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels (individually and in combination) would expose sensitive receptors to substantial levels of toxic air contaminants (TACs) generated by construction equipment.
- Impact AQ-11:** Construction of the 350 Eighth Street project would expose sensitive receptors to substantial levels of toxic air contaminants (TACs) generated by construction equipment.
- Impact C-AQ-1:** The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would contribute considerably to cumulative air quality impacts from emissions of criteria air pollutants.
- Impact C-AQ-2:** The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would result in cumulative exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial levels of toxic air contaminants (TACs).

Wind and Shadow

- Impact WS-3:** The implementation of the Draft Plan and Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels (individually and in combination) would create new shadow in a manner that would substantially affect outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas.
- Impact C-WS-2:** The implementation of the Draft Plan and/or Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, could contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact on shadow conditions.

E. Significant Irreversible Impacts

In accordance with CEQA *Guidelines* Section 15126.2(c), this section discusses the significant irreversible environmental changes associated with the Draft Plan, Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels, and 350 Eighth Street project relevant to land use changes, nonrenewable resources, and environmental accidents. Implementation of the Proposed Project would intensify the development of a range of land uses in the Project Area that would be consistent with development in an urban area.

Changes that Commit Future Generations to Similar Uses

Development within the Project Area, including the 350 Eighth Street project, and on the Adjacent Parcels, would result in more intensive development on some parcels within the Western SoMa neighborhood. Although this more intensive development would not be irreversible, commitment to these uses would be difficult to overturn within the short term.

Use of Nonrenewable Resources

Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in an irreversible commitment of energy resources, primarily in the form of fossil fuels, including fuel oil, natural gas, and gasoline or diesel fuel for automobiles and construction equipment during construction and from ongoing activity in the Project Area. The consumption or destruction of other nonrenewable or slowly renewable resources would also result during construction, occupancy, and use of the Project Area. These resources include, but are not limited to, lumber, concrete, sand and gravel, asphalt, masonry, metals, water, and those related to water and solid waste disposal. Development within the Project Area would consume nonrenewable resources in amounts typical of projects within urban areas.

F. Alternatives

In accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) *Guidelines* Section 15126.6(a), an environmental impact report (EIR) must describe a reasonable range of alternatives that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project while also reducing or eliminating significant impacts of the project. The “range of alternatives” is governed by the “rule of reason,” which requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit informed public participation and an informed and reasoned choice by the decision-making body (CEQA *Guidelines* Section 15126.6(f)).

The project alternatives analyzed in this EIR are as follows: (1) No Project Alternative, (2) Reduced Growth Alternative (which includes a Reduced Intensity Alternative for the 350 Eighth Street project), and (3) Greater Growth Alternative. The Alternatives chapter of an EIR must include those alternatives that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project and would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project (CEQA *Guidelines* Section 15126.6).

Alternative 1: No Project Alternative

Description

CEQA *Guidelines* Section 15126.6(e)(3)(A) states that, generally, when a project being analyzed is the revision of an existing land use or regulatory plan—such as the Western SoMa Community Plan and Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels, along with San Francisco Planning Code and Zoning Map revisions that would implement the Draft Plan and Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels—the No Project Alternative should be considered to be continuation of the existing plan into the future. As stated in CEQA *Guidelines* Section 15126.6(e)(3)(A), “typically this is a situation where other projects initiated under the existing plan will continue while the new plan is developed. Thus, the projected impacts of the proposed plan or alternative plans would be compared to the impacts that would occur under the existing plan.”

Consistent with this guidance, the No Project Alternative considered in this EIR is the maintenance of the existing zoning controls in the Project Area, including the Draft Plan Area, the Adjacent Parcels, and the 350 Eighth Street project site. Under this alternative, the San Francisco Planning Department would not implement the Draft Plan or the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels. No rezoning reclassifications would occur for any portion of the Draft Plan Area or Adjacent Parcels, and the Project Area would remain zoned as under existing conditions. (See Chapter 2, Project Description, for a discussion of current zoning and height and bulk classifications.) This alternative includes what could be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if these two project components were not approved, based on existing use districts and height and bulk classifications (CEQA *Guidelines* Section 15126.6(e)). Specifically, no increases or decreases in building heights would occur due to height and bulk district reclassifications, and no areawide, systematic density or land use changes would be anticipated. (The Adjacent Parcels would remain under the C-M and SLR zoning designations, as under existing conditions.)

