



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Certificate of Determination Exemption from Environmental Review

Case No.: 2012.0909E
Project Address: 690 Page Street
Zoning: RM-1 (Residential, Mixed – Low Density) District
40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 0843/016
Lot Size: 7,800 square feet
Project Sponsor: Victor Quan, Town Consulting – 415 246-8855
Staff Contact: Heidi Kline, 415 575-9043, Heidi.Kline@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

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposed project includes the demolition of an existing 2,050-square-foot, single-story former church building and 15-space parking lot built in 1959 and the construction of four multi-family buildings with three dwelling units in each, totaling 12 dwelling units. The four buildings would be four-stories in height with a roof deck. The first floor of each building would be a three-car garage with a driveway onto Page Street. The four buildings would range in size from 5,400 to 5,900 square feet with a maximum height of 40 feet. The 12 individual dwelling units would range in size from 1,325 to 1,450 square feet and all units would have three bedrooms. The project site would be subdivided into four 1,950-square-foot lots with a three-unit residential building on each lot.

EXEMPT STATUS:

Categorical Exemption, Class 32 [State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15332]

REMARKS:

See next page.

DETERMINATION:

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

Sarah B. Jones

Environmental Review Officer

Date

cc: Victor Quan, Town Consulting
London Breed, Supervisor, District 5

Virna Byrd, MDF

PROJECT APPROVALS

Demolition/ Building Permit from the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection.

Approval Action: The proposed project is subject to notification under Section 311 of the Planning Code. If discretionary review before the Planning Commission is requested, the discretionary review hearing is the Approval Action for the project. If no discretionary review is requested, the issuance of a demolition/building permit by DBI is the Approval Action. The Approval Action date establishes the start of the 30-day appeal period for this CEQA exemption determination pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

REMARKS

Setting. The project site is located on the block bounded by Page, Steiner, Oak, and Fillmore Streets in the Western Addition neighborhood. The project site is a rectangular corner lot with its short side on Steiner Street and long side on Page Street. The natural slope of the eastern half of the site was previously altered and the area excavated for the construction of the existing church building. The Steiner Street roadway slopes downhill from north to south (rear to front of the project site) at a 14 percent grade while the project site's Page Street frontage is at a lower elevation and is relatively flat. The entrance to the existing circa 1959 former church building is from the lower elevation on Page Street with the entrance to the parking lot located at a higher elevation on Steiner Street.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) State Guidelines Section 15332, or Class 32, provides an exemption for projects characterized as in-fill development meeting the conditions described below:

(a) The project is consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with pertinent zoning designation and regulations.

The project site is in a RM-1 (Residential, Mixed – Low Density) zoning district. The San Francisco Planning Code (SF Planning Code) specifies that the RM-1 zoning designation should provide for a mix of dwelling unit types found in the various RH (Residential – House, One-Family) districts, but also permit apartment buildings with a range of unit sizes and variety of structure types. A pattern of 25- to 35-foot building widths should be maintained. Structures should rarely exceed 40 feet in height. The overall density of dwelling units would remain low, buildings would be moderately-scaled and segmented, and units or groups of units have separate entrances. The permitted density in the RM-1 zoning district is a maximum of three dwelling units per lot or one unit per 800 square feet of lot area. The minimum lot size for corner lots in the RM-1 zoning district is 1,750 square feet if the frontage is within 125 feet of an intersection. The project site is located in the 40-X height and bulk district that allows a maximum 40-foot building height.

The proposed project is comprised of four multi-family residential buildings that would be constructed on the 7,800-square-foot project site and then, subdivided into four lots that are 25

feet wide and a minimum 1,950 square feet in area. A three-unit residential building would be located on each approximately 1,950-square-foot lot. The proposed project would have a density of three dwelling units per lot and all four buildings would have a 40-foot height. Therefore, the proposed density and building width would be consistent with the development standards in the RM-1 zoning district.

(b) The proposed development occurs within city limits on a project site of no more than five acres substantially surrounded by urban uses.

