

RESOLUTION NO. 137-2008

As amended by the Agency Commission on December 2, 2008

CONSIDERING THE ADOPTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS AND A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT AND AUTHORIZING AN OWNER PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT WITH PACIFIC HEIGHTS FRANKLIN PARTNERS, L.P., A CALIFORNIA LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, AS TO AN UNDIVIDED ½ INTEREST, AND PACIFIC HEIGHTS FRANKLIN PARTNERS II, L.P., A CALIFORNIA LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, AS TO AN UNDIVIDED ½ INTEREST, AS TENANTS-IN-COMMON, FOR A 69-UNIT MIXED-USE PROJECT AT 1450 FRANKLIN STREET (ASSESSOR'S BLOCK 671, LOT 6); WESTERN ADDITION REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA A-2

BASIS FOR RESOLUTION

1. 1450 Franklin Street is located on approximately one quarter of an acre on the southeast corner of Franklin and Bush Streets (the "Site") in the Western Addition Redevelopment Project Area A-2 (the "Project Area"). The Site is developed with a two-story concrete building constructed in 1922-1923 that currently houses a specialty auto dealership and repair facility. The owner of the property is Pacific Heights Franklin Partners, L.P., a California limited partnership, as to an undivided ½ interest and Pacific Heights Franklin Partners II, L.P., a California limited partnership, as to an undivided ½ interest, as tenants-in-common (collectively, the "Owner").
2. The Redevelopment Plan for the Western Addition A-2 Redevelopment Project Area (the "Redevelopment Plan") provides for owners to participate in the redevelopment of private property in the Project Area. The Owner wishes to participate and to enter into an Owner Participation Agreement (the "OPA") to make improvements to the Site.
3. Under the OPA, the Owner proposes to demolish the existing building and construct a 13-story mixed-use structure containing 69 for-sale residential units, approximately 1,472 sq. ft. of commercial office space, and 73 off-street parking spaces. Seven of the units will be affordable housing units, pursuant to the terms of the Agency's Housing Participation Policy and the Agency's Limited Equity Home Ownership Program. At the Agency Commission's public hearing on this matter on December 2, 2008, a representative of the Owner offered to increase the number of affordable units by two, without changing the total number of units in the project, for a total of nine units subject to the Agency's Housing Participation Policy and Limited Equity Home Ownership Program. The Owner also agreed not to proceed with demolition of the existing building until the financing commitments necessary to construct the new building have been secured.

4. The Redevelopment Plan also establishes land use controls that property owners must follow so long as the Redevelopment Plan remains in effect. The Redevelopment Plan designates the Site as part of the CH (Commercial, General High Density) Land Use District and the 130-E Height and Bulk District (the "Redevelopment Land Use Requirements"). The density permitted by the Redevelopment Plan is not less than 50 square feet of lot area for each Agency Room, or 240 Agency Rooms. The project as proposed contains 237 Agency Rooms, in a mix of 69 studio, one-, and two-bedroom units.
5. On December 2, 2008, the Agency Commission adopted Resolution No. 136-2008 certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR") for the proposed development pursuant to the California Environment Quality Act and State CEQA Guidelines (collectively "CEQA").
6. The Agency Commission has considered the Final EIR and the administrative record, and seeks to make findings in response to significant effects identified in the Final EIR that the OPA is an Implementing Action in furtherance of the proposed development. The Agency Commission's findings are included as Attachment A to this Resolution. Documents related to the Final EIR and the OPA have been and continue to be available for review by the Agency Commission and the public, and are part of the record before the Agency Commission.
7. As stated in the CEQA findings in Attachment A to this Resolution, the proposed Project will have an unavoidable cumulative significant impact on historical resources associated with the effect of the demolition of the existing building at 1450 Franklin Street.
8. The CEQA findings in Attachment A to this Resolution include a Statement of Overriding Considerations that detail specific overriding benefits of the Project that outweigh the policy of reducing or avoiding identified significant and unavoidable impact on the environment.
9. All other potential significant environmental impacts of the proposed development can be mitigated to less than significant levels with the implementation of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP"). The MMRP is set forth in Exhibit 1 of the CEQA findings in Attachment A to this Resolution. The requirements of the MMRP have also been incorporated into the proposed OPA as Attachment J of the OPA.
10. At the hearing of December 2, 2008, the Agency Commission amended the Resolution by accepting the Owner's offer described in Section 3 above and required that the project provide nine affordable units. The Agency Commission also amended the Resolution by requiring that the existing building not be demolished until the financing commitments necessary to construct the new building have been secured.

RESOLUTION

ACCORDINGLY, IT IS RESOLVED by the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco that:

1. The Agency Commission has reviewed and considered the Final Environmental Impact Report and hereby approves and adopts the environmental findings regarding the proposed Project contained in Attachment A of this Resolution, which relates to the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (attached as Exhibit 1 to Attachment A) and alternatives to the Project.
2. The Agency Commission hereby approves and adopts a Statement of Overriding Considerations for the unavoidable cumulative significant impact on historical resources. The Agency Commission has balanced the Project's benefits against the Project's environmental impacts, and hereby determines that the Project benefits outweigh significant effects that cannot be mitigated.
3. The Executive Director is authorized to execute an Owner Participation Agreement, substantially in the form lodged with the Agency General Counsel, that includes the Commission-authorized amendments, namely an increase of two affordable units subject to the Agency's Housing Participation Policy and Limited Equity Home Ownership Program for a total of nine affordable units in the new building, and the condition that the Owner shall not demolish the existing building until it has secured financing commitments necessary to construct the new building, and to execute related documents with Pacific Heights Franklin Partners, L.P., a California limited partnership, and Pacific Heights Franklin Partners II, L.P., a California limited partnership, for a proposed mixed-use development at 1450 Franklin Street, on Assessor's Block 671, Lot 006 in the Western Addition Redevelopment Project Area A-2.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:


for James B. Morales
Agency General Counsel

ATTACHMENT A:

