



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

## Certificate of Determination Community Plan Evaluation

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

*Case No.:* 2016-004823ENV  
*Project Address:* 744 Harrison Street/29 Rizal Street  
*Zoning:* MUO (Mixed Use Office) Zoning District  
South of Market Youth and Family Special Use District  
85-X Height and Bulk District  
*Block/Lot:* 3751/028 and 054  
*Lot Size:* 4,000 square feet  
*Plan Area:* Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, East SoMa Subarea  
*Project Sponsor:* Thomas Tunny, Reuben, Junius and Rose LLP 415-567-9000  
*Staff Contact:* Justin Horner 415-575-9023 justin.horner@sfgov.org

Reception:  
415.558.6378

Fax:  
415.558.6409

Planning  
Information:  
415.558.6377

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project site is located between Harrison and Rizal streets, with a frontage on Lapu Lapu Street, on the block bounded by Harrison Street to the south, 3<sup>rd</sup> Street to the east, 4<sup>th</sup> Street to the west and Folsom Street to the north in the South of Market neighborhood (see Figure 1). The project site consists of two lots with frontages on Harrison Street, Lapu Lapu Street and Rizal Street (see Figure 2). The project site is occupied by a 25-foot-tall, two-story, 3,250-square-foot vacant commercial building built in 1926 fronting on Harrison Street, and a surface parking lot in the rear with access from Lapu Lapu Street, in the East SoMa area of the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area.

The proposed project involves the merger of the two lots, demolition of the existing structure and the construction of an eight-story, 85-foot-tall mixed-use project, consisting of hotel, residential and retail uses.

Continued on page 2

### 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.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Lisa Gibson  
Environmental Review Officer

11/9/17  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

cc: Thomas Tunny, Project Sponsor; Supervisor Kim, District 6; Esmerelda Jardines, Current Planning Division; Virna Byrd, M.D.F.; Exemption/Exclusion File

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION CONTD.

The proposed building would include 52 hotel rooms, seven group housing units, and 1,750-sf of ground floor retail space (see Figures 3-8). The proposed building would include 24 Class 1 bicycle spaces and eight Class 2 bicycle spaces and does not propose any vehicle parking spaces.<sup>1</sup> The project would include the removal of three existing curb cuts: two on Lapu Lapu Street and one on Rizal Street. Hotel and residential access would be provided from Lapu Lapu Street and retail access would be provided from Harrison Street. The proposed project would involve excavation of up to approximately 10 feet below ground surface and 850 cubic yards of soil is proposed to be removed.

## PROJECT APPROVAL

The proposed project requires a Large Project Authorization and a Conditional Use Authorization from the Planning Commission. The approval of the Conditional Use Authorization will constitute the Approval Action for the proposed project. 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 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 744 Harrison Street/29 Rizal Street project described above, and incorporates by reference information contained in the Programmatic EIR for the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans (PEIR)<sup>2</sup>. 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 Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

After several years of analysis, community outreach, and public review, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was adopted in December 2008. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was adopted in part to support housing development in some areas previously zoned to allow industrial uses, while preserving an

---

<sup>1</sup> Class one bicycle spaces are spaces in secure, weather-protected facilities intended for use as long-term, overnight, and work-day bicycle storage by dwelling unit residents, non-residential occupants, and employees. Class two bicycle spaces are "bicycle racks located in a publicly-accessible, highly visible location intended for transient or short-term use by visitors, guests, and patrons to the building or use. Planning Code section 155.1 (a).

<sup>2</sup> Planning Department Case No. 2004.0160E and State Clearinghouse No. 2005032048

adequate supply of space for existing and future production, distribution, and repair (PDR) employment and businesses. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR also included changes to existing height and bulk districts in some areas, including the project site at 744 Harrison Street/29 Rizal Street.