Specific private development projects may be proposed in the future on specific parcels throughout the Draft Plan Area and on one or more of the Adjacent Parcels. These would be required to go through the Planning Department review and permitting process, which would include any necessary zoning changes. However, any changes proposed as part of individually proposed projects would be site-specific and would be evaluated for approval by the Planning Department on an individual (i.e., project-specific) basis.

In addition, no area-wide transportation system improvements envisioned by the Draft Plan (along designated streets and intersections) would occur, including installations of signalized pedestrian crossings, installations of sidewalk extensions and corner bulb-outs, installations of gateway treatments, or installations of public realm greening and pedestrian enhancements.

350 Eighth Street Project

Normally the No Project Alternative for an individual development project is “the circumstance under which the project does not proceed” (CEQA *Guidelines* Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B)). Accordingly, a project-specific No Project Alternative for the proposed 350 Eighth Street project would involve no development on the 350 Eighth Street project site. The existing paved lot would remain, although it is assumed that Golden Gate Transit would relocate its midday bus parking to a location beneath the Bay Bridge approach, as this move is planned independently as part of implementation of the new Transit Center project. The No Project Alternative for the 350 Eighth Street project site would not preclude future development of the 350 Eighth Street project site. Any such future project would be subject to its own environmental review under CEQA.

Alternative 2: Reduced Growth Alternative

Description

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, the San Francisco Planning Department would implement a modified version of the Proposed Project, with select modifications that would lessen the development potential in certain areas within the Project Area. The intent of this alternative is to eliminate or reduce significant and unavoidable impacts that would result from the Proposed Project. However, even with the No Project Alternative, some significant and unavoidable impacts would occur (including those

related to historical resources, transportation, and air quality emissions), owing to anticipated changes that are expected to occur in the Project Area regardless of the Proposed Project or alternative implemented. Therefore, while reducing growth intensity could reduce some of those impacts, most would remain significant and unavoidable. For this reason, it is difficult to set growth reduction targets for this alternative in a way that would eliminate or reduce significant and unavoidable impacts.

For purposes of this analysis, however, the Reduced Growth Alternative assumes that about 20 percent fewer housing units and jobs would be created under this alternative than under the Proposed Project. There are several ways in which an areawide reduction in growth can be achieved, although no specific actions are stipulated in this EIR. For example, reduction in development buildout can be achieved by limiting some or all of the height and bulk districts within the Western SoMa Community Plan Area that have variable height limits to those permitted by the base height, such as the Western SoMa Service, Arts, Light Industrial district south of Bryant Street, which has a variable height limit of 40-X/55-X and portions of the Western SoMa Regional Commercial District north of Harrison Street that have a variable height limit of 55-X/65-B. This would reduce building heights by about one story on various parcels that would otherwise be eligible for height increases with CU authorization. A reduction in growth could also be achieved by designating larger areas as RED or RED Mixed zones than are currently proposed by the Draft Plan, or by reducing floor area ratios within the proposed commercial districts (Western SoMa Regional Commercial District [W SoMa RCD] and Folsom Neighborhood Commercial Transit [Folsom NC-T]). These types of zoning changes would lead to overall less intensive development in the Project Area.

Under this alternative, the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would be implemented as under the Proposed Project, since no height rezoning is proposed as part of this project component and because rezoning these parcels to districts other than those proposed would not meet the basic objectives of the project. However, this alternative assumes that net 20-percent reduction in housing and jobs could be achieved Project Area-wide.

Based on growth assumptions prepared as part of the transportation impact analysis, the Proposed Project would result in about 209 more housing units and 1,068 more jobs than the No Project Alternative. Therefore, a reduction of 20 percent from the Proposed Project projections would result in 42 fewer housing units and 213 fewer jobs, for a total of 5,670 housing units and 22,738 jobs under the Reduced Growth Alternative.