**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT FINDINGS – 1450
FRANKLIN STREET RESIDENTIAL USE PROJECT**

1. INTRODUCTION

These findings are made by the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco (“Agency”) pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code section 21000 et seq. and the State CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Admin. Code Title 14, Section 15000 et seq. (“CEQA Guidelines”), collectively referred to as “CEQA” unless the context indicates otherwise), with respect to the 1450 Franklin Street Residential Use Project (“Project”), based on the documents, files and other evidence in the record of Project proceedings, including but not limited to, the Draft Environmental Impact Report (“Draft EIR”) and the Comments and Responses document, which jointly constitute the 1450 Franklin Street Residential Use Project Final Environmental Impact Report (“Final EIR”) prepared pursuant to CEQA.

The following sections of this document are organized as follows:

Section 2 describes the Project.

Section 3 lists the actions to be taken by the Agency (which are also part of the Project).

Section 4 provides the basis for approval of the Project, including a description of each alternative to the Project and the economic, legal, social, technological and other considerations that lead to the rejection of the alternatives as infeasible.

Section 5 sets forth findings as to the Project’s potentially significant environmental impacts and the mitigation measures necessary to reduce such impacts to less than significant levels, as contained in **Exhibit 1**, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program required by CEQA Statute Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 1509. **Exhibit 1** provides a table setting forth each mitigation measure listed in Section IV of the Final EIR that is required to reduce or avoid a potentially significant adverse impact, along with improvement measures identified in Section III of the Final EIR to improve conditions where there would be non-significant impacts. **Exhibit 1** also specifies the agency responsible for implementation of each measure, establishes monitoring actions and a monitoring schedule.

Section 6 describes the unavoidable, significant adverse impacts of the Project that have not been mitigated to a less than significant level by the adoption of mitigation measures as provided in the Final EIR.

Section 7 contains a Statement of Overriding Considerations, setting forth specific reasons in support of the Agency’s approval actions for the Project in light of the significant unavoidable impacts discussed in Section 6.

Section 8 provides information regarding access to the administrative record regarding the Project.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project site is located in the Cathedral Hill neighborhood of San Francisco, a few blocks east of Japantown and about eight blocks north of Civic Center. The rectangular 12,000-square-foot project site is on Franklin Street, bounded by Fern Street (south), Franklin Street (west), Bush Street, (north), and Van Ness Avenue (east). The project site is located at 1450 Franklin Street (Assessor's Block 0671, Lot 006). The 12,000-square-foot site (approximately 0.27 acre) is currently fully covered by a two-story concrete and glass building housing a specialty auto dealership and repair facility occupied by 928-CARS, a Porsche and Vespa dealership that also sells a variety of classic sports cars. The existing building contains approximately 24,000 gross square feet that was constructed in 1922 as part of the burgeoning Van Ness "Auto Row." The building is not listed in the California or National Registers of Historic Resources, but is listed in *Splendid Extended* (the Foundation for San Francisco's Architectural Heritage's extended survey of the Downtown).

The project sponsor, Pacific Heights Franklin Partners, LLC, proposes to demolish the existing building and to construct a 13-story mixed-use residential and commercial building. The basement would contain parking. Approximately 1,472 gross square feet of commercial office space located on the ground floor. Floors two and three would contain additional parking, and floors four through thirteen would contain 10 studio units, 21 one-bedroom units, and 38 two-bedroom units for a total of 69 residential units. Two vehicle entrances would be located at the southwest corner of the building—one on Franklin Street and one on Fern Street—forming a porte-cochere that would provide internal access to both the residential lobby and the ramp leading to the second- and third-story parking levels. A third vehicle entrance, located on Fern Street at the southeast corner of the building, would provide access to the three ground-floor commercial parking spaces and the ramp down to the basement parking level. Pedestrian entrances to the commercial office space would be located both on Bush and Franklin Streets. Primary pedestrian access to the residences would be from a lobby located on Franklin Street, with secondary entrances providing garage access located on Bush and Fern Streets.

3. AGENCY COMMISSION ACTIONS

At this time, the Agency's Commission is considering various actions ("Actions") in furtherance of the Project, which include the following:

- 3.1 Certification of the Final EIR for the Project.
- 3.2 Adoption of these CEQA Findings, including the mitigation measures contained in **Exhibit 1**, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.
- 3.3 Approval of an Owner Participation Agreement for the Project.
- 3.4 Approval of the Schematic Design for the Project.