The Planning Commission held public hearings to consider the various aspects of the proposed Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans and related Planning Code and Zoning Map amendments. On August 7, 2008, the Planning Commission certified the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR by Motion 17659 and adopted the Preferred Project for final recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.<sup>3,4</sup>

In December 2008, after further public hearings, the Board of Supervisors approved and the Mayor signed the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Planning Code amendments. New zoning districts include districts that would permit PDR uses in combination with commercial uses; districts mixing residential and commercial uses and residential and PDR uses; and new residential-only districts. The districts replaced existing industrial, commercial, residential single-use, and mixed-use districts.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR is a comprehensive programmatic document that presents an analysis of the environmental effects of implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, as well as the potential impacts under several proposed alternative scenarios. The Eastern Neighborhoods Draft EIR evaluated three rezoning alternatives, two community-proposed alternatives which focused largely on the Mission District, and a "No Project" alternative. The alternative selected, or the Preferred Project, represents a combination of Options B and C. The Planning Commission adopted the Preferred Project after fully considering the environmental effects of the Preferred Project and the various scenarios discussed in the PEIR. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR estimated that implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan could result in approximately 7,400 to 9,900 net dwelling units and 3,200,000 to 6,600,000 square feet of net non-residential space (excluding PDR loss) built in the Plan Area throughout the lifetime of the Plan (year 2025). The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR projected that this level of development would result in a total population increase of approximately 23,900 to 33,000 people throughout the lifetime of the plan.<sup>5</sup>

A major issue of discussion in the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning process was the degree to which existing industrially-zoned land would be rezoned to primarily residential and mixed-use districts, thus reducing the availability of land traditionally used for PDR employment and businesses. Among other topics, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR assesses the significance of the cumulative land use effects of the rezoning by analyzing its effects on the City's ability to meet its future PDR space needs as well as its ability to meet its housing needs as expressed in the City's General Plan.

As a result of the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning process, the project site has been rezoned to MUO (Mixed Use Office) District. The MUO District is designed to encourage office uses and housing, as well as small-scale light industrial and arts activities. Nighttime entertainment and small tourist hotels are permitted as a conditional use. The 744 Harrison Street/29 Rizal Street site, which is located in the East SoMa Area of the Eastern Neighborhoods, was designated as a site with building up to 85 feet in height.

---

<sup>3</sup> San Francisco Planning Department. Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), Planning Department Case No. 2004.0160E, certified August 7, 2008. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1893>, accessed August 17, 2012.

<sup>4</sup> San Francisco Planning Department. San Francisco Planning Commission Motion 17659, August 7, 2008. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=1268>, accessed August 17, 2012.

<sup>5</sup> Table 2 Forecast Growth by Rezoning Option Chapter IV of the Eastern Neighborhoods Draft EIR shows projected net growth based on proposed rezoning scenarios. A baseline for existing conditions in the year 2000 was included to provide context for the scenario figures for parcels affected by the rezoning.

Individual projects that could occur in the future under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans 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 744 Harrison Street/29 Rizal Street is consistent with and was encompassed within the analysis in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, including the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR development projections. This determination also finds that the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR adequately anticipated and described the impacts of the proposed 744 Harrison Street/29 Rizal Street project, and identified the mitigation measures applicable to the 744 Harrison Street/29 Rizal Street project. The proposed project is also consistent with the zoning controls and the provisions of the Planning Code applicable to the project site.<sup>6,7</sup> Therefore, no further CEQA evaluation for the 744 Harrison Street/29 Rizal Street project is required. In sum, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and this Certificate of Determination and accompanying project-specific initial study comprise the full and complete CEQA evaluation necessary for the proposed project.

## PROJECT SETTING

The project site is located between Harrison and Rizal streets, with a frontage on Lapu Lapu Street, on the block bounded by Harrison Street to the south, 3<sup>rd</sup> Street to the east, 4<sup>th</sup> Street to the west and Folsom Street to the north in the South of Market neighborhood. The project area along Harrison Street is characterized primarily by commercial and mixed-use residential land uses in one- to seven-story buildings on the north side of Harrison Street, with commercial and PDR land uses in one- to three-story buildings on the south side. Across Rizal Street from the project site is the Amice Street Community Garden, a nine-story residential building. Parcels surrounding the project site are within MUO (Mixed Use Office), MUR (Mixed Use Residential) and SLI (SOMA Service, Light Industrial) Zoning Districts, and are within 85-X, 55-X and 45-X Height and Bulk districts. There is a seven-story, 77-unit residential building currently under construction adjacent to the project site to the west at 750 Harrison Street.<sup>8</sup> The project site is approximately 550 feet south of Moscone Center.

The closest Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) stop is at Montgomery Street, approximately 0.4 miles northwest of the site. The project site is within a quarter mile of several local transit lines, including Muni lines 8AX-Bayshore A express, 8BX-Bayshore B Express, 10-Townsend, 12-Folsom/Pacific, 27-Bryant, 30-Stockton, 45-Union/Stockton, 47-Van Ness, 81X-Caltrain Express, 82X-Levi Plaza Express, 83X-Mid-Market Express 49-Van Ness/Mission and 67-Bernal Heights.

