

# REVISED **Certificate of Determination COMMUNITY PLAN EVALUATION**

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

Reception: 415.558.6378

Fax:

415.558.6409

Planning Information: 415.558.6377

Case No .:

2014.0008E

Project Title:

33 Norfolk Street

Zoning/Plan Area: WMUG (WSoMa Mixed Use General) District

55-X Height and Bulk District

Western SoMa Community Plan

Block/Lot:

3521/053A and 093

Lot Size:

5,975 square feet

Project Sponsor:

Hannu Pajuluoma – ILG Properties

(415) 392-1111, hannu@ilgproperties.com

Staff Contact:

Michael Li

(415) 575-9107, michael.j.li@sfgov.org

THIS COMMUNITY PLAN EVALUATION (CPE) SUPERSEDES THE CPE THAT WAS PUBLISHED ON SEPTEMBER 3, 2015. FOLLOWING THE PUBLICATION OF THE PREVIOUS CPE, THE PROPOSED PROJECT WAS REVISED.

## **CEQA DETERMINATION**

The project is eligible for streamlined environmental review per Section 15183 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines and California Public Resources Code Section 21083.3.

## **DETERMINATION**

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

**Environmental Review Officer** 

November 22, 2017

CC:

Hannu Pajuluoma – ILG Properties, Project Sponsor

Chris Townes, Current Planning Division

Supervisor Jane Kim, District 6

Virna Byrd, M.D.F.

Exclusion/Exemption Dist. List

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project site is on the east side of Norfolk Street between Folsom and Harrison streets in San Francisco's South of Market (SoMa) neighborhood; it is on the block bounded by Folsom Street on the north, 11th Street on the east, Harrison Street on the south, and Norfolk Street on the west. The project site consists of two adjacent parcels: Assessor's Block 3521, Lots 053A and 093. Lot 053A is occupied by a two-story, 20-foot-tall building containing an office use. Lot 093 is vacant; it is used as a surface parking lot for five vehicles and as a storage area by the adjacent office use.

The proposed project consists of merging the two existing lots into a single 5,975-square-foot (sf) lot, demolishing the existing building and surface parking lot, and constructing a five-story, 55-foot-tall, building containing 19 dwelling units and two parking spaces. The parking spaces would be on the ground floor, and they would be accessed by a garage door on Norfolk Street. The project site has three existing curb cuts on Norfolk Street; all three would be removed, and one new curb cut would be provided. A total of 20 bicycle parking spaces would be provided; there would be 19 Class 1 spaces in a secure storage room on the ground floor and one Class 2 space adjacent to the residential entrance to the proposed building. Usable open space for the residents of the proposed project would be provided in the form of private balconies/decks, a common second-floor terrace, and a common roof deck.

Construction of the proposed project is expected to last 16 months. The proposed building would be supported by a mat slab foundation; no pile driving is required. Construction of the proposed project would require excavation to a depth of three feet below ground surface and the removal of approximately 1,666 cubic yards of soil.

## PROJECT APPROVAL

The proposed project would require the following approvals:

- **Demolition Permit** (*Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection*)
- Site/Building Permit (Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection)

The proposed project is subject to notification under Planning Code Section 312. If discretionary review before the Planning Commission is requested, the discretionary review action constitutes the Approval Action for the specific building being reviewed. If no discretionary review is requested, the issuance of the building permit application by the Department of Building Inspection constitutes the Approval Action for the specific building being reviewed. The Approval Action date establishes the start of the 30-day appeal period for this CEQA determination pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

## COMMUNITY PLAN EVALUATION OVERVIEW

California Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 provide that projects that are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan, or general plan policies for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was certified, shall not be subject to additional environmental review except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. Section 15183 specifies that examination of environmental effects shall be limited to those effects that: (a) are peculiar to the project or parcel on which the project would be located; (b) were not analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR on

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT the zoning action, general plan, or community plan with which the project is consistent; (c) are potentially significant off-site and cumulative impacts that were not discussed in the underlying EIR; or (d) are previously identified in the EIR, but which, as a result of substantial new information that was not known at the time that the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than that discussed in the underlying EIR. Section 15183(c) specifies that if an impact is not peculiar to the parcel or to the proposed project, then an EIR need not be prepared for the project solely on the basis of that impact.

This determination evaluates the potential project-specific environmental effects of the 33 Norfolk Street project described above, and incorporates by reference information contained in the Programmatic EIR for the Western SoMa Community Plan, Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels, and 350 Eighth Street Project (Western SoMa PEIR).¹ Project-specific studies were prepared for the proposed project to determine if the project would result in any significant environmental impacts that were not identified in the Western SoMa PEIR.