4. CONSIDERATION OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

4.1 Summary of Alternatives Analyzed in the Final EIR

The Final EIR for the Project analyzed the environmental effects of the Project and considered three alternatives:

No Project Alternative

Adaptive Reuse Alternative

Reduced Alternative with Partial Preservation

4.2 Reasons for Selection of the Project

The Project is selected because it would promote achievement of the following objectives of the Redevelopment Plan for the Western Addition Redevelopment Project Area A-2:

1. Provide the framework within which restoration of the economic and social health of the Project Area and its environs will be accomplished by private actions.
3. Guide development toward the production of a satisfying and urbane living and working environment preserving and enhancing the unique social, cultural and esthetic qualities of the City.
4. Stimulate and attract private investment to improve the City's economic health and expand the tax base.

In addition, the Project will promote achievement of all of the following Project Sponsor objectives:

- Replace the existing two-story automotive services building on the site with a high-quality, cost-effective residential/office building in the Cathedral Hill area of San Francisco to provide 69 residential units and associated parking, and 1,472 square feet of commercial space, to meet

the demands of the expanding San Francisco economy and growth in the project area.

- Develop a project consistent with the existing urban design character of the area.
- Complete the project on schedule and within budget.
- Develop a project with minimal environmental disruption.

4.3 Project Alternatives Considered and Reasons for Rejection of the Alternatives

The following section presents an overview of the Alternatives analyzed in the Final EIR. A more detailed description of each Alternative can be found in Chapter VI of the Final EIR.

4.3.1 Alternative A, No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative would entail no change to the existing two-story, approximately 24,000-square-foot building on the site, which is currently in use by an automotive sales and repair facility. The Project would not be built. This alternative, however, would not preclude future proposals for redevelopment of the project. For the purposes of the Draft EIR analysis, it was assumed that the existing building structure would not change, and that it would continue to be occupied in the future by the same type of automotive services use currently occupying the building.

If the No Project Alternative were implemented, none of the impacts associated with the project would occur. The existing building would remain unaltered, and its historic resources would not be recorded at the Historic American Buildings Survey (“HABS”) level set forth by the Draft EIR. The project-specific impacts on intersection conditions, transit use, parking, loading, and pedestrian and bicycle traffic, would not occur, although these impacts would not be significant under the Project. Likewise, the aesthetic impacts, which would also not be significant, would not occur. If a change in use of the existing building were to occur, additional person-trips and associated traffic, transit, and parking demand would likely be generated, but the impacts would be smaller than those of the Project. Intersection operations at Van Ness/Pine and Franklin/Pine would degrade to LOS E levels, and Franklin/Sutter would degrade to LOS F levels of service by the 2025 cumulative horizon year, and would do so under this alternative.

Air quality impacts listed in the Initial Study would not occur under Alternative A, therefore, Mitigation Measure AQ-1, which would mitigate construction-generated PM₁₀ impacts, would not be implemented.

Cumulative wind impacts addressed in the Initial Study would likely still occur as a result of other expected development in the area's future. Because the existing building would

not be further contributing to the cumulative wind impact, Mitigation Measure WS-I, which mandates planting of trees as windbreaks along the project site's sidewalks, would not be implemented.

Geological impacts related to seismic hazards would continue to exist, and no seismic retrofitting or improvements would be included in Alternative A. Therefore, the geology and soils impacts of this alternative would be greater than those of the Project, as the existing building would not match the structural quality of the Project, thereby exposing workers and customers to the potential effects of seismic ground shaking, including structural failure of the building.

Alternative A would not create an impact on archaeological or paleontological resources compared to the Project, as no demolition of the existing structure and subsurface excavation would occur.

Other less-than-significant effects of the Project described in the Initial Study, including effects of the proposed 13-story project on air quality, agricultural resources, biology, hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, noise, population and housing, recreation, and utilities/public services would not occur with this alternative and no mitigation measures would be required.

The No Project Alternative is rejected as infeasible for the following reasons:

Reduced Housing – The No Project Alternative would provide no housing overall and no affordable housing, and therefore, would not improve residential conditions in the Project area or encourage residential activity or contribute to affordable housing in the City.

Reduced Economic and Business Vitality – The No Project Alternative will provide fewer resources for economic revitalization efforts and would not stimulate and attract private investment to improve the City's economic health, tax base and employment opportunities.

Building Obsolescence – The No Project Alternative would not provide a modern building constructed to current seismic and building code standards and future uses of the building would be limited by the existing construction or would require substantial upgrades to conform to modern building code standards.

For the economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations reasons set forth here and in the Final EIR, the No Project Alternative is rejected as infeasible.

4.3.2 Alternative B, Adaptive Reuse of Existing Building Alternative

Alternative B, the Adaptive Reuse of Existing Building Alternative, would retain the existing building, but would allow of adaptive reuse of the building as lofts or condominium units. This alternative would provide approximately 21 residential units averaging 1,000 square feet each plus 3,000 square feet for approximately 18 parking

spaces. Assuming an average occupancy rate of 1.43 residents per unit, Alternative B would introduce approximately 30 new residents to the project site, instead of the estimated 99 new residents under the project proposal, a reduction of approximately 68 percent. Alternative B would not involve any commercial use on the project site.

Unlike the Project, Alternative B: Adaptive Reuse of Existing Building Alternative would preserve the existing building on the site. Because the building could be included in a potential MPS Historic District, its preservation would avoid a potentially significant cumulative impact on historical resources. The impact of this alternative on visual quality, urban design, views, and land use would be less than those of the Project, although they would be less-than-significant for both the Project and this alternative.