---

<sup>6</sup> Steve Wertheim, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Evaluation Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning and Policy Analysis, 744 Harrison Street/29 Rizal Street, February 2, 2017. This document (and all other documents cited in this report, unless otherwise noted), is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2016-004823ENV.

<sup>7</sup> Jeff Joslin, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Evaluation Eligibility Determination, Current Planning Analysis, 744 Harrison Street/29 Rizal Street, February 8, 2017.

<sup>8</sup> 750 Harrison Street, Planning Department Case No. 2013-0485ENV.

**POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR included analyses of environmental issues including: land use; plans and policies; visual quality and urban design; population, housing, business activity, and employment (growth inducement); transportation; noise; air quality; parks, recreation and open space; shadow; archeological resources; historic architectural resources; hazards; and other issues not addressed in the previously issued initial study for the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans. The proposed 744 Harrison Street/29 Rizal Street project is in conformance with the height, use and density for the site described in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and would represent a small part of the growth that was forecast for the Eastern Neighborhoods plan areas. Thus, the plan analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR considered the incremental impacts of the proposed 744 Harrison Street/29 Rizal Street project. As a result, the proposed project would not result in any new or substantially more severe impacts than were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

Significant and unavoidable impacts were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR for the following topics: land use, historic architectural resources, transportation and circulation, and shadow. The proposed project would not divide an established community, cumulatively contribute to the loss of PDR, adversely impact an historic resource, contribute to an adverse transportation impact or cast shadow to an extent to adversely impact the use or enjoyment of a public park.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified feasible mitigation measures to address significant impacts related to noise, air quality, archeological resources, historical resources, hazardous materials, and transportation. **Table 1** below lists the mitigation measures identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and states whether each measure would apply to the proposed project.

**Table 1 – Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures**

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
<b>F. Noise</b>		
F-1: Construction Noise (Pile Driving)	Not Applicable: pile driving not proposed	N/A
F-2: Construction Noise	Not Applicable: no particularly noisy construction methods would be anticipated during the project’s construction phase.	N/A
F-3: Interior Noise Levels	Not Applicable: CEQA no longer requires the consideration of the effects of the existing environment on a proposed project’s future users or residents where that project would not exacerbate existing noise levels.	N/A

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
F-4: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses	Not Applicable: CEQA generally no longer requires the consideration of the effects of the existing environment on a proposed project's future users or residents where that project would not exacerbate existing noise levels.	N/A
F-5: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses	Not Applicable: the project does not include any noise-generating uses.	N/A
F-6: Open Space in Noisy Environments	Not Applicable: CEQA generally no longer requires the consideration of the effects of the existing environment on a proposed project's future users or residents where that project would not exacerbate existing noise levels.	N/A
<b>G. Air Quality</b>		
G-1: Construction Air Quality	Not Applicable: these requirements have been superseded by the San Francisco Dust Control Ordinance.	If visible dust is generated by the proposed project, it would be required to comply with the San Francisco Dust Control Ordinance.
G-2: Air Quality for Sensitive Land Uses	Applicable: proposed project includes construction with an Air Pollution Exposure Zone (APEZ).	Sponsor has agreed to Project Mitigation Measure 2: Construction Air Quality
G-3: Siting of Uses that Emit DPM	Not Applicable: the proposed residential and retail uses are not expected to emit substantial levels of DPMs.	N/A
G-4: Siting of Uses that Emit other TACs	Not Applicable: proposed project would not include a backup diesel generator or other use that emits TACs.	N/A