The Reduced Growth Alternative would include most of the areawide streetscape and transportation system improvements envisioned by the Draft Plan. Specifically, the following would be implemented:

- Installation of new signalized mid-block crossings on Folsom Street at Rausch Street (between Seventh and Eighth Streets) and mid-block between Eighth and Ninth Streets;
- Installation of new signalized mid-block crossings at Seventh and Minna Streets and Eighth and Natoma Streets;
- Installation of streetscape and traffic calming improvements on Minna, Natoma, and Ringold Streets; and

- Installation of gateway treatments at and in vicinity of freeway off-ramps, potentially including signage, lighting, and physical roadway features such as enhanced hardscape area, landscaped islands, or colored textured pavement.

However, the Reduced Growth Alternative would not post “truck route” signs on Ninth, 10th, Harrison, and Bryant Streets in the Draft Plan Area, nor include the public realm greening and pedestrian enhancements along Folsom Street and 12th Street that are proposed under the Draft Plan in order to avoid the Proposed Project’s significant unavoidable impacts related to removal of on-street loading spaces along 12th Street and also to avoid the less-than-significant with mitigation impacts related to removal of on-street loading spaces along Folsom Street.

350 Eighth Street Project

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, the 350 Eighth Street project would be reduced in height from 65 feet to 55 feet, and the buildings along the Eighth Street and Harrison Street frontages and in the center of the 350 Eighth Street project site would be five stories plus mezzanine, one story less than under the Proposed Project. About 90 fewer dwelling units would be provided, for a total of 354 units, which would be a 20 percent reduction in unit count as compared to the Proposed Project. The buildings on Gordon and Ringold Streets would also be reduced in height by one story, to four stories plus mezzanine. The building at Gordon and Harrison Streets would be reduced in height to 50 feet, 10 feet shorter than with the project; this building would still have three floors of commercial (office) space over retail, but with lower floor-to-floor heights. The floor area of this building would remain the same as under the Proposed Project.

Alternative 3: Greater Growth Alternative

Description

The Greater Growth Alternative is based on a more intensive development program for certain sites (“opportunity sites”) within the *Western SoMa Community Plan Area*, as compared to the program envisioned in the Draft Plan. This alternative would also reduce one or more of the significant impacts identified for the Proposed Project, as shown in Table S-3, below. This alternative would develop 11 opportunity sites within the Draft Plan Area at a higher density than proposed by the Draft Plan, while implementing the Draft Plan as proposed under the Proposed Project everywhere else in the Draft Plan Area. These 11 opportunity sites are all located north of Harrison Street; one is located at 350 Eighth Street. Nine of the 11 opportunity sites are located in the area bounded by 10th, 13th, Howard, and Folsom Streets. The remaining site is located on a large parcel on the block bounded by Harrison, Folsom, Seventh, and Eighth Streets. Existing uses on these sites include automobile repair services, a sporting goods retailer, public storage, institutional uses, and public parking. Several of these parcels (including the 350 Eighth Street project site) are primarily used only on the ground level for automobile and bus storage yards. The 11 opportunity sites total approximately 14 acres and currently include buildings ranging from one to six stories tall.

Under the Greater Growth Alternative, all of the parcels identified for more intensive development would be rezoned as either Western SoMa Mixed-Use General (W SoMa MUG) or Western SoMa

Regional Commercial District (W SoMa RCD), the same as proposed under the *Western SoMa Community Plan*. All 11 parcels are identified in the Draft Plan as parcels where building heights up to 65 feet could be considered through a CU authorization and hearing process. Under this alternative, however, the maximum height limits on these parcels would be increased to 85 feet, 20 feet higher than under the Draft Plan, in order to encourage more intensive development programs on these parcels, which are generally considered underused. The increased allowable heights on the 11 opportunity sites under the Greater Growth Alternative would result in larger buildings with more housing units than would be allowed under the Draft Plan. Non-residential uses (and, thus, employment) would remain similar to what is proposed under the Draft Plan, since this alternative specifically targets residential development.

It is assumed that, with the exception of more intensive development on these 11 opportunity sites, the Draft Plan would be implemented as proposed under the Proposed Project. Thus, the same rezoning and height and bulk changes would occur throughout the rest of the Draft Plan Area as described in Chapter 2, Project Description. Thus, the Greater Growth Alternative assumes the same growth projections for the remainder of the Draft Plan Area as assumed under the Draft Plan.