Alternative B would generate fewer vehicle trips than the Project, and have reduced environmental effects on transportation and parking, although these impacts would be less-than-significant for the Project. This alternative would contribute smaller amounts than the Project to the cumulative year 2025 growth in traffic at three nearby intersections that would operate at Level of Service E or F under cumulative conditions (Van Ness/Pine, Franklin/Pine, and Franklin/Sutter), and this alternative would not have a significant cumulative impact, because either the traffic movements would continue to operate satisfactorily, or the alternative would make very small contributions to critical intersection movements that would operate below standard.

Construction-related air quality impacts addressed and mitigated in the Initial Study would not occur under Alternative B, as no exterior construction work would occur. Some construction dust would likely be created as part of the interior remodeling; however, the criterion pollutant in this case, PM₁₀, would not be created in any significant amount, as it is usually associated with grading, excavating, and wind erosion on unpaved land.

Cumulative wind impacts addressed in the Initial Study would likely still occur as a result of other expected development in the area's future. Because the existing building would not further contribute to the cumulative wind impact, implementation of Mitigation Measure WS-1, which mandates planting of trees as windbreaks along the project site's sidewalks, would not be required.

Alternative B would not create an impact on archaeological or paleontological resources compared to the Project, as no demolition of the existing structure and subsurface excavation would occur.

Alternative B would expose people and structures to seismic ground shaking and possible liquefaction. For conversion to residential units, structural improvement would likely be required which would bring the existing structure to a level of safety similar to the proposed new project building. The geology and soils impacts of Alternative B would therefore be comparable to those of the Project.

In a comparative evaluation, Alternative B would have smaller effects on hazards, hydrology, land use, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, utilities, and wind and shadows, although these impacts would be less-than-significant for both this alternative and the Project. Similar to the project, this alternative would have no adverse effects related to agricultural resources, biological resources, or mineral resources.

Alternative B is rejected as infeasible for the following reasons:

Reduced Housing – Alternative B would provide substantially less housing overall and substantially less affordable housing.

Reduced Economic and Business Vitality – Alternative B would not include any commercial office space and consequently would provide fewer resources for economic revitalization efforts and would provide less of a stimulus for private investment to improve the City's economic health, tax base and employment opportunities.

Economic Infeasibility – Alternative B is considered infeasible due to numerous physical, technical, and marketability problems. In order to provide 18 parking spaces within only 3,000 sq. ft. parking stackers or a puzzle-lift type of system would need to be installed. These systems are expensive to install and maintain, sometimes require attendants. There would be little diversity in the unit mix with almost all units being very small one bedroom/one bath and small studio units, and the price points to provide marketable residential units would not cover project development costs. In addition, because Alternative B does not provide one for one parking, it is uncertain if lenders will fund the construction of residential units that do not provide a parking space.

For the economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations reasons set forth here and in the Final EIR, the Preservation Alternative is rejected as infeasible.

4.3.3 Alternative C, Reduced Alternative with Partial Preservation Alternative

Alternative C, the Reduced Alternative With Partial Preservation, would alter the existing building by constructing additional residential levels above the existing building. Under this alternative, seven levels, with approximately 7 units per floor for a total of 49 residential units, would be added. The existing building's exterior would remain mostly intact, while the seven additional levels would be built above the existing building. This alternative would include approximately 1,500 square feet of ground-floor commercial office space. Parking would take place on the remainder of the ground floor, and on the second floor of the existing building. No underground parking would be required; therefore, a reduced amount of excavation would be required, limited to that needed for structural strengthening and foundation construction. Nevertheless, similar to the Project, Alternative C may create an impact on archaeological or paleontological resources and would require implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-1.

Under this alternative, new openings in the existing facade would be required to accommodate retail and residential foot and vehicle traffic, however, a porte-cochere would not be included in this alternative in order to maximize preservation of the exterior. Due to the alteration of the facade that would be required, Mitigation Measure CR-2, which requires HABS documentation of the building, would likely still be required. The alternative would require evaluation by a qualified architectural historian to determine whether or not it would avoid the significant and unavoidable cumulative impact on historic resources that has been identified for the project.

Under this alternative, the overall appearance of the project site would be substantially altered due to the construction of seven additional floors on top of the existing building, for a total of nine floors. The height, massing, and scale of this alternative would be reduced in comparison with the Project, and impacts on visual quality, urban design, and views would therefore be less than those of the Project, although the impacts of both this alternative and the project would be less-than-significant.

This alternative would add to the intensity of land use within the Cathedral Hill area, but the approximately 49 residential units would not be considered a significant addition to the projected residential housing stock in the City when considered within the context of year 2025 housing projections. Land use and growth-inducing impacts, including cumulative impacts, of this alternative would be less than significant.

Alternative C would have reduced environmental effects on transportation and parking. Reducing the number of residential units relative to the Project by 30 percent, Alternative C would generate approximately 49 units with approximately 70 new residents. The impacts of this alternative on operating conditions and levels of congestion at the key intersections studied would be less-than-significant. This alternative would contribute smaller amounts than the Project to the cumulative year 2025 growth in traffic at three nearby intersections that would operate at Level of Service E or F under cumulative conditions (Van Ness/Pine, Franklin/Pine, and Franklin/Sutter), but this alternative would not have a significant cumulative impact, because either the traffic movements would continue to operate satisfactorily, or the alternative would make very small contributions to critical intersection movements that would operate below standard.