The Western SoMa PEIR included analyses of the following environmental issues: land use; aesthetics; population and housing; cultural and paleontological resources; transportation and circulation; noise and vibration; air quality; greenhouse gas emissions; wind and shadow; recreation; public services, utilities and service systems; biological resources; geology and soils; hydrology and water quality; hazards and hazardous materials; mineral and energy resources; and agricultural and forest resources.

The 33 Norfolk Street project site is located in the area covered by the *Western SoMa Community Plan*. As a result of the Western SoMa rezoning process, the project site has been reclassified from an SLR (Service/Light Industrial/Residential Mixed Use) District and a 50-X Height and Bulk District to a WMUG (WSoMa Mixed Use General) District and a 55-X Height and Bulk District. The WMUG District is designed to maintain and facilitate the growth and expansion of small-scale light industrial, wholesale distribution, arts production and performance/exhibition activities, general commercial and neighborhood-serving retail and personal service activities while protecting existing housing and encouraging the development of housing at a scale and density compatible with the existing neighborhood. The proposed project is consistent with the uses permitted within the WMUG District.

Individual projects that could occur in the future under the *Western SoMa Community Plan* will undergo project-level environmental evaluation to determine if they would result in further impacts specific to the development proposal, the site, and the time of development and to assess whether additional environmental review would be required. This determination concludes that the proposed project at 33 Norfolk Street is consistent with and was encompassed within the analysis in the Western SoMa PEIR. This determination also finds that the Western SoMa PEIR adequately anticipated and described the impacts of the proposed 33 Norfolk Street project and identified the mitigation measures applicable to the project. The proposed project is also consistent with the zoning controls and the provisions of the Planning Code applicable to the project site.<sup>2,3</sup> Therefore, no further CEQA evaluation for the 33 Norfolk

\_

San Francisco Planning Department, Western SoMa Community Plan, Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels, and 350 Eighth Street Project Final Environmental Impact Report (PEIR), Planning Department Cases No. 2008.0877E and 2007.1035E, State Clearinghouse No. 2009082031, certified December 6, 2012. Available online at: <a href="http://sf-planning.org/area-plan-eirs">http://sf-planning.org/area-plan-eirs</a>, accessed September 25, 2017.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Evaluation Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning Analysis, 33 Norfolk Street, November 16, 2017.

Street project is required. In sum, the Western SoMa PEIR and this Certificate of Exemption for the proposed project comprise the full and complete CEQA evaluation necessary for the proposed project.

#### PROJECT SETTING

The project vicinity is characterized by a mix of residential, retail, office, nighttime entertainment, and production/distribution/repair (PDR) uses. The scale of development in the project vicinity varies in height from 15 to 90 feet. Land uses on the same block as the project site include café, nighttime entertainment, and PDR uses to the north and east and live/work, residential, and PDR uses to the south. There is a residential building and a PDR building on the west side of Norfolk Street directly across from the project site. Other uses within one block of the project site include residential, restaurant, retail, and PDR uses, auto repair facilities, and a multi-level public parking garage.

The project site is well served by public transportation. Within one-quarter mile of the project site, the San Francisco Municipal Railway (Muni) operates the following bus lines: the 9 San Bruno, 9R San Bruno Rapid, 12 Folsom/Pacific, 27 Bryant, 47 Van Ness, and the 83X Mid-Market Express.

#### POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

The proposed 33 Norfolk Street project is in conformance with the height, use and density for the site described in the Western SoMa PEIR and would represent a small part of the growth that was forecast in the Western SoMa Community Plan. Thus, the project analyzed in the Western SoMa PEIR considered the incremental impacts of the proposed 33 Norfolk Street project. As a result, the proposed project would not result in any new or substantially more severe impacts than were identified in the Western SoMa PEIR.

The Western SoMa PEIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts for the following topics: cultural and paleontological resources, transportation and circulation, noise, air quality, and shadow. The proposed project would not result in demolition, alteration, or modification of any historic or potentially historic resources or any resources contributing to a historic district. In addition, the proposed project is required to comply with the *Design Standards for Western SoMa Special Use District*.<sup>4</sup> For these reasons, the proposed project would not contribute to any impacts on historic resources. Traffic and transit ridership generated by the project would not contribute considerably to the traffic and transit impacts identified in the Western SoMa PEIR.