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
<b>J. Archeological Resources</b>		
J-1: Properties with Previous Studies	Not Applicable: no archeological research design and treatment plan on file for this site.	N/A
J-2: Properties with no Previous Studies	Applicable: property has not been the subject of previous archeological study.	Project has agreed to Project Mitigation Measure 1: Archeological Testing
J-3: Mission Dolores Archeological District	Not Applicable: project does not include any excavation and is not located in Mission Dolores Archeological District.	N/A
<b>K. Historical Resources</b>		
K-1: Interim Procedures for Permit Review in the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area	Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation completed by Planning Department	N/A
K-2: Amendments to Article 10 of the Planning Code Pertaining to Vertical Additions in the South End Historic District (East SoMa)	Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation completed by Planning Commission	N/A
K-3: Amendments to Article 10 of the Planning Code Pertaining to Alterations and Infill Development in the Dogpatch Historic District (Central Waterfront)	Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation completed by Planning Commission	N/A
<b>L. Hazardous Materials</b>		
L-1: Hazardous Building Materials	Applicable: project includes alteration of an existing structure.	Project sponsor has agreed to Project Mitigation Measure 3: Hazardous Building Materials.
<b>E. Transportation</b>		
E-1: Traffic Signal Installation	Not Applicable: automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis	N/A
E-2: Intelligent Traffic Management	Not Applicable: automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis	N/A
E-3: Enhanced Funding	Not Applicable: automobile delay removed from CEQA	N/A

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
	analysis	
E-4: Intelligent Traffic Management	Not Applicable: automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis	N/A
E-5: Enhanced Transit Funding	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A
E-6: Transit Corridor Improvements	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A
E-7: Transit Accessibility	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A
E-8: Muni Storage and Maintenance	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A
E-9: Rider Improvements	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A
E-10: Transit Enhancement	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A
E-11: Transportation Demand Management	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A

Please see the attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) 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 Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

## PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT

A "Notification of Project Receiving Environmental Review" was mailed on February 27, 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. Public comments included concerns about the height of the building and potential shadow impacts to the Alice Street Community Garden (a private garden located directly northeast of the project site), transportation impacts, including guest arrival and departure and deliveries, the lack of affordable housing and the need for a Conditional Use Authorization for a hotel in this area. Unit mix and land use restrictions are not subject to environmental analysis under CEQA. The remaining comments were addressed in the CPE Checklist for the proposed project. The proposed project would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts associated with the issues identified by the public beyond those identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

## CONCLUSION

As summarized above and further discussed in the CPE Checklist<sup>9</sup>:

1. The proposed project is consistent with the development density established for the project site in the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans;
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 Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR;
3. The proposed project would not result in potentially significant off-site or cumulative impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods 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 Eastern Neighborhoods 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 Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR to mitigate project-related significant impacts.

Therefore, no further environmental review shall be required for the proposed project pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.

---

<sup>9</sup> The CPE Checklist is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, in Case File No. 2016-004823ENV.

EXHIBIT 1

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program – 744 Howard Street/29 Rizal Street

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Status/Date Complete
<p><b>Cultural Resources</b></p> <p><b>Project Mitigation Measure 1: Archeological Testing Program.</b> Base on the 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 Sections 15064.5 (a) (c).</p>	<p>Project sponsor/ archeological consultant at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer (ERO).</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of site permits.</p>	<p>Project sponsor to retain a qualified archeological consultant who shall report to the ERO. Qualified archeological consultant will scope archeological testing program with ERO.</p>	<p>Archeological consultant shall be retained prior to issuing of site permit. Archeological consultant has approved scope by the ERO for the archeological testing program Date Archeological consultant retained: _____ Date Archeological consultant received approval for archeological testing program scope: _____</p>
<p><b>Archeological Testing Program.</b> The archeological consultant shall prepare and submit to the ERO for review and approval an archeological testing plan (ATP). The archeological testing program shall be conducted in accordance with the approved ATP. The ATP shall identify the property types of the expected archeological resource(s) that potentially could be adversely affected by the proposed project, the testing method to be used, and the locations recommended for testing. The purpose of the archeological testing program will be to determine to the extent possible the presence or absence of archeological resources and to identify and to evaluate whether any archeological resource encountered on the site constitutes an historical resource under CEQA.</p>	<p>Project sponsor/ archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO.</p>	<p>Prior to any soil- disturbing activities on the project site.</p>	<p>Archeologist shall prepare and submit draft ATP to the ERO. ATP to be submitted and reviewed by the ERO prior to any soils disturbing activities on the project site.</p>	<p>Date ATP submitted to the ERO: _____ Date ATP approved by the ERO: _____ Date of initial soil disturbing activities: _____</p>

EXHIBIT C

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program – 744 Howard Street/29 Rizal Street

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Status/Date Complete
<p>At the completion of the archeological testing program, the archeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings to the ERO. If based on the archeological testing program the archeological consultant finds that significant archeological resources may be present, the ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant shall determine if 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The proposed project shall be re-designed so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archeological resource; or</li> <li>▶ 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.</li> </ul> <p><i>Archeological Monitoring Program.</i> If the ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant determines that an archeological monitoring program shall be implemented, the archeological consultant shall prepare an archeological monitoring plan (AMP):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ 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, site remediation, etc., shall require archeological monitoring because of the risk these activities pose to potential archaeological resources and to their depositional context.</li> <li>▶ 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.</li> <li>▶ 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.</li> </ul>	<p>Project sponsor/ archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO.</p>	<p>After completion of the Archeological Testing Program.</p>	<p>Archeological consultant shall submit report of the findings of the ATP to the ERO.</p>	<p>Date archeological findings report submitted to the ERO: _____</p> <p>ERO determination of significant archeological resource present? Y N</p> <p>Would resource be adversely affected? Y N</p> <p>Additional mitigation to be undertaken by project sponsor? Y N</p> <p>AMP required? Y N Date: _____</p> <p>Date AMP submitted to the ERO: _____</p> <p>Date AMP approved by the ERO: _____</p> <p>Date AMP implementation complete: _____</p> <p>Date written report regarding findings of the AMP received: _____</p>

EXHIBIT 1

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program – 744 Howard Street/29 Rizal Street

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Status/Date Complete
<p>Whether or not significant archaeological resources are encountered, the archaeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings of the monitoring program to the ERO.</p> <p><i>Archaeological Data Recovery Program:</i> The archaeological data recovery program shall be conducted in accord with an archaeological data recovery plan (ADRP). The archaeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the ADRP prior to preparation of a draft ADRP. The archaeological 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 archaeological 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 archaeological resources if nondestructive methods are practical.</p> <p>The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Field Methods and Procedures. Descriptions of proposed field strategies, procedures, and operations.</li> <li>▶ Cataloguing and Laboratory Analysis. Description of selected cataloguing system and artifact analysis procedures.</li> <li>▶ Discard and Deaccession Policy. Description of and rationale for field and post-field discard and deaccession policies.</li> <li>▶ Interpretive Program. Consideration of an on-site/off-site public interpretive program during the course of the archaeological data recovery program.</li> <li>▶ Security Measures. Recommended security measures to protect the archaeological resource</li> </ul>	<p>Archaeological consultant at the direction of the ERO</p>	<p>If there is a determination that an ADRP program is required.</p>	<p>Project sponsor/ archaeological consultant/ archaeological monitor/ contractor(s) shall prepare an ADRP if required by the ERO.</p>	<p>ADRP required? Y N Date: _____ Date of scoping meeting for ADRP: _____ Date Draft ADRP submitted to the ERO: _____ Date ADRP approved by the ERO: _____ Date ADRP implementation complete: _____</p>

EXHIBIT C

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program – 744 Howard Street/29 Rizal Street

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Status/Date Complete
<p>from vandalism, looting, and non-intentionally damaging activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Final Report. Description of proposed report format and distribution of results.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul> <p><i>Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects.</i> The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and Federal laws. This shall include immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the Coroner's determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (Pub. Res. Code Sec. 5097.98). The archaeological consultant, project sponsor, ERO, and MLD shall have up to but not beyond six days after the discovery to make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects with appropriate dignity (CEQA Guidelines, Sec. 15064.5(d)). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects. Nothing in existing State regulations or in this mitigation measure compels the project sponsor and the ERO to accept recommendations of an MLD. The archaeological consultant shall retain possession of any Native American human remains and associated or unassociated burial objects until completion of any scientific analyses of the human remains or objects as specified in the treatment agreement if such as agreement has been made or, otherwise, as determined by the archaeological consultant and the ERO.</p>	<p>Project sponsor / archaeological consultant in consultation with the San Francisco Coroner, NAHC, and MDL.</p>	<p>In the event human remains and/or funerary objects are found.</p>	<p>Project sponsor/ archaeological consultant to monitor (throughout all soil disturbing activities) for human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects and, if found, contact the San Francisco Coroner/ NAHC/ MDL</p>	<p>Human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects found? Y N Date: _____</p> <p>Persons contacted: Date: _____</p> <p>Persons contacted: Date: _____</p> <p>Persons contacted: Date: _____</p>
<p><i>Final Archeological Resources Report.</i> 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.</p>	<p>Project sponsor/ archaeological consultant at the direction of the ERO.</p>	<p>After completion of the archeological data recovery, inventorying, analysis and interpretation.</p>	<p>Project sponsor/ archaeological consultant</p>	<p>Following completion of soil disturbing activities. Considered complete upon distribution of final FARR. Date Draft FARR submitted</p>

EXHIBIT 1

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program – 744 Howard Street/29 Rizal Street

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Status/Date Complete
<p>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 one bound, one unbound 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 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.</p>				<p>to ERO: _____                      Date FARR approved by ERO: _____                      Date of distribution of Final FARR: _____                      Date of submittal of Final FARR to information center: _____</p>
<p><b>Air Quality</b></p>				
<p><b>Project Mitigation Measure 2: Construction Air Quality.</b> The project sponsor or the project sponsor's contractor shall comply with the following:</p>				
<p>1) Engine Requirements.</p> <p>a) All off-road equipment greater than 25 horsepower (hp) and operating for more than 20 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 emissions standards automatically meet this requirement.</p> <p>b) Where access to alternative sources of power is available, portable diesel engines shall be prohibited.</p> <p>c) Diesel engines, whether for off-road or on-road equipment, shall not be left idling for more than two minutes, at any location, 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.</p> <p>d) 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.</p>	Project sponsor and/or construction contractor	Submit certification statement prior to construction activities requiring the use of off-road equipment	Project sponsor, contractor(s), and the ERO	Considered complete upon submittal of certification statement
<p>2) Waivers</p> <p>a) The Planning Department's Environmental Review Officer or designee (ERO) 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</p>				

EXHIBIT C

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program – 744 Howard Street/29 Rizal Street

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Status/Date Complete												
<p>documentation that the equipment used for onsite power generation meets the requirements of Subsection (A)(1).                      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.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Compliance Alternative</th> <th>Engine Emission Standard</th> <th>Emissions Control</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Tier 2</td> <td>ARB Level 2 VDECS</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Tier 2</td> <td>ARB Level 1 VDECS</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Tier 2</td> <td>Alternative Fuel*</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>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.</p> <p>3) Construction Emissions Minimization Plan. Before starting on-site construction activities, the Contractor shall submit a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan to the ERO for review and approval. The plan shall state, in reasonable detail, how the Contractor will meet the requirements of Section 1.</p> <p>a) 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 type, equipment manufacturer, equipment identification number, engine model year, engine certification (Tier rating), hp, engine serial number, and expected fuel usage and hours of operation. For VDECS install, 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.</p> <p>b) The ERO shall ensure that all applicable 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.</p> <p>c) The contractor shall make the plan available to the public for review on-site during work hours. The contractor shall post at the construction site, legible and visible sign summarizing the plan. The</p>	Compliance Alternative	Engine Emission Standard	Emissions Control	1	Tier 2	ARB Level 2 VDECS	2	Tier 2	ARB Level 1 VDECS	3	Tier 2	Alternative Fuel*				
Compliance Alternative	Engine Emission Standard	Emissions Control														
1	Tier 2	ARB Level 2 VDECS														
2	Tier 2	ARB Level 1 VDECS														
3	Tier 2	Alternative Fuel*														

EXHIBIT 1

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program – 744 Howard Street/29 Rizal Street

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Status/Date Complete
<p>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.</p> <p>4) Monitoring. 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 required in the plan.</p>				
<p><b>Hazardous Materials</b></p> <p><b>Project Mitigation Measure 3: Hazardous Building Materials Abatement.</b> The project sponsor of any development project in the Plan area shall ensure that any building planned for demolition or renovation is surveyed for hazardous building materials including PCB-containing electrical equipment, fluorescent light ballasts containing PCBs or DEHP, and fluorescent light tubes containing mercury vapors. These materials shall be removed and properly disposed of prior to the start of demolition or renovation. Old light ballasts that are proposed to be removed during renovation shall be evaluated for the presence of PCBs and in the case where the presence of PCBs in the light ballast cannot be verified, they shall be assumed to contain PCBs, and handled and disposed of as such, according to applicable laws and regulations. Any other hazardous building materials identified either before or during demolition or renovation shall be abated according to federal, state, and local laws and regulations.</p>				
	Project Sponsor, Construction contractor(s)	Prior to any demolition or construction activities	If necessary, the project sponsor to provide hazardous materials survey and abatement results to the Planning Department and SFDPH	Prior to any demolition or construction activities