Even assuming compliance with the Western Addition A-2 Redevelopment Plan, Alternative C would present more parking demand than parking spaces, similar to the project proposal. By scaling the number of units to 70 percent of project proposal, and assuming the number of parking spaces would be scaled in a similar manner, approximately 70 percent of the parking deficit would be generated, or approximately 14 spaces. Furthermore, no curb cuts would be removed; therefore the two additional street parking spaces generated by the project proposal would not be created by Alternative C, resulting in a net deficit of 16 spaces. CEQA does not consider parking, or a lack thereof, to be a significant impact. Furthermore, The City of San Francisco's Transit First Policy established in the City's Charter Section 16.1 02 provides that "parking policies for areas well served by public transit shall be designed to encourage travel by public transportation and alternative transportation." Therefore, under CEQA and San Francisco

policy, a lack of sufficient parking, especially when near to public transit access, is considered a less-than-significant impact.

This alternative's effects on wind and shadow, including cumulative impacts, would be less than those of the Project. However, Mitigation Measure WS-1 would likely still be required to mitigate the alternative's contribution to wind impacts under 2025 Cumulative conditions to less-than-significant levels.

Alternative C would result in reduced PM₁₀ emissions during construction relative to the Project, as the existing building shell would remain in place during construction, which would eliminate bare-earth surface exposure during construction, and implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would not be required. The other less-than-significant operational air quality impacts would be further reduced under Alternative C because it would generate less traffic than the Project.

This alternative would have geology and soils impacts similar to those of the Project; it would introduce residents to potential seismic ground shaking and ground failure. For the Project, new-building standards would negate the impact to a less-than-significant level; however, for this alternative, extensive retrofitting and reconstruction of the foundation system may be required. City building standards would be implemented to ensure compliance with all safety requirements, ensuring a less-than-significant impact.

Construction of this alternative would require considerable modification of the existing structure, which would affect the historic resources value of the structure. However, partial preservation would have a reduced impact on historic resources in comparison to the project. The alternative would also have a reduced construction impact on air quality impact because site grading would not be required, and the alternative would not be required to implement Mitigation Measure AQ-1. Operational impacts on air quality would be somewhat reduced in comparison with the project, and would not require mitigation.

Compared to the Project, the Reduced Alternative With Partial Preservation would have similar or smaller effects on hazards, noise, utilities and public services, biology, water, and energy/natural resources, although these impacts would be less-than-significant for both this alternative and the Project.

A variant to Alternative C (Partial Preservation, Same Density as Proposed Project) that would match the number of residential units with the proposed project would either require relief from the parking requirements imposed by the *Redevelopment Plan*, or require that additional parking be provided. The Alternative C variant would have to include a subterranean level for additional parking. However, the additional requirement of the construction of a subterranean level under the existing building facades would require that all sides of the existing building be underpinned to extend support for the existing exterior walls of the building to below the subterranean building before excavation and foundation construction could occur. Even if the east side of the building

facing the adjoining lot could be removed and replaced, underpinning would still be necessary to protect the adjacent structure.

Alternative C is rejected as infeasible for the following reasons:

Reduced Housing – Alternative C would provide less housing overall and less affordable housing than with the Project.

Reduced Economic Development – Alternative C would provide less overall development and would provide fewer resources for economic revitalization efforts and would provide less of a stimulus for private investment to improve the City's economic health, tax base and employment opportunities.

Economic Infeasibility – Alternative C is considered infeasible due to complications encountered in providing the structure for an above-grade parking garage and the resultant added costs of construction. The price points to provide marketable residential units would not cover the increased project development costs. Retaining the approximately 12-inch-thick outer walls of the existing building would significantly inhibit the available interior space for parking when considering the additional supports and bracing needed due to the removal of the existing floor and roof structures and replacing them with sloping concrete decks, and due to the increased lateral loading imposed on the structure by the existing concrete facades. This additional structural support would substantially increase the overall costs to design and construct the building. In addition, the structural grid needed to achieve the parking layout on the sloping concrete decks would be incongruous with the existing façade of the building and would require column placement within the openings of the existing façade, thus compromising the quality of the retained structure. Aside from the additional costs needed to preserve, protect, temporarily shore, and permanently brace the existing facades, substantial additional expense would be needed to construct the interior structure of the parking decks with the existing facades in place.

A variant to Alternative C that would provide the same density (69 residential units) as Project would face the same increased project development costs as Alternative C. If the variant were to include a subterranean level for additional parking, there would be additional development costs, as the construction of a subterranean level under the existing building facades would require that all sides of the existing building be underpinned to extend support for the existing exterior walls of the building to below the subterranean building before excavation and foundation construction could occur. In addition, if the subterranean parking level is not constructed, the variant to Alternative C would not provide one for one parking, and consequently, it is uncertain if lenders will fund the construction of residential units that do not provide a parking space.

For the economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations reasons set forth here and in the Final EIR, the Reduced Alternative is rejected as infeasible.

5. SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT AND POTENTIAL MITIGATION MEASURES

The California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) requires agencies to adopt mitigation measures that would avoid or substantially lessen a project's identified significant impacts or potential significant impacts if such measures are feasible.