A total of approximately 1,273 housing units could be developed under the Greater Growth Alternative on the 11 opportunity sites identified for more intensified growth. This would be approximately 341 more housing units than would be expected under the Draft Plan. It is noted that some of the opportunity sites identified, such as the St. Joseph's Church, contain historic properties. Thus, development potential on those sites could be somewhat constrained, both under the Draft Plan and the Greater Growth Alternative.

Similar to the Reduced Growth Alternative, the Greater Growth Alternative would include most of the areawide streetscape and transportation system improvements envisioned by the Draft Plan. Specifically, the following would be implemented:

- Installation of new signalized mid-block crossings on Folsom Street at Rausch Street (between Seventh and Eighth Streets) and mid-block between Eighth and Ninth Streets;
- Installation of new signalized mid-block crossings at Seventh and Minna Streets and Eighth and Natoma Streets;
- Installation of streetscape and traffic calming improvements on Minna, Natoma, and Ringold Streets; and
- Installation of gateway treatments at and in vicinity of freeway off-ramps, potentially including signage, lighting, and physical roadway features such as enhanced hardscape area, landscaped islands, or colored textured pavement.

However, the Greater Growth Alternative would not post "truck route" signs on Ninth, 10th, Harrison, and Bryant Streets in the Draft Plan Area nor include any public realm greening and pedestrian enhancements along Folsom Street and 12th Street that are proposed under the Draft Plan, in order to avoid the Proposed Project's significant unavoidable impacts related to removal of on-street loading spaces along 12th Street and also avoid the less-than-significant with mitigation impacts related to removal of on-street loading spaces along Folsom Street.

Under this alternative, the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels would be implemented as under the Proposed Project. However, as under the Proposed Project, no height rezoning is anticipated as part of this project component; therefore, a more intensified development would not necessarily be achieved on this portion of the Project Area. However, the rezoning these parcels would meet the basic objectives of the project and is therefore included as part of the Greater Growth Alternative.

350 Eighth Street Project

The 350 Eighth Street project site is one of the locations where increased height would be permitted under this alternative. Therefore, under the Greater Growth Alternative, that development project would accommodate 560 dwelling units, about 25 percent more than the 444 units proposed by the 350 Eighth Street project. Under the Greater Growth Alternative, the 350 Eighth Street project would include eight-story-plus-mezzanine structures on the Eighth Street and Harrison Street frontages and in the center of the site; these structures would be two stories taller than those included in the Proposed Project. The buildings on Gordon and Ringold Streets would be developed at the same height and intensity as under the Proposed Project.

Table S-3, on the following page, provides brief descriptions of the Proposed Project along with all of the proposed alternatives and compares potentially significant impacts of those alternatives in relation to the Proposed Project.

Environmentally Superior Alternative

The No Project Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative. Of the remaining alternatives, the Reduced Growth Alternative would also qualify as the environmentally superior alternative because it would reduce some of the impacts associated with the Proposed Project, such as potential impacts to historical resources, air quality emissions, and transportation-related impacts. However, it cannot be determined whether those impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance. The Reduced Growth Alternative would also reduce the less-than-significant impacts associated with Proposed Project implementation, including those related to individual historical resources and contributors to historic districts; archeological resources; temporary or permanent ambient noise levels and construction-related noise and vibration; alterations to wind patterns; impacts on species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special-status species; and impacts associated with hazardous materials.

G. Areas of Known Controversy and Issues to be Resolved

On the basis of public comments on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) and at the public scoping meeting, potential areas of controversy and unresolved issues for the Proposed Project include the following opinions:

- Emphasis on stabilization, prohibition, and preservation may serve to reinforce lack of residential density and neighborhood-serving amenities.
- Maximum housing production should be promoted.