The Western SoMa PEIR identified feasible mitigation measures to address significant impacts related to cultural and paleontological resources, transportation and circulation, noise and vibration, air quality, wind, biological resources, and hazards and hazardous materials. **Table 1** below lists the mitigation measures identified in the Western SoMa PEIR and states whether each measure would apply to the proposed project.

SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
4

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Evaluation Eligibility Determination, Current Planning Analysis, 33 Norfolk Street, November 17, 2017.

Western SoMa Citizens Planning Task Force, Design Standards for Western SoMa Special Use District, 2011. Available online at <a href="http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/publications-reports/WesternSoMa-DesignStandards-Draft.pdf">http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/publications-reports/WesternSoMa-DesignStandards-Draft.pdf</a>, accessed October 2, 2017.

Table 1 – Western SoMa PEIR Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
D. Cultural and Paleontological Resources		
M-CP-1a: Documentation of a Historical Resource	Not Applicable: The project site does not contain a historic resource and is not located in a historic district.	Not Applicable
M-CP-1b: Oral Histories	Not Applicable: The project site does not contain a historic resource and is not located in a historic district.	Not Applicable
M-CP-1c: Interpretive Program	Not Applicable: The project site does not contain a historic resource and is not located in a historic district.	Not Applicable
M-CP-4a: Project-Specific Preliminary Archeological Assessment	Applicable: Soils-disturbing activities are proposed.	Completed: The Planning Department has conducted a Preliminary Archeological Review.
M-CP-4b: Procedures for Accidental Discovery of Archeological Resources	Applicable: Soils-disturbing activities are proposed.	The project sponsor has agreed to implement procedures related to the accidental discovery of archeological resources (see Project Mitigation Measure 3).
M-CP-7a: Protect Historical Resources from Adjacent Construction Activities	Applicable: Adjacent historic resources are present.	The project sponsor has agreed to implement practices to protect adjacent historic resources from damage caused by project-related construction activities (see Project Mitigation Measure 1).
M-CP-7b: Construction Monitoring Program for Historical Resources	Applicable: Adjacent historic resources are present.	The project sponsor has agreed to implement a program to monitor adjacent historic resources for damage caused by project-related construction activities and to repair such damage (see Project Mitigation Measure 2).

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
E. Transportation and Circulation		
M-TR-1c: Traffic Signal Optimization (8th/Harrison/I-80 WB off-ramp)	Not Applicable: Plan level mitigation by SFMTA.	Not Applicable
M-TR-4: Provision of New Loading Spaces on Folsom Street	Not Applicable: No existing commercial vehicle loading spaces on Folsom Street between 11th and 12th streets would be removed.	Not Applicable
M-C-TR-2: Impose Development Impact Fees to Offset Transit Impacts	Not Applicable: Transit ridership generated by the project would not contribute considerably to this impact.	Not Applicable
F. Noise and Vibration		
M-NO-1a: Interior Noise Levels for Residential Uses	Not Applicable: Impacts of the environment on proposed projects removed from CEQA analysis	Not Applicable
M-NO-1b: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses	Not Applicable: Impacts of the environment on proposed projects removed from CEQA analysis	Not Applicable
M-NO-1c: Siting of Noise- Generating Uses	Not Applicable: The project does not include noisegenerating uses.	Not Applicable
M-NO-1d: Open Space in Noisy Environments	Not Applicable: Impacts of the environment on proposed projects removed from CEQA analysis	Not Applicable
M-NO-2a: General Construction Noise Control Measures	Applicable: The project includes construction in a noisy environment.	The project sponsor has agreed to develop and implement noise attenuation measures during construction (see Project Mitigation Measure 4).
M-NO-2b: Noise Control Measures During Pile Driving	Not Applicable: The project would not include pile-driving activities.	Not Applicable