The Findings in this section concern mitigation measures set forth in the Final EIR. These Findings discuss mitigation measures as proposed in the Final EIR and recommended for adoption by the Agency Commission, which can be implemented by the Agency and City agencies or departments, including, but not limited to, the Department of City Planning ("Planning Department"), the Department of Public Works, the Municipal Transportation Agency, the Department of Building Inspection and the County Coroner. The project sponsor will have primary responsibility for implementation of the mitigation measures, and the Agency and various City agencies will have the primary responsibility for monitoring the implementation.

5.1 Significant Environmental Impacts

The Initial Study on the Project, which is attached to the Draft EIR as Appendix A, identified potential significant impacts related to construction air quality, wind, and archaeological and paleontological resources, and included mitigation measures to reduce these impacts to less than significant levels. The Draft EIR identified a potential cumulative significant impact on historical resources. These impacts are discussed below.

5.1.1 Construction Air Quality

Construction operations for any sizeable project have the potential to result in short-term but significant adverse air quality impacts. PM₁₀ is emitted by construction equipment and is especially generated by site grading, excavation, movement of vehicles over unpaved surfaces, and as a result of wind erosion over exposed earth surfaces. Particulate emissions from these sources can contribute to adverse health effects and cause nuisance effects such as reduced visibility and deposition of dust on parked cars, window ledges, and other horizontal surfaces. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District's CEQA Guidelines identify control measures keyed to the size of construction. Absent implementation of the appropriate control measures, the project's effects of construction-generated dust would be a potentially significant impact. Implementation all of the controls listed in Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would reduce the project's construction-related air quality impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure AQ-1:

The project applicant shall require the construction contractor to reduce the severity of project construction period dust impacts by complying with the following control measures:

- Water all active construction areas at least twice daily. Consistent with Ordinance 175-91, only non-potable water shall be used for all dust-control purposes. The construction contractor shall obtain reclaimed water from the City's Clean Water Program for this purpose.
- Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials, or require all trucks to maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard.
- Pave, apply water two times daily, or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at the construction site.
- Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at the construction site.
- Sweep adjacent public streets daily (with water sweepers) if any visible soil material is carried onto the streets.
- Require construction contractors to (1) properly maintain construction equipment and vehicles in accordance with the manufacturers' recommendations, and (2) minimize idling time when equipment is not in use and when trucks are waiting in queues. Include these provisions in all construction contracts.

5.1.2 Wind

Large buildings can redirect wind flows around and down to street level, resulting in increased wind speed and turbulence at street level. To provide a comfortable wind environment for San Franciscans, the City established specific comfort criteria for evaluation of proposed buildings. The Planning Code establishes an equivalent wind speed of 7 miles per hour (mph) in seating areas and 11 mph in areas of substantial pedestrian use as comfort criteria. Based on a wind tunnel test, the Planning Code's 11-mph pedestrian comfort criterion is currently exceeded at seven of the test point locations.

Under project conditions, wind speeds of 14 mph would occur at four locations. Results would be similar under cumulative conditions. Implementation of the proposed project would not increase the net number of pedestrian comfort criterion exceedances currently occurring (seven exceedances), and exceedances would be eliminated at two of the four test points immediately surrounding the project site, mid-block on Fern and Bush Streets. However, eight pedestrian comfort criterion exceedances would occur under cumulative conditions, representing a net increase in ambient wind speeds relative to existing conditions. This would be potentially significant impact, which would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure WS-1.

Mitigation Measure WS-1:

The project applicant shall plant street trees along all three street frontages of the project site to reduce pedestrian-level wind speeds. The project applicant shall also explore the use of wind baffles or other building façade design modifications to

further reduce the potential for exceedances of the pedestrian comfort criterion. These building and site modifications shall be subjected to an additional wind tunnel study to demonstrate that the proposed building would not result in additional exceedances, beyond those currently existing, of the 11-mph equivalent wind speed in pedestrian use areas under project and/or cumulative conditions. If the project is unable to conform with this requirement, the project sponsor shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Office of Environmental Review that it is not feasible to modify the building to meet the requirement without restricting the development potential of the site.

5.1.3 Archaeological and Paleontological Resources

The project site is situated in what was, prior to the arrival of the first Europeans, the territory occupied by the Costanoan people, a Native American group also referred to as the Ohlone. The project site is located in a sensitive area within a one-mile radius of five other sites. Furthermore, five other sites within a two-mile radius of the project site have yielded deeply buried, previously unrecorded prehistoric artifacts. The presence of numerous deeply buried prehistoric deposits in an intensively developed area of San Francisco indicates that similar prehistoric/protohistoric (up to 1775 A.D.) archeological deposits may exist within or adjacent to the proposed project site.

Construction of the proposed project would require excavation to a depth of approximately 18 feet, and removal of substantial amounts of soil. Given the potential presence of archeological resources on the site, a program of pre-construction testing and evaluation is recommended to determine the presence or absence of subsurface resources of significance, as identified in Mitigation Measure CR-1. Mitigation Measure CR-1 additionally sets forth programs for monitoring and data recovery, should archeological resources be discovered. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce potential impacts to less-than-significant levels.

There are no known or suspected paleontological resources at the project site, and, therefore, the project is not expected to result in any adverse effects on paleontological resources. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-1 would ensure that potential impacts to paleontological resources would remain less than significant.

Mitigation Measure CR-1:

Archeological Resources (Testing)

Based on a reasonable presumption that archeological resources may be present within the project site, the following measures shall be undertaken to avoid any potentially significant adverse effect from the proposed project on buried or submerged historical resources. The project sponsor shall retain the services of a qualified archeological consultant having expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archeology. The archeological consultant shall undertake an archeological testing program as specified herein. In addition, the consultant shall

be available to conduct an archeological monitoring and/or data recovery program if required pursuant to this measure. The archeological consultant's work shall be conducted in accordance with this measure at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer (ERO). All plans and reports prepared by the consultant as specified herein shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment, and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Archeological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction of the project for up to a maximum of four weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of construction can be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce to a less-than-significant level potential effects on a significant archeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Sect. 15064.5(a)(c).

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

At the completion of the archeological testing program, the archeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings to the ERO. If based on the archeological testing program the archeological consultant finds that significant archeological resources may be present, the ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant shall determine if additional measures are warranted. Additional measures that may be undertaken include additional archeological testing, archeological monitoring, and/or an archeological data recovery program. If the ERO determines that a significant archeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the proposed project, at the discretion of the project sponsor either:

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

Archeological Monitoring Program. If the ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant determines that an archeological monitoring program shall

be implemented, the archeological monitoring program shall minimally include the following provisions:

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

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

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

The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements:

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

Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects. The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and Federal laws. This shall include immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the Coroner's determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (Pub. Res. Code 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 Guidelines 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.

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

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

5.1.4 Historical Resources

Although the building, located at 1450 Franklin Street is a well-preserved auto-related building, it is not eligible for individual listing in the National and/or California Registries. Notwithstanding, the building is consistent with an automotive use and may be eligible as a contributor to a potential Van Ness Avenue Multiple Property Submission (“MPS”) Historic District. Demolition of the building at 1450 Franklin Street would not necessarily result in a substantive adverse change to the significance of the MPS Historic District as a whole; however, demolition of the building would result in the loss of a well-preserved contextual building that informs the story of the San Francisco's Auto Row, and therefore, the demolition would contribute to some unknown degree to the loss of the historic fabric of the area. Given these considerations the Final EIR included Mitigation Measure CR-2 to offset the cumulatively significant impact on the potential MPS Historic District. Nevertheless, the mitigations would not reduce the loss of the building and the demolition of the building at 1450 Franklin Street would be considered to be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure CR-2:

HABS recordation

The project sponsor shall document the history and the existing exterior and interior conditions of the building at 1450 Franklin Street according to the Historic American Buildings Survey ("HABS") Level II documentation. According to HABS standards, Level II documentation consists of the following tasks:

- Drawings: Existing drawings, where available, should be photographed with large format negatives or photographically reproduced on mylar.
- Photographs: Photographs with large-format negatives should be shot of exterior and interior views or historic views where available. These should be printed on archival fiber paper.
- Written data: A report documenting the existing conditions and history of the building should be prepared.

The completed documentation package shall be submitted to local and regional archives, including but not limited to, the San Francisco Public Library History Room, the California Historical Society and the Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University in Rohnert Park.

History Exhibition

The project sponsor could contribute to a fund an exhibit illustrating the history and architecture of San Francisco's Van Ness Avenue Corridor for display at the San Francisco Public Library or City Hall. This exhibit may include text and photographs depicting the history of Van Ness Avenue as San Francisco's Auto Row as well as a map identifying the remaining auto-related buildings deemed to have architectural significance.

Salvage

As part of deconstruction, prior to demolition, the project sponsor shall consult with a Planning Department Preservation Technical Specialist and local historical societies regarding the salvage of materials from the existing building for public information or reuse in other locations. As determined appropriate through this consultation, the project sponsor may salvage the original character-defining entry features of the existing building for possible reuse in a future historic district, and shall seek to donate those elements to an organization such as a local historical society. The architect and builder shall seek an interested neighborhood organization to look after these salvage materials so they are stored appropriately, for reuse in restoration. The City, prior to the issuance of building permits, shall confirm donation of the materials to the historical society or other entity. Demolition may proceed only after any significant historic materials have been identified and their removal completed.

Research Compilation

In order to reduce the adverse cumulative impact to the potential MPS historic district, research conducted in the course of the environmental review of this project shall be compiled for future reference and usefulness. Further documentation of the potential district would hasten the ability for San Francisco to designate such a MPS historic district and enact preservation controls as warranted. The project sponsor's Preservation Consultant shall organize information about the 1450 Franklin Street building, and supplement existing data only where necessary to complete items (3.A and 3.C) noted below. This information shall be made available to the Agency, to the Planning Department, and to the public, for educational use, and for use by the Planning Department in future Preservation survey and district designation programs.

- A. A context statement related to the buildings surrounding the project.
- B. A table of spreadsheet of the surrounding properties involved and their status as possible contributors to a district based on the context statement.
- C. General direction for future survey activity building on the report described above.

Contribution to the City's Historic Preservation Fund

The project sponsor shall be subject to making a contribution to the City's historic preservation fund if the City has established a program for survey, research and evaluation of the potential Van Ness Avenue MPS Historic District prior to completion of the project (i.e., issuance of the final certificate of occupancy). The project sponsor shall be required to contribute its fair share of funds to the City to be applied to future historic preservation activities related to the potential MPS Historic District, including survey work and research and evaluation, in accordance with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation & Illustrated Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*.

5.2 Feasible Mitigation Measures

The Agency finds that, based on the record before it, the mitigation measures proposed for adoption in the Final EIR, as explained above, are feasible and they can and should be carried out by the identified agencies at the designated time. All mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR that will reduce or avoid significant adverse environmental impacts are proposed for adoption and are set forth in **Exhibit 1**, in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. None of the mitigation measures set forth in the Final EIR that is needed to reduce or avoid significant adverse environmental impacts are rejected.

5.3 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Public Resources Code section 21081.6 requires public agencies to adopt a reporting or monitoring program whenever a public agency adopts an environmental impact report to mitigate or avoid a project's significant effects on the environment. The purpose of this requirement is to ensure that such mitigation measures are implemented in a timely manner and in accordance with the terms of project approval.

The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (“MMRP”) for the Project, pursuant to AB 3180, CEQA Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15097, provides the basic framework through which adopted mitigation measures will be monitored to ensure implementation.

5.3.1 Organization of the MMRP

The MMRP is attached as **Exhibit 1** and organized in a table format. For each measure, the table: (1) lists the mitigation measure; (2) specifies the party responsible for implementing the measure; (3) establishes a schedule for mitigation implementation; (4) assigns mitigation monitoring responsibility; and (5) establishes monitoring actions and a schedule for mitigation monitoring.

For ease of reference each measure listed in **Exhibit 1** has a corresponding number, arranged in the order in which they are discussed in the Final EIR.

The MMRP includes improvement measures for reducing effects on transportation. The improvement measure diminishes the effects of the project that were found through the environmental analysis process to result in less than significant impacts.

5.3.2 Implementation of the MMRP

While the MMRP generally outlines the actions, responsibilities and schedule for mitigation monitoring, it does not attempt to specify the detailed procedures to be used to verify implementation (e.g., interactions between the Project Sponsor - the Agency and City of San Francisco departments, use of private consultants, sign-off on plans, site inspections, etc.). Specific monitoring procedures are either contained in approval documents or will be developed at a later date, closer to the time the mitigation measures will actually be implemented.

6. **SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

In accordance with Section 21100(b)(2)(A) of CEQA, and with Section 15126.2 of the CEQA Guidelines, this section identifies environmental 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 described in Final EIR Chapter IV, Mitigation Measures. The proposed Project, with

mitigation, would have an unavoidable cumulative significant impact on historical resources. As described in Section 5.1.4 above, the building at 1450 Franklin Street is a contributor to a potential Van Ness Avenue MPS Historic District. Demolition of the building would contribute to some unknown degree to the loss of the historic fabric of the area. Although implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-2 included in the Final EIR would offset the cumulatively significant impact on the potential MPS Historic District, the mitigations would not reduce the loss of the building and the demolition of the building at 1450 Franklin Street would be considered to be significant and unavoidable.

7. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Notwithstanding the unavoidable cumulative significant impact noted above, pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(b) and the CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, the Redevelopment Agency finds, after considering the FEIR and based on substantial evidence in said documents, the administrative record and as set forth herein, that specific overriding economic, legal, social and other considerations outweigh the identified significant effects on the environment. In addition, the Redevelopment Agency finds, in addition to the specific reasons discussed in Article 4 above, that those Project Alternatives rejected above are also rejected for the following specific economic, social, or other considerations resulting from project approval and implementation:

- 7.1 The proposed Project will further some of the goals of the Western Addition A-2 Redevelopment Plan (October 3, 1994).
- 7.2 The proposed Project will further the City's General Plan goal related to reduction of urban sprawl by concentrating high density new housing in the City and lessening the pressure to develop on open space in other parts of the Bay Area.
- 7.3 The proposed Project will create 62 market rate studios, one-bedroom, and two-bedroom units and will increase the City's market rate housing supply. These market rate units will help address the City's broader need for additional housing in a citywide context in which job growth and in-migration outpace the provision of new housing.
- 7.4 The City and the A-2 Redevelopment Area face a continuing shortage of affordable housing ownership opportunities. In compliance with the Agency's Affordable Housing Policy and the objectives of the California Community Redevelopment Law, and in furtherance of the region's housing needs allocation, the proposed Project will create seven on-site affordable owner-occupied opportunities to low and moderate income level households within the A-2 Redevelopment Area. The affordable units consist of a mix of studio,

one-bedroom, and two-bedroom units on various floors throughout the building, and will promote economic diversity within the Cathedral Hill neighborhood. These units will remain affordable for a minimum of 45 years pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 33334.3.

7.5 The proposed Project will create a number of temporary construction jobs and may create up to 10 new permanent jobs in the Redevelopment Area. The proposed Project consists of five primary construction phases over a period of approximately 24 to 28 months, and will generate temporary construction jobs during the two year construction period. The existing auto dealership currently employs approximately 10 people, and the proposed Project will create approximately 10-20 permanent jobs, including building management positions, building maintenance positions, and commercial positions in the ground floor commercial office space, resulting in a net increase of up to 10 new permanent jobs.

Having considered these Project benefits, including the considerations discussed in Article 4 above, the Agency Commission finds that the Project's benefits outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, and that the adverse environmental effects are therefore acceptable.

8. LOCATION OF PROJECT RECORDS

The public hearing transcript, a copy of all letters regarding the Final EIR received during the public review period, the administrative record, and background documentation for the Final EIR are located at the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, One South Van Ness Avenue, Fifth Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103. Records pertaining to the Project may be reviewed by contacting Benjamin Ibarra, Public Affairs Officer (415) 749-2519.