



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Certificate of Determination Community Plan Evaluation

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

Case No.: 2016-008438ENV
 Project Address: 1075-1089 Folsom Street
 Zoning: SOMA Neighborhood Commercial Transit (NCT)
 65-X Height and Bulk District
 SOMA Youth and Family Special Use District
 Block/Lot: 3754/038, 039
 Lot Size: 3,402 and 3,341 square feet
 Plan Area: Eastern SoMa subarea of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan
 Project Sponsor: Jonathan Pearlman, Elevation Architects, (415) 537-1125 ext. 101
 Staff Contact: Alesia Hsiao, (415) 575-9044, Alesia.Hsiao@sfgov.org

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project site consists of two adjacent lots at 1075 Folsom Street and 1089 Folsom Street on the south side of Folsom Street, between 7th and Sherman streets, on the block bounded by Folsom Street to the north, Cleveland Street to the south, 7th Street to the west, and Sherman Street to the east in the South of Market neighborhood. The approximately 3,341 square-foot lot at 1075 Folsom Street is currently occupied by a vacant 2-story industrial building constructed in 1924; the approximately 3,402 square-foot lot at 1089 Folsom Street is currently occupied by a vacant 1-story industrial building constructed in 1951 and an asphalt-paved parking area.

The project site is served by two curb cuts along Folsom Street: one in front of 1075 Folsom Street (approximately 16½-feet) and one in front of 1089 Folsom Street (approximately 16-feet).


(Continued on next page.)

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.

for 
 Lisa M. Gibson
 Environmental Review Officer

September 12, 2018
 Date

cc: Jonathan Pearlman, Project Sponsor; Supervisor Jane Kim, District 6; Kimberly Durandet, Current Planning Division; Virna Byrd, M.D.F.; Exemption/Exclusion File

PROJECT DESCRIPTION (continued)

The proposed project would demolish the existing buildings on the site and construct a six-story, approximately 25,756 gross square foot building with 48 single room occupancy (SRO) units on the first through sixth floors, as well as commercial space, a residential lobby, a community room, a bicycle storage room, and a trash room on the first floor. The commercial space would be approximately 1,141 square feet (sf) in size. Each SRO unit would be approximately 350 sf in size. The project would provide approximately 1,122 sf of common open space in the rear yard and approximately 1,500 sf of private open space (a total of 15 private decks and balconies) on floors two to six. The proposed building would be approximately 65 feet tall per the San Francisco Planning Code (73 feet, 9 inches with stair and elevator penthouses).

The proposed project would not provide off-street vehicle parking; 48 *class I* bicycle parking spaces would be located within a bicycle storage room on the first floor, one class I bicycle parking space would be located within the first floor commercial space and four *class II* bicycle spaces would be located in front of the building's commercial space. The project would remove two existing curb cuts and two street trees, and install three street trees along Folsom Street. The existing 10-foot sidewalk along Folsom Street would remain.

Construction of the proposed project would occur for approximately 19 months. On-site construction work would consist of demolition of the existing structures, excavation, and subgrade work. Project construction would require excavation of approximately two feet below existing grade with an extra 10 inches of depth along the perimeter and removal of approximately 425 cubic yards of soil for installation of a mat slab foundation system. Pile driving would not be required.

PROJECT APPROVAL

The proposed project would require the following approvals:

San Francisco Planning Commission

- Findings, upon the recommendation of the Recreation and Park Director and/or Commission, that shadow would not adversely affect public open spaces under Recreation and Park Commission jurisdiction (Section 295).

Department of Building Inspection

- Review and approval of demolition and building permits.

Department of Public Health

- Department of Public Health review for compliance with the Maher Ordinance, article 22A of the Health Code.
- Department of Public Health review for compliance with enhanced ventilation, article 38 of the Health Code.
- Department of Public Health review and approval of a Dust Control Plan.

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

- Review and approval of closure of two curb cuts along Folsom Street.

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

- Approval of a stormwater management plan that complies with the city's stormwater design guidelines.

San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department:

- Determination that shadow would not adversely affect open spaces under Commission jurisdiction.

The approval of the building permit would be the Approval Action for the project. The Approval Action date establishes the start of the 30-day appeal period for this CEQA exemption determination pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

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 1075-1089 Folsom Street project described above, and incorporates by reference information contained in the Programmatic EIR for the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans (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 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 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 1075 and 1089 Folsom 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.^{2,3}

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

¹ Planning Department Case No. 2004.0160E and State Clearinghouse No. 2005032048

² 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.

³ 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.

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.⁴

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 MUR District. The MUR District is intended to facilitate the development of high-density, mid-rise housing and encourage the expansion of retail, business service and commercial and cultural arts activities. It is also intended to serve as a buffer between high-density, predominately commercial areas near the Yerba Buena Center to the east and the lower-scale, mixed use service/industrial and housing area west of 6th Street. The proposed project and its relation to PDR land supply and cumulative land use effects is discussed further in the Community Plan Evaluation (CPE) Initial Study Checklist, under Land Use. The 1075 and 1089 Folsom Street site, which is located in the East SoMa District of the Eastern Neighborhoods, was designated as a site with a height limit of 65 feet.