The project site is 7,800 square feet, or 0.18 acres, which is within the maximum five-acre size permitted to be eligible for a Class 32 exemption, Section 15332 of the CEQA Guidelines. The project site is located within the Western Addition neighborhood in San Francisco, the second-most densely populated city in the United States¹. The project site is located at the corner of Steiner and Page Streets and is surrounded on all four sides with existing residential buildings. Thus, the proposed project is properly characterized as being on a site of less than five acres and surrounded by urban uses.

(c) The project site has no value as habitat for rare, threatened, or endangered species.

The project site is currently covered with impervious surface (building and asphalt parking lot) and is located in an established urban neighborhood in San Francisco. There are eight existing street trees of a non-native landscape species along the site's Page and Steiner Streets frontage. One existing tree would be removed due to a conflict with the proposed driveway to the easternmost multi-family residential building. A new 24" box size tree of a similar species would be planted approximately 10 feet to the east to replace it. No known rare, threatened, or endangered species or habitat have been designated in areas on or adjacent to the project site. Small isolated parcels such as the project site – because of their limited size, non-native landscaping, and non-contiguous nature – are generally of very limited value as habitat. Thus, the site currently has no value as habitat for rare, threatened, or endangered species.

(d) Approval of the project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.

Traffic

Based on the residential trip generation rates in the Planning Department's *Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review* (October 2002), the proposed 12 new dwelling units would generate an additional 120 daily person-trips of which 21 would be expected to occur during the PM peak-hour. These PM peak-hour person-trips would be distributed among various transportation modes, including eight vehicle trips, six transit trips, six walking trips, and one other (bicycle, motorcycle, or taxi) trip.

¹ Wikipedia, *San Francisco, California*. Accessed April 10, 2014. [Available online at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/San_Francisco](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/San_Francisco).

The estimated increase of eight PM peak hour vehicle trips generated by the 12 three-bedroom residential units would be a small incremental increase in traffic and would not be considered a substantial traffic increase relative to the existing capacity of the surrounding area's street system. The final design of the new curb cuts and driveways on Page Street would be reviewed by the San Francisco Department of Public Works (SF DPW) to minimize any conflict with vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic with vehicles entering and exiting the proposed new garages (one per building). Therefore, there would not be a significant impact on traffic in the project area as a result of the proposed project.

Construction Traffic

The project sponsor estimates that during construction, there would be an average of two truck trips per day during the expected month-long excavation and shoring phase, and about four truck trips per day for the estimated 12-month-long construction phase that would follow. It is anticipated that a majority of the construction-related truck traffic would use I-80, I-280, and U.S. 101 to access the project site from the East Bay, South Bay, and from locations within the City. There would be an average of four construction workers per day at the project site, with a maximum of eight workers on any given day, depending on the construction phrase. It is anticipated that the addition of worker-related vehicle or transit trips would not substantially affect transportation conditions. Construction workers who drive to the site would cause a temporary increase in traffic volume and demand for on-street parking. Thus, during the project's demolition and construction phases, worker demand for parking would lessen the availability of on-street parking during working hours. Due to their temporary and limited duration, construction-related impacts would not be considered a significant traffic impact.

Parking

In San Francisco, a closely-related issue to traffic is parking. Section 151 of the SF Planning Code requires that a minimum of one off-street parking space be provided for each dwelling unit within the RM-1 zoning district. Thus, the proposed project with 12 dwelling units would be required to provide 12 off-street parking spaces. As such, the proposed 12 off-street parking spaces would comply with the SF Planning Code's off-street parking requirement.

A portion of the existing 15-space parking lot is currently used for a carsharing service and would be removed as a result of the proposed project. Access to the existing parking lot is from a driveway on Steiner Street. Approximately seven on-street parking spaces are currently available along the project site's Steiner and Page Streets frontage. The proposed project would include the removal of the Steiner Street driveway to the existing parking lot and the establishment of four new driveways on Page Street. The proposed multi-family residential buildings would have their entrances and garages oriented on and accessed from the lower elevation on Page Street. As a result, one additional on-street parking space would be added along the property's Steiner Street frontage and two parking spaces would need to be removed from along the property's Page Street frontage. The overall reduction in parking would be three off-street parking spaces and one on-street parking space.

San Francisco does not consider parking supply as part of the permanent physical environment. Parking conditions are not static, as parking supply and demand varies from day to day, from day to night, from month to month, etc. Hence, the availability of parking spaces (or lack thereof) is not a permanent physical condition, but changes over time as people change their modes and patterns of travel.

Parking deficits are considered to be social effects, rather than impacts on the physical environment as defined by CEQA. Under CEQA, a project's social impacts need not be treated as significant impacts on the environment. Environmental documents should, however, address the secondary physical impacts that could be triggered by a social impact (CEQA Guidelines Section 15131(a)). The social inconvenience of parking deficits, such as having to hunt for scarce parking spaces, is not an environmental impact, but there may be secondary physical environmental impacts, such as increased traffic congestion at intersections, air quality impacts, safety impacts, or noise impacts caused by congestion. In the experience of San Francisco transportation planners, however, the absence of a ready supply of parking spaces, combined with available alternatives to auto travel (e.g., transit service, taxis, bicycles or travel by foot) and a relatively dense pattern of urban development, induces many drivers to seek and find alternative parking facilities, shift to other modes of travel, or change their overall travel habits. Any such resulting shifts to transit service in particular, would be in keeping with the City's "Transit First" policy. The City's Transit First Policy, established in the City's Charter Section 16.102 provides that "parking policies for areas well served by public transit shall be designed to encourage travel by public transportation and alternative transportation."

Noise

An approximate doubling of traffic volumes in the area would be necessary to produce an increase in ambient noise levels discernable to most people. The project would generate an additional 46 daily vehicle trips. Thus, the proposed project would not cause a doubling in traffic volumes and would not result in a substantial increase in the ambient noise level in the project vicinity. Although an increase in noise would be associated with the construction phase of the project, such occurrences would be regulated by the San Francisco Noise Ordinance, Article 29 of the San Francisco Police Code, and would be temporary in nature. Thus, no significant noise impacts would be associated with the proposed project.

Air Quality

In accordance with the state and federal Clean Air Acts, air pollutant standards are identified for the following six criteria air pollutants: ozone, carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter (PM), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), sulfur dioxide (SO₂) and lead. These air pollutants are termed criteria air pollutants because they are regulated by developing specific public health- and welfare-based criteria as the basis for setting permissible levels. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has established thresholds of significance to determine if projects would violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants within the San Francisco Bay Area

Air Basin. To assist lead agencies, the BAAQMD, in their *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* (May 2011), has developed screening criteria. If a proposed project meets the screening criteria, then the project would result in less-than-significant criteria air pollutant impacts. A project that exceeds the screening criteria may require a detailed air quality assessment to determine whether criteria air pollutant emissions would exceed significance thresholds. The proposed thresholds for general condominiums/ townhouses (the category most similar to the proposed project) are 240 units for construction and 451 units for operational. The proposed project would not exceed criteria air pollutant screening levels for operation or construction.²

In addition to criteria air pollutants, individual projects may emit toxic air contaminants (TACs). TACs collectively refer to a diverse group of air pollutants that are capable of causing chronic (i.e., of long-duration) and acute (i.e., severe but of short-term) adverse effects to human health, including carcinogenic effects. In an effort to identify areas of San Francisco most adversely affected by sources of TACs, San Francisco partnered with the BAAQMD to inventory and assess air pollution and exposure from mobile, stationary, and area sources within San Francisco. Areas with poor air quality, termed the "Air Pollutant Exposure Zone," were identified based on two health-protective criteria: (1) excess cancer risk from the contribution of emissions from all modeled sources greater than 100 per one million population, and/or (2) cumulative PM_{2.5} concentrations greater than 10 micrograms per cubic meter. Land use projects within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone require special consideration to determine whether the project's activities would expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations.

The proposed project is not within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with respect to exposing sensitive receptors to substantial levels of air pollution. The proposed project would require construction activities for the approximate 13-month total construction duration. However, construction emissions would be temporary and variable in nature and would not be expected to expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutants. Furthermore, the proposed project would be subject to, and comply with, California regulations limiting idling to no more than five minutes,³ which would further reduce nearby sensitive receptors exposure to temporary and variable TAC emissions. Therefore, construction period TAC emissions would result in a less than significant impact with respect to exposing sensitive receptors to substantial levels of air pollution.

Project-related demolition, excavation, grading and other construction activities may cause wind-blown dust that could contribute particulate matter into the local atmosphere. To reduce construction dust impacts, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved the Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 176-08, effective July 30, 2008) with the intent of reducing the quantity of dust generated during site preparation, demolition, and construction work in order to protect the health of the general public and of onsite workers, minimize public nuisance complaints, and to avoid orders to stop work by the Department of Building Inspection (DBI).

² Bay Area Air Quality Management District, *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*, Updated May 2011. Table 3-1.

³ California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Division 3, § 2485.

Pursuant to the Construction Dust Ordinance, the proposed project would be required to comply with applicable dust control requirements outlined in the ordinance.

In conclusion, the proposed project would not result in significant air quality impacts.

Water Quality

The proposed project would not generate substantial amounts of additional wastewater or result in discharges that would have the potential to degrade water quality or contaminate a public water supply. The proposed new residential dwelling units would be serviced by the City's existing combined sewer system and side sewer connections to the existing system would be permitted through DPW. Furthermore, the City's combined sewer system possesses sufficient capacity to accommodate the incremental increase in demand associated with the proposed project.

The proposed project would be required to implement standard best management practices (BMPs), such as perimeter silt fences, haybales, and sand bags during wet weather to control the quality and quantity of any surface stormwater runoff from the site during construction.

Because the project would result in a ground surface disturbance of 5,000 ft² or greater, the proposed project is subject to San Francisco's stormwater management requirements as outlined in the Stormwater Management Ordinance and the corresponding San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) Stormwater Design Guidelines (Guidelines). Projects that trigger the stormwater management requirements must prepare a Stormwater Control Plan demonstrating project adherence to the performance measures outlined in the Guidelines including: (a) reduction in total volume and peak flow rate of stormwater for areas in combined sewer systems OR (b) stormwater treatment for areas in separate sewer systems. Responsibility for review and approval of the Stormwater Control Plan is with the SFPUC, Wastewater Enterprise, Urban Watershed Management Program. Without SFPUC approval of a Stormwater Control Plan, no site or building permits can be issued. The Guidelines also require a signed maintenance agreement to ensure proper care of the necessary stormwater controls. Preparation of the Stormwater Control Plan for the proposed four-lot project and an ongoing maintenance schedule for the future lot owners would minimize the quantity of stormwater runoff generated by the site and ensure that it would not adversely affect water quality in the area. Thus, the project would not result in significant effects related to water quality.

(e) The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.

The project would be undertaken in an area where all utilities and services are currently provided. Utilities to serve the proposed 12-unit development are available within the adjacent roadways. Therefore, there would be no need for any expansion of public utilities or public service facilities to serve these 12 units. The project sponsor would be required to have plans for all connections to the existing utilities and any modifications to the existing frontage improvements within the public right-of-way approved by DPW's Bureau of Street Use and

Mapping (BSM). BSM would also coordinate construction activities so as to minimize disruption to utility service to other customers during construction.

Nearby public services include Fire Stations Nos. 6 and 21 within 2,500 feet and Fire Stations No. 5 and 36 within 3,000 feet of the project site. Also, the project site is within the Northern Police District and is served from the Northern Police Station located at 1125 Fillmore Street, approximately 2,500 feet from the project site. The Eureka Valley Branch library is located approximately 3,500 feet from the project site at 1 Jose Sarria Court and the Western Addition Branch library is located approximately 4,000 feet from the project site at 1550 Scott Street. Alamo Square Park and Duboce Park are two public parks located within 1,100 feet of the project site. Public schools within 1,000 feet of the project site include the John Muir Pre-kindergarten and Elementary School and the Gateway Middle School (Charter). Public transportation within 400 feet of the project site includes the following San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) MUNI bus routes: 16A Noriega A Express, 16B Noriega Express, 6 Parnassus, 7 Haight, 22 Fillmore, and 71/71L Haight/ Noriega.

Therefore, as demonstrated above, public utilities and public services are available to adequately serve the project site.

Historic Resource

The existing single-story former church building was constructed in 1959 and is classified as a Category "B", or potential historic resource, in the Planning Department's records. A Category B rating indicates that additional information is necessary to make a determination as to whether the site is an historic resource or not. In order for a building to be deemed a historic resource for purposes of CEQA Section 21084.1, it must be listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), or included in a local register of historic resources.

Based on a historic resource evaluation (HRE) prepared by ESA⁴ and subsequent evaluation by the Planning Department Preservation Planning staff,⁵ the project site was determined to not be eligible for listing in the CRHR nor was it included on a local register of historic resources. The extant former church-owned building is an utilitarian building with some aspects of the Modern style of architecture from the Post-War period with several alterations by the owner over the decades, the Second Spanish Baptist Church.

In order for a project to be deemed eligible for listing in the CRHR, the project must be shown to meet any one of the National Register of Historic Places' four criteria: Criterion 1 (Event), Criterion 2 (Persons),

⁴ ESA, *Historic Resource Evaluation Report*, 690 Page Street, San Francisco, California. June 2013. A copy of this document is available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2012.0909E.

⁵ Hilyard, Gretchen, *Historic Resource Evaluation Response*. September 10, 2013. A copy of this document is available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2012.0909E.

Criterion 3 (Architecture), or Criterion 4 (Information Potential). The Planning Department concurs with the findings of the HRE that the subject property is not eligible for listing in the California Register under any criteria, specifically: No known historic events occurred at the property (Criterion 1), none of the owners or occupants have been identified as important to history (Criterion 2), the building design does not embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represent the work of an important creative individual, or possess high artistic merit (Criterion 3). Based upon a review of information in the Departments records, the subject property is not significant under Criterion 4, which is typically associated with archaeological resources. Preservation Planning staff determined that the site does not meet any of these four criteria and is not eligible for listing individually.

The project site is located immediately adjacent to the boundaries of a potential historic district, the Page Street Historic District. The character-defining features of the potential historic district include:

- Two- to three-story height (usually over raised basement with garage opening),
- Residential use (single-family and multi-family flats),
- Raised entry with wood stairs and porch,
- Double-hung, wood-sash windows,
- Two- or three-part vertical façade composition,
- Wood cladding,
- Front property setback and some with side setback,
- Italianate, Queen Anne, Stick/Eastlake, and Classical Revival architectural styles,
- Victorian-era and Revival style façade ornament including: wood brackets, window/door surrounds and hoods, entry porches and columns, and spandrel panels.
- Bracketed, decorative, overhanging cornices,
- Projecting angled, round, or square architectural bays,
- Flat roofs with decorative parapets, and
- Paneled wood garage doors.

The 1959 construction date of the subject property, 690 Page Street, post-dates the period of significance of the district (1887 – 1907) and has not been identified as a contributory resource within the potential historic district. Preservation planning staff evaluated whether the proposed project would have a significant adverse impact to the potential historic district such that the significance of the district would be materially impaired. In its March 10, 2014 Historic Resource Evaluation,⁶ it was determined that the proposed four new residential buildings on the subject property would have a building height, scale and configuration more compatible with the character-defining features of the potential historic district than the current building does. The proposed project would strengthen the project site's compatibility with the adjacent district by providing a consistent street face of four-story residential buildings on 25-foot-wide lots. The proposed project would not result in the removal of any character-defining features or contributors of the eligible Page Street Historic District. Therefore, it was determined that the project

⁶ Hilyard, Gretchen, *Historic Resource Evaluation Response*. March 10, 2014. A copy of this document is available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2012.0909E.

would not have a significant adverse impact to the potential historic district that would materially impair its significance as a historic resource.

The proposed project would not directly involve or alter any historic resources and would not cause a significant adverse impact upon a potential historic district as defined by CEQA.

Public Notice and Comment

A "Notification of the Project Receiving Environmental Review" was mailed on March 21, 2013 to occupants adjacent to the project site and to owners within a 300-foot radius and to potentially interested parties. A number of responses and inquiries for project information were received. Concerns included air quality from construction and future residents' vehicles, potential traffic impacts due to an increase in cars, loss of on-street parking and off-street carsharing spaces, and noise. Comments were also received on the impact on views and loss of natural light to adjoining buildings, bicycle and pedestrian safety due to the proposed garages, hazardous materials, and loss of community assembly space.

Air quality from construction and future occupancy of the units is discussed on pp. 5-6, traffic and parking are discussed on pp. 3-5 and noise is discussed on p. 5.

Shadow and Views

San Francisco is an urban area whose neighborhoods are comprised of residences with varying degrees of public and private views and sunlight penetration. Residences within the neighborhood have a variety of private views, some on- and off-site. Changes to these views, while they may be considered undesirable for those affected, are expected to occur in urban areas. Additionally, there are no view easements in the immediate area that would be compromised. Although the proposed project could affect some private views and the amount of sunlight nearby properties would receive, this change is expected in an urban area and would not be considered a significant environmental impact pursuant to CEQA.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Impacts

The proposed project would involve the addition of four driveways along Page Street to provide access to 12 off-street parking spaces for the new residential units and the removal of the existing driveway from Steiner Street. Bicycle Route 32 is located on Page Street along the project frontage. The proposed project would not alter the bicycle route. The design of the driveways would be required to adhere to both the SF Planning Code and DPW requirements. Compliance with these existing regulations would ensure that the proposed project would not have a significant impacts on bicycle and pedestrian safety.

Hazardous Materials

The proposed project would involve excavation to construct the proposed building foundations for the residential buildings. A Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment⁷ was prepared for the project site and concluded that there was no evidence found during the site reconnaissance to indicate that current or historical activities conducted on the property have contributed to contamination of subsurface soil or groundwater in the area of the property. The project site is not within an area identified by the San Francisco Department of Public Health as being subject to the Maher Ordinance, Article 22A of the San Francisco Public Health Code, that pertains to properties adjacent to freeways, former industrial sites, and areas with known on-site and proximate off-site contamination, such as leaking underground storage tanks or post-1906 earthquake fill. In addition, all demolition work involving the handling and removal of hazardous building materials, such as asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint, would be required to comply with federal, state, and local regulations to ensure its safe removal for both construction workers and neighborhood residents. Therefore, no environmental concerns involving hazardous materials would be associated with the proposed project.

Loss of Assembly Space

The project site is zoned RM-1 and both residential uses and church uses (with Planning Commission approval of a Conditional Use Authorization) are permitted uses. The proposed conversion of this existing use to another permitted use (residential) is consistent with the SF Planning Code, a requirement for projects to be eligible for a Class 32 exemption under CEQA. The loss of church/assembly space is a social/ economic issue and is not considered a physical impact to the environment under CEQA.

Conclusion

CEQA State Guidelines Section 15300.2 states that a categorical exemption shall not be used for an activity where there is a reasonable possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances. For reasons as described above, the project would not result in a significant impact. There are no unusual circumstances surrounding the current proposal that would suggest a reasonable possibility of a significant environmental effect. The project would be exempt under Class 32. For all the above reasons, the proposed project is appropriately exempt from environmental review.

⁷ Partner Engineering and Science, Inc., *Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment Report for 690 Page Street, San Francisco, California*, October 12, 2012May 1999. This document is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103 as part of Case File No. 2012.0909E.