**TABLE S-3
COMPARISON OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT TO THE
IMPACTS OF THE ALTERNATIVES**

	Proposed Project	No Project Alternative	Reduced Growth Alternative	Greater Growth Alternative
Description	Western SoMa Community Plan, as proposed; Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels, as proposed; 350 Eighth Street project, as proposed.	Maintenance of existing zoning and height and bulk controls in the Project Area, including the Draft Plan Area, Adjacent Parcels, and 350 Eighth Street project site.	Rezoning to achieve 20 percent less growth Project Area-wide than would be created under the Proposed Project. 350 Eighth Street project would be 10 feet shorter, and would accommodate 90 fewer dwelling units. Posting of “truck route” signs on Ninth, 10th, Harrison, and Bryant Street and public realm greening and pedestrian enhancements along Folsom Street and 12th Street would be excluded from the Transportation and Street Network Improvements program. Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels as proposed under Proposed Project.	Western SoMa Community Plan as proposed, with exception of 11 opportunity sites (including 350 Eighth Street project site) that would be developed more intensively as compared to the Draft Plan. Posting of “truck route” signs on Ninth, 10th, Harrison, and Bryant Street and public realm greening and pedestrian enhancements along Folsom Street and 12th Street would be excluded from the Transportation and Street Network Improvements program. Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels as proposed under Proposed Project.
Ability to Meet Project Sponsor’s Objectives	Would meet all objectives for the Draft Plan, Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels, and the 350 Eighth Street project.	Would not meet most objectives for the Draft Plan, Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels, or the 350 Eighth Street project.	Would meet most objectives for the Draft Plan and 350 Eighth Street project. Would meet all objectives for the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels.	Would meet most objectives for the Draft Plan and the 350 Eighth Street project. Would meet all of the objectives for the Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels
Land Use	LS	LS↑	LS↔	LS↔
Aesthetics	LS	LS↑	LS↔	LS↑
Population and Housing	LS	LS↔	LS↔	LS↔
Cultural and Paleontological Resources	SU	SU↔	SU↓	SU↑
Transportation and Circulation	SU	SU↑	SU↓	SU↑
Noise and Vibration	SU	SM↓	SM ↓	SM ↓
Air Quality	SU	SU↑	SU↓	SU↑
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	LS	LS↑	LS↓	LS↑
Wind and Shadow	SU	SU↔	SU↓	SU↑
Recreation	LS	LS↑	LS↓	LS↑
Public Services, Utilities, and Service Systems	LS	LS↔	LS↔	LS↔

TABLE S-3 (Continued)
COMPARISON OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT TO THE
IMPACTS OF THE ALTERNATIVES

	Proposed Project	No Project Alternative	Reduced Growth Alternative	Greater Growth Alternative
Biological Resources	SM	SM ⇔	SM ⇔	SM ⇔
Geology and Soils	LS	LS⇔	LS⇔	LS⇔
Hydrology and Water Quality	LS	LS⇔	LS⇔	LS⇔
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	SM	SM ⇔	SM ⇔	SM ⇔
Mineral and Energy Resources	LS	LS⇔	LS⇔	LS⇔
Agricultural Resources	N	N	N	N

Legend

LS Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SM Significant but Mitigable

SU Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

N No impact

↑ ↓ ⇔ Impact is more severe than, less severe than, or similar to project impact, after mitigation

NOTE: The identified level of significance represents the worst case significance conclusion of all impacts addressed under the corresponding environmental topic.

- Retention of Residential Enclave District (RED) zoning will limit the potential for new housing.
- Prohibition of housing south of Harrison Street will result in land use impacts.
- The proposed six jobs created to one unit of housing and 70 percent market rate/ 30 percent affordable housing split will result in constraints on housing production.
- Historic districts will limit new development to the existing low density. An alternative that would create smaller districts and/or individual landmark designations should be considered.
- An alternative that includes higher heights and no restrictions on residential development above ground floor along major streets should be considered.
- The Western SoMa portion of the Fourth Street corridor should be severed from the proposed Draft Plan Area and implementing rezoning and studied separately along with the area west of Third Street.
- There are concerns regarding downzoning lots along Mission Street (between Seventh and 11th Streets).
- There are concerns regarding existing sources of noise.
- There are concerns regarding mobile and fixed sources of air quality “hot spots” and their relation to sensitive uses.
- Traffic collisions should be identified and their spatial distribution should be mapped to determine “hot spots,” including roads and intersections, within the Draft Plan Area.

- Results of the 2003 San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency PedSafe Analysis regarding Western SoMa should be reviewed.
- Existing pedestrian conditions analysis should include an evaluation based on the Pedestrian Environmental Quality Index.

This page intentionally left blank