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
G. Air Quality		
M-AQ-2: Transportation Demand Management Strategies for Future Development Projects	Not Applicable: The project would not generate more than 3,500 daily vehicle trips.	Not Applicable
M-AQ-3: Reduction in Exposure to Toxic Air Contaminants for New Sensitive Receptors	Not Applicable: Superseded by Health Code Article 38.	Not Applicable
M-AQ-4: Siting of Uses that Emit PM <sub>2.5</sub> or DPM and Other TACs	Not Applicable: The project would not site uses that emit TACs.	Not Applicable
M-AQ-6: Construction Emissions Minimization Plan for Criteria Air Pollutants	Not Applicable: The project would not exceed the construction screening criterion.	N/A
M-AQ-7: Construction Emissions Minimization Plan for Health Risks and Hazards	Applicable: The project site is in an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone.	The project sponsor has agreed to implement a mitigation measure related to minimizing exhaust emissions from construction equipment and vehicles (see Project Mitigation Measure 5).
I. Wind and Shadow		
M-WS-1: Screening-Level Wind Analysis and Wind Testing	Not Applicable: The project would not exceed 80 feet in height.	Not Applicable
L. Biological Resources		
M-BI-1a: Pre-Construction Special- Status Bird Surveys	Applicable: The project includes building demolition.	The project sponsor has agreed to conduct pre-construction special-status bird surveys prior to demolition of the existing building (see Project Mitigation Measure 6).
M-BI-1b: Pre-Construction Special- Status Bat Surveys	Not Applicable: Project would not demolish a vacant building.	Not Applicable

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
O. Hazards and Hazardous Materials		
M-HZ-2: Hazardous Building Materials Abatement	Applicable: The project includes demolition of a pre-1970s building.	The project sponsor has agreed to remove and properly dispose of any hazardous building materials in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local laws prior to demolishing the existing building (see Project Mitigation Measure 7).
M-HZ-3: Site Assessment and Corrective Action	Not Applicable: Superseded by Health Code Article 22A (Maher Ordinance).	Not Applicable

Please see the attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the complete text of the applicable mitigation measures. With implementation of these mitigation measures the proposed project would not result in significant impacts beyond those analyzed in the Western SoMa PEIR.

#### PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT

A "Notification of Project Receiving Environmental Review" was mailed on September 20, 2017 to adjacent occupants and owners of properties within 300 feet of the project site. Overall, concerns and issues raised by the public in response to the notice were taken into consideration and incorporated in the environmental review as appropriate for CEQA analysis.

One comment raised the issue of shadows on a residential building across the street from the project site. As discussed under initial study checklist topic 8b, shadows on outdoor recreation facilities and other public areas are analyzed under CEQA. Shadows on private properties are generally not considered an environmental impact under CEQA but may be considered by City decision-makers during the design review and entitlement process. Another comment raised the issue of whether the proposed project would include any design features like bay windows or balconies that would encroach beyond the front property line of the project site, thereby making it more difficult for large trucks to navigate along Norfolk Street, which is a narrow street. The proposed project would not include any design features that would encroach beyond the front property line of the project site. These issues were considered but were not found to have the potential to result in significant impacts beyond those analyzed in the Western SoMa PEIR.

#### CONCLUSION

As summarized above and further discussed in the attached initial study checklist:

1. The proposed project is consistent with the development density established for the project site in the *Western SoMa Community Plan*;

- 2. The proposed project would not result in effects on the environment that are peculiar to the project or the project site that were not identified as significant effects in the Western SoMa PEIR;
- 3. The proposed project would not result in potentially significant off-site or cumulative impacts that were not identified in the Western SoMa PEIR;
- 4. The proposed project would not result in significant effects, which, as a result of substantial new information that was not known at the time the Western SoMa PEIR was certified, would be more severe than were already analyzed and disclosed in the PEIR; and
- 5. The project sponsor will undertake feasible mitigation measures specified in the Western SoMa PEIR to mitigate project-related significant impacts.

Therefore, the proposed project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.

## EXHIBIT 1: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

	MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM			
	Responsibility			
	for	Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting	Status / Date
Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures	Implementation	Schedule	Actions and Responsibility	Completed
MITIGATION MEASURES				
Project Mitigation Measure 1: Protect Historical	Project sponsor	Prior to and	The project sponsor and	Considered
Resources from Adjacent Construction Activities	and construction	during	construction contractor(s) to	complete upon
(Implementing Western SoMa PEIR Mitigation	contractor(s)	demolition	implement measures to	end of
Measure M-CP-7a)	under the	and	prevent damage to adjacent	construction.
The project sponsor shall consult with Planning	direction of the	construction	and nearby historic buildings	
Department environmental planning/preservation staff to	Environmental Review Officer	activities.	during the construction	
determine whether adjacent or nearby buildings constitute	(ERO).		period.	
historical resources that could be adversely affected by	(EKO).			
construction-generated vibration. For purposes of this				
measure, nearby historic buildings shall include those				
within 100 feet of a construction site if pile driving would				
be used; otherwise, it shall include historic buildings within 25 feet if heavy equipment would be used. (No				
measures need be applied if no heavy equipment would				
be employed.) If one or more historical resources is				
identified that could be adversely affected, the project				
sponsor shall incorporate into construction specifications				
for the proposed project a requirement that the				
construction contractor(s) use all feasible means to avoid				
damage to adjacent and nearby historic buildings. Such				
methods may include maintaining a safe distance between				
the construction site and the historic buildings (as				
identified by the Planning Department preservation staff),				
using construction techniques that reduce vibration,				

MONITORING	AND REPORTING PRO	CRAM
VI	4   V   J	A TIN A IVI

Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring and Reporting Actions and Responsibility	Status / Date Completed
appropriate excavation shoring methods to prevent movement of adjacent structures, and providing adequate security to minimize risks of vandalism and fire.				
Project Mitigation Measure 2: Construction Monitoring Program for Historical Resources (Implementing Western SoMa PEIR Mitigation Measure M-CP-7b)  For those historical resources identified in Mitigation Measure M-CP-7a, and where heavy equipment would be used, the project sponsor shall undertake a monitoring program to minimize damage to adjacent historic buildings and to ensure that any such damage is documented and repaired. The monitoring program, which shall apply within 100 feet where pile driving would be used and within 25 feet otherwise, shall include the following components. Prior to the start of any ground-disturbing activity, the project sponsor shall engage a historic architect or qualified historic preservation professional to undertake a pre-construction survey of historical resource(s) identified by the San Francisco Planning Department within 125 feet of planned construction to document and photograph the buildings' existing conditions. Based on the construction and condition of the resource(s), the consultant shall also establish a maximum vibration level that shall not be exceeded at each building, based on existing condition, character-defining features, soils conditions, and anticipated construction practices (a common standard is 0.2 inch per second, peak particle velocity). To ensure that	Project sponsor, construction contractor(s), and qualified historic preservation professional under the direction of the ERO.	Prior to and during ground-disturbing, demolition, or construction activities.	The project sponsor and construction contractor(s) shall monitor vibration levels during ground-disturbing, demolition, or construction activities.  In the event that vibration levels exceed the maximum limit established by the historic preservation professional, construction shall be halted and alternative construction techniques shall be implemented to the extent feasible.	Considered complete upon end of construction.

MONITORING	AND	REPORTING	G PROGRAM
------------	-----	-----------	-----------

Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring and Reporting Actions and Responsibility	Status / Date Completed
vibration levels do not exceed the established standard, the project sponsor shall monitor vibration levels at each structure and shall prohibit vibratory construction activities that generate vibration levels in excess of the standard.				
Should vibration levels be observed in excess of the standard, construction shall be halted and alternative construction techniques put in practice, to the extent feasible. (For example, pre-drilled piles could be substituted for driven piles, if feasible based on soils conditions; smaller, lighter equipment might be able to be used in some cases.) The consultant shall conduct regular periodic inspections of each building during ground-disturbing activity on the project site. Should damage to either building occur, the building(s) shall be remediated to its pre-construction condition at the conclusion of ground-disturbing activity on the site.				
Project Mitigation Measure 3: Procedures for Accidental Discovery of Archeological Resources (Implementing Western SoMa PEIR Mitigation Measure M-CP-4b)	Project sponsor at the direction of the ERO.	Prior to and during soils-disturbing	Project sponsor shall distribute Alert sheet and shall submit a signed affidavit	Considered complete when ERO receives
The following mitigation measure is required to avoid any potential adverse effect from the proposed project on accidentally discovered buried or submerged historical resources as defined in <i>CEQA Guidelines</i> Section 15064.5(a) and (c). The project sponsor shall distribute the Planning Department archeological resource "ALERT" sheet to the project prime contractor; to any		activities.	confirming the distribution to the ERO.	signed affidavit.

MONITORING	AND R	<b>FPORTING</b>	PROCRAM

Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures	for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring and Reporting Actions and Responsibility	Status / Date Completed
project subcontractor (including demolition, excavation, grading, foundation, pile driving, etc. firms); or utilities firm involved in soils-disturbing activities within the project site. Prior to any soils-disturbing activities being undertaken, each contractor is responsible for ensuring that the "ALERT" sheet is circulated to all field personnel, including machine operators, field crew, pile drivers, supervisory personnel, etc. The project sponsor shall provide the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) with a signed affidavit from the responsible parties (prime contractor, subcontractor(s), and utilities firm) to the ERO confirming that all field personnel have received copies of the Alert Sheet.				
Should any indication of an archeological resource be encountered during any soils-disturbing activity of the project, the project Head Foreman and/or project sponsor shall immediately notify the ERO and shall immediately suspend any soils-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the discovery until the ERO has determined what additional measures should be undertaken.  If the ERO determines that an archeological resource may be present within the project site, the project sponsor shall retain the services of an archeological consultant from the pool of qualified archeological consultants maintained by the Planning Department archeologist. The archeological consultant shall advise the ERO as to whether the discovery is an archeological resource retains sufficient integrity and is of potential scientific/historical/cultural	Project sponsor / Head Foreman and archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO.	Accidental discovery	In the event of accidental discovery, the project sponsor shall suspend soils-disturbing activities, notify the ERO, and retain a qualified archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO. The archeological consultant shall identify and evaluate the archeological resources and recommend actions for review and approval by the ERO. The archeological consultant shall undertake additional measures at the direction of	archeological consultant

Responsibility

	MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM			
Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring and Reporting Actions and Responsibility	Status / Date Completed
significance. If an archeological resource is present, the archeological consultant shall identify and evaluate the archeological resource. The archeological consultant shall make a recommendation as to what action, if any, is warranted. Based on this information, the ERO may require, if warranted, specific additional measures to be implemented by the project sponsor.			the ERO.	
Measures might include: preservation in situ of the archeological resource; an archeological monitoring program; or an archeological testing program. If an archeological monitoring program or archeological testing program is required, it shall be consistent with the Environmental Planning Division guidelines for such programs. The ERO may also require that the project sponsor immediately implement a site security program if the archeological resource is at risk from vandalism, looting, or other damaging actions.				
The project archeological consultant shall submit a Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archeological resource and describing the archeological and historical research methods employed in the archeological monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the final report.	Archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO.	Following completion of additional measures by archeological consultant as determined by the ERO.	Submittal of draft FARR to ERO for review and approval. Distribution of the FARR by the archeological consultant.	Considered complete upon distribution of approved FARR.

Copies of the Draft FARR shall be sent to the ERO for

MONITORING A	ND REP	ORTING	PROGRAM
--------------	--------	--------	---------

Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring and Reporting Actions and Responsibility	Status / Date Completed
review and approval. Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one (1) copy, and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Environmental Planning Division of the Planning Department shall receive one bound copy, one unbound copy and one unlocked, searchable PDF copy on CD of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest or interpretive value, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.				
<ul> <li>Project Mitigation Measure 4: General Construction Noise Control Measures (Implementing Western SoMa PEIR Mitigation Measure M-NO-2a)</li> <li>To ensure that project noise from construction activities is minimized to the maximum extent feasible, the project sponsor shall undertake the following:</li> <li>The project sponsor shall require the general contractor to ensure that equipment and trucks used for project construction use the best available noise control techniques (e.g., improved mufflers, equipment redesign, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures and acoustically attenuating</li> </ul>	Project sponsor and construction contractor(s).	Prior to and during demolition or construction activities.	The project sponsor and construction contractor(s) shall submit a noise attenuation plan to the Department of Building Inspection and monthly reports to the Planning Department.	Considered complete upon submittal of final monthly report.

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
----------------------------------

Responsibility			
for	Mitigation	<b>Monitoring and Reporting</b>	Status / Date
Implementation	Schedule	Actions and Responsibility	Completed

shields or shrouds, wherever feasible).

**Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures** 

- The project sponsor shall require the general contractor to locate stationary noise sources (such as compressors) as far from adjacent or nearby sensitive receptors as possible, to muffle such noise sources, and to construct barriers around such sources and/or the construction site, which could reduce construction noise by as much as 5 dBA. To further reduce noise, the contractor shall locate stationary equipment in pit areas or excavated areas, if feasible.
- The project sponsor shall require the general contractor to use impact tools (e.g., jackhammers, pavement breakers, and rock drills) that are hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools. Where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust shall be used, along with external noise jackets on the tools, which could reduce noise levels by as much as 10 dBA.
- The project sponsor shall include noise control requirements in specifications provided to construction contractors. Such requirements could include, but not be limited to: performing all work in a manner that minimizes noise to the

MONITORING	AND REPORTING PROGRAM	1
	A N	

Responsibility			
for	Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting	Status / Date
Implementation	Schedule	Actions and Responsibility	Completed

## Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures

extent feasible; undertaking the most noisy activities during times of least disturbance to surrounding residents and occupants, as feasible; and selecting haul routes that avoid residential buildings inasmuch as such routes are otherwise feasible.

Prior to the issuance of each building permit, along with the submission of construction documents, the project sponsor shall submit to the Planning San Francisco Department Department of Building Inspection (DBI) a list of measures to respond to and track complaints pertaining to construction noise. These measures shall include: (1) a procedure and phone numbers for notifying DBI, the Department of Public Health, and the Police Department (during regular construction hours and off-hours); (2) a sign posted on-site describing noise complaint procedures and a complaint hotline number that shall be answered at all times during construction; (3) designation of an on-site construction complaint and enforcement manager for the project; and (4) notification of neighboring residents and non-residential building managers within 300 feet of the project construction area at least 30 days in advance of extreme noise-generating activities (defined as activities generating noise levels of 90 dBA or greater)

	Responsibility			
	for	Mitigation	<b>Monitoring and Reporting</b>	Status / Date
Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures	Implementation	Schedule	<b>Actions and Responsibility</b>	Completed
about the estimated duration of the activity.				
Project Mitigation Measure 5: Construction Air Quality	Project sponsor,	Prior to	Project sponsor, contractor(s)	Considered
(Implementing Western SoMa PEIR Mitigation	contractor(s).	construction	to submit certification	complete upon
Measure M-AQ-7)		activities	statement to the ERO.	submittal of

The project sponsor or the project sponsor's Contractor shall comply with the following:

## A. Engine Requirements.

- 1. All off-road equipment greater than 25 hp and operating for more than 20 total hours over the entire duration of construction activities shall have engines that meet or exceed either U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) or California Air Resources Board (ARB) Tier 2 off-road emission standards, and have been retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy. Equipment with engines meeting Tier 4 Interim or Tier 4 Final off-road emission automatically standards meet this requirement.
- 2. Where access to alternative sources of power are available, portable diesel engines shall be prohibited.
- 3. Diesel engines, whether for off-road or onroad equipment, shall not be left idling for more than two minutes, at any location,

Prior to Project sponsor, contractor(s) Considered construction to submit certification complete upon activities statement to the ERO. submittal of certification use of off-road equipment.

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
----------------------------------

Responsibility			
for	Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting	Status / Date
Implementation	Schedule	<b>Actions and Responsibility</b>	Completed

## Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures

except as provided in exceptions to the applicable state regulations regarding idling for off-road and on-road equipment (e.g., traffic conditions, safe operating conditions). The Contractor shall post legible and visible signs in English, Spanish, and Chinese, in designated queuing areas and at the construction site to remind operators of the two-minute idling limit.

4. The Contractor shall instruct construction workers and equipment operators on the maintenance and tuning of construction equipment, and require that such workers and operators properly maintain and tune equipment in accordance with manufacturer specifications.

#### B. Waivers.

1. The Planning Department's Environmental Review Officer (ERO) or designee may waive the alternative source of power requirement of Subsection (A)(2) if an alternative source of power is limited or infeasible at the project site. If the ERO grants the waiver, the Contractor must submit documentation that the equipment used for on-site power generation meets the requirements of Subsection (A)(1).

Responsibility			
for	Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting	Status / Date
Implementation	Schedule	<b>Actions and Responsibility</b>	Completed

## Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures

2. The ERO may waive the equipment requirements of Subsection (A)(1) if: a particular piece of off-road equipment with an ARB Level 3 VDECS is technically not feasible; the equipment would not produce desired emissions reduction due to expected operating modes; installation of the equipment would create a safety hazard or impaired visibility for the operator; or, there is a compelling emergency need to use off-road equipment that is not retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 VDECS. If the ERO grants the waiver, the Contractor must use the next cleanest piece of off-road equipment, according to the table below.

Table - Off-Road Equipment Compliance Step-down Schedule

Engine Emission Standard	Emissions Control
Tier 2	ARB Level 2 VDECS
Tier 2	ARB Level 1 VDECS
Tier 2	Alternative Fuel*

How to use the table: If the ERO determines that the equipment requirements cannot be met, then the project sponsor would need to meet Compliance Alternative 1. If the ERO determines that the Contractor cannot supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 1, then the Contractor must meet Compliance Alternative 2. If the ERO determines that the Contractor cannot supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 2, then the Contractor must meet Compliance Alternative 3. Alternative fuels are not a VDECS.

#### MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures

- C. Construction Emissions Minimization Plan. Before starting on-site construction activities, the Contractor shall submit a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan (Plan) to the ERO for review and approval. The Plan shall state, in reasonable detail, how the Contractor will meet the requirements of Section A.
  - 1. The Plan shall include estimates of the construction timeline by phase, with a description of each piece of off-road equipment required for every construction phase. The description may include, but is not limited to: equipment equipment manufacturer, type, equipment identification number, engine model year, engine certification (Tier horsepower, rating), engine serial number, and expected fuel usage and hours of operation. For VDECS installed, the description may include: technology type, serial number, make, model, manufacturer, ARB verification number level, and installation date and hour meter reading on installation date. For off-road equipment using alternative fuels, the description shall also specify the type of alternative fuel being used.
  - 2. The ERO shall ensure that all applicable

Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring and Reporting Actions and Responsibility	Status / Date Completed
Project sponsor, contractor(s).	Prior to issuance of a permit specified in Section 106A.3.2.6 of the Francisco Building Code.	Project sponsor, contractor(s) to prepare and submit a Plan to the ERO.	Considered complete upon findings by the ERO that the Plan is complete.

MONITORING	AND R	<b>FPORTING</b>	PROCRAM

	MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM			
Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring and Reporting Actions and Responsibility	Status / Date Completed
requirements of the Plan have been incorporated into the contract specifications. The Plan shall include a certification statement that the Contractor agrees to comply fully with the Plan.				
3. The Contractor shall make the Plan available to the public for review on-site during working hours. The Contractor shall post at the construction site a legible and visible sign summarizing the Plan. The sign shall also state that the public may ask to inspect the Plan for the project at any time during working hours and shall explain how to request to inspect the Plan. The Contractor shall post at least one copy of the sign in a visible location on each side of the construction site facing a public right-of-way.				
D. <i>Monitoring</i> . After start of construction activities, the Contractor shall submit quarterly reports to the ERO documenting compliance with the Plan. After completion of construction activities and prior to receiving a final certificate of occupancy, the project sponsor shall submit to the ERO a final report summarizing construction activities, including the start and end dates and duration of each construction phase, and the specific information	Project sponsor, contractor(s).	Quarterly.	Project sponsor, contractor(s) to submit quarterly reports to the ERO.	Considered complete upon findings by the ERO that the Plan is being/has been implemented.

MONITORING	AND REPORTING	PROGRAM

	Responsibility			
	for	Mitigation	<b>Monitoring and Reporting</b>	Status / Date
Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures	Implementation	Schedule	Actions and Responsibility	Completed
required in the Plan.				
Status Bird Surveys (Implementing Western SoMa PEIR Mitigation Measure M-BI-1a)  Conditions of approval for building permits issued for construction within the Plan Area or on the Adjacent Parcels shall include a requirement for pre-construction special-status bird surveys when trees would be removed or buildings demolished as part of an individual project. Pre-construction special-status bird surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist between February 1 and August 15 if tree removal or building demolition is scheduled to take place during that period. If bird species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act or the California Fish and Game Code are found to be nesting in or near any work area, an appropriate no-work buffer zone (e.g., 100 feet for songbirds) shall be designated by the biologist. Depending on the species involved, input from the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and/or United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) may be warranted. As recommended by the biologist, no activities shall be conducted within the no-work buffer zone that could disrupt bird breeding. Outside of the breeding season (August 16 – January 31), or after young birds have fledged, as determined by the biologist, work activities may proceed. Special-status birds that establish nests during the construction period are considered habituated to such activity and no buffer shall be required,	Project sponsor, construction contractor(s), and qualified biologist.	Prior to and during tree removal or demolition activities.	If tree removal or building demolition is proposed between February 1 and August 15, the qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction special-status bird survey.  If birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act or the California Fish and Game Code are found to be nesting in or near any work area, the qualified biologist shall designate a no-work buffer zone.	Considered complete upon end of construction.

## MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring and Reporting Actions and Responsibility	Status / Date Completed
except as needed to avoid direct destruction of the nest, which would still be prohibited.				
Project Mitigation Measure 7: Hazardous Building Materials Abatement (Implementing Western SoMa PEIR Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2)  The project sponsor shall ensure that any equipment containing polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) or mercury, such as fluorescent light ballasts, are removed and properly disposed of according to applicable federal, state, and local laws prior to the start of renovation, and that any fluorescent light tube fixtures, which could contain mercury, are similarly removed intact and properly disposed of. Any other hazardous materials identified, either before or during work, shall be abated according to applicable federal, state, and local laws.	Project sponsor and construction contractor(s).	During demolition and construction activities.	The project sponsor and construction contractor(s) to submit a report to the Department of Public Health, with copies to the Planning Department and the Department of Building Inspection, at the end of the construction period.	Considered complete upon submittal of report.