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 1075 and 1089 Folsom 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 1075 and 1089 Folsom Street project, and identified the mitigation measures applicable to the 1075 and 1089 Folsom Street project. The proposed project is also consistent with the zoning controls and the provisions of the Planning Code applicable to the project

⁴ 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.

site.^{5,6} Therefore, no further CEQA evaluation for the 1075 and 1089 Folsom 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 on the north side of Folsom Street between 7th Street and Sherman Street, and Cleveland Street to the south. Folsom Street is an eastbound three-lane, one-way street with parking on the north side of the street and a protected bike lane on the south side of the street. Running north, 7th Street is a one-way, four-lane street with parking on the west side of the street and a protected bike lane on the east side of the street. Sherman Street is a narrow one-way, one-lane street running south with parking on the east side of the street. *Class II*⁷ and *IV*⁸ bicycle facilities are located on Folsom Street and 7th Street respectively.

Recently approved and proposed projects within one block include:

- 40 Cleveland Street, which would replace the existing building on the lot with a new 40-foot-tall, 4-story, 5-unit, 5,658 square foot residential condominium building. 1,008 square feet of private and common open space would be provided in the rear yard, private decks, and a common roof deck. The new building would include a single parking space and six Class 1 bicycle parking spaces within a bicycle storage room in the ground floor garage.
- 1052-1060 Folsom Street and 190-194 Russ Street, which would demolish the existing structures and construct a new six-story, 64½-foot-tall, 58,673 gross square feet mixed use building with 63 units and 17 parking spaces. Common usable open space for 60 units would consist of a 2,420 square foot rear yard on the second floor and a 5,241 square foot roof deck. 3 units have 1,262 square feet of private open space in the form of balconies, terraces, or patios.
- 280 7th Street, which would demolish a vacant two-story nightclub and replace it with two new buildings: a 65-foot-tall mixed-use residential building and a five-story, 52-foot-tall residential building (collectively measuring approximately 25,659 gross square feet) with up to 20 dwelling units and no parking.
- 262 7th Street, which would demolish the existing warehouse and construct a 65-foot-tall, seven story, mixed-use building approximately 39,222 square feet in size with 96 single room occupancy residential units and 906 square feet of ground-floor commercial retail space.

The project site vicinity is characterized by a mix of residential, PDR, commercial, and recreational uses and features low- to mid-density scale of development. The buildings on Folsom Street are predominately two to four stories while the buildings on 7th Street range from one to five stories. Victoria Manalo Draves Park is less than a block away, located along Sherman Street between Folsom and Harrison

⁵ Josh Switzky, San Francisco Planning Department, *Community Plan Evaluation Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning and Policy Analysis, 1075 & 1089 Folsom Street*, July 11, 2018. 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. 2016-008438ENV.

⁶ Jeff Joslin, San Francisco Planning Department, *Community Plan Evaluation Eligibility Determination, Current Planning Analysis, 1075 & 1089 Folsom Street*, October 16, 2017.

⁷ *Class II bikeways* (bike lanes) are established along streets in corridors where there is significant bicycle demand, and where there are distinct needs that can be served by them (California Department of Transportation, *Chapter 1000 Bicycle Transportation Design*, updated July 2, 2018).

⁸ A *class IV bikeway* (separated bikeway) is a bikeway for the exclusive use of bicycles and includes a separation required between the separated bikeway and the through vehicular traffic. The separation may include, but is not limited to, grade separation, flexible posts, inflexible physical barriers, or on-street parking. (California Department of Transportation, *Class IV Bikeway Guidance (Separated Bikeways/Cycle Tracks)*, May 3, 2018.)

streets. Bessie Carmichael Elementary School and the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of St. Michael are located south of the project site, south of Cleveland Street. The project site is also located within the SoMA Neighborhood Commercial Transit (NCT) Zoning District, 65-X Height and Bulk District, South of Market Youth and Family Special Use District, and the National Register-eligible Western SoMa Light Industrial and Residential Historic District.

The project site is located within a quarter mile of several local transit lines including Muni lines 12, 14, 14R, 14X, 19, 27, 47, 8, 83X, 8AX and 8BX.

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 1075 and 1089 Folsom 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 1075 and 1089 Folsom 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 contribute to significant and unavoidable impacts on historic architectural resources, transportation and circulation, and shadow. The existing building on the project site is not individually eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources but is a contributor to the National Register-eligible Western SoMa Light Industrial and Residential Historic District.⁹ Although the proposed project involves demolition of a contributor to the historic district, the proposed new building compatible with the historic district and the loss of the existing structure was determined not to materially impair the character defining features of the historic district such that it would not convey its significance.^{10,11} As such, the proposed demolition of the existing buildings on the project site would not result in a significant adverse impact on historic resources, and therefore would not contribute to any significant and unavoidable impacts to historic resources. In regards to transportation impacts, the proposed project would not contribute considerably to significant project-specific and cumulative traffic and transit impacts identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that projects developed in the South of Market neighborhood in the area surrounding Victoria Manalo Draves Park could result in significant and unavoidable shadow impacts. However, shadow on Victoria Manalo Draves Park generated by the proposed project would not be expected to substantially affect the use and enjoyment of the park as the shade would occur during lower levels of weekday and weekend use and would be of short duration, and would not combine with shadows from other reasonably foreseeable development projects. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute considerably to shadow impacts identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

⁹ Tim Kelley Consulting, LLC, *Part I Historical Resource Evaluation – 1075 Folsom Street San Francisco, California*, May 2015.

¹⁰ Tim Kelley Consulting, LLC, *Historical Resource Evaluation Part 2– 1075 Folsom Street San Francisco, California*, January 2017.

¹¹ San Francisco Planning Department, *Historic Resource Evaluation Response for 1075-1089 Folsom Street*, March 8, 2018.

The proposed project would contribute to significant and unavoidable impacts on land use with respect to PDR land supply. The existing vacant buildings are former industrial buildings dedicated to PDR uses, thus, the proposed project would remove approximately 6,743 square feet of existing PDR use. The PEIR considers the presence of PDR businesses and activities and how they may operate as PDR clusters. As noted in the PEIR, PDR uses typically occupied small floor plate-buildings with garages and upper floor lofts with one of the largest PDR clusters in East SoMa as printing and publishing. Therefore, the proposed project's, removal of approximately 6,743 gsf of existing PDR space would contribute considerably to the significant and unavoidable land use impact identified in the PEIR related to the loss of PDR space.

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
F. Noise		
F-1: Construction Noise (Pile Driving)	Not Applicable: the proposed project would not involve pile driving.	Not Applicable
F-2: Construction Noise	Applicable: temporary construction noise from use of heavy equipment.	The project sponsor has agreed to develop and implement a set of construction noise attenuation measures under Project Mitigation Measure 3.
F-3: Interior Noise Levels	Not Applicable: the regulations and procedures set forth by Title 24 would ensure that existing ambient noise levels would not adversely affect the proposed residential uses on the project site.	Not Applicable
F-4: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses	Not Applicable: the regulations and procedures set forth by Title 24 would ensure that existing ambient noise levels would not adversely affect the proposed residential uses on the project site.	Not Applicable
F-5: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses	Not Applicable: the proposed project would not include noise-generating uses.	Not Applicable
F-6: Open Space in Noisy	Not Applicable: CEQA no longer requires the	Not Applicable

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
Environments	consideration of the effects of existing environmental conditions on a proposed project's future users if the project would not exacerbate those environmental conditions	
G. Air Quality		
G-1: Construction Air Quality	Applicable: the proposed project would include construction within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone.	The project sponsor has agreed to develop and implement a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan to reduce construction emissions under Project Mitigation Measure 2.
G-2: Air Quality for Sensitive Land Uses	Not Applicable: this mitigation measure has been superseded by Health Code Article 38, and the project sponsor has enrolled with the Department of Public Health in the Article 38 program.	Not Applicable
G-3: Siting of Uses that Emit DPM	Not Applicable: the proposed residential and commercial uses are not expected to emit substantial levels of DPM.	Not Applicable
G-4: Siting of Uses that Emit other TACs	Not Applicable: the proposed residential and commercial uses are not expected to emit substantial levels of other TACs.	Not Applicable
J. Archeological Resources		Not Applicable
J-1: Properties with Previous Studies	Not Applicable: the project site was not evaluated in any previous studies.	Not Applicable
J-2: Properties with no Previous Studies	Applicable: the project site is located in an area with no previous studies. Project would implement Testing mitigation measure based on the preliminary archeological review.	The project sponsor has agreed to implement the Planning Department's Standard Mitigation Measure #3 (Testing) in compliance with this mitigation measure under Project Mitigation Measure 1.
J-3: Mission Dolores Archeological District	Not Applicable: the project site is not located within the	Not Applicable

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
	Mission Dolores Archeological District.	
K. Historical Resources		Not Applicable
K-1: Interim Procedures for Permit Review in the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area	Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation completed by Planning Department	Not Applicable
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	Not Applicable
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	Not Applicable
L. Hazardous Materials		
L-1: Hazardous Building Materials	Applicable: the project involves the demolition of existing buildings.	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 buildings under Project Mitigation Measure 4.
E. Transportation		
E-1: Traffic Signal Installation	Not Applicable: automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis	Not Applicable
E-2: Intelligent Traffic Management	Not Applicable: automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis	Not Applicable
E-3: Enhanced Funding	Not Applicable: automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis	Not Applicable
E-4: Intelligent Traffic Management	Not Applicable: automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis	Not Applicable
E-5: Enhanced Transit Funding	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	Not Applicable

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
E-6: Transit Corridor Improvements	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	Not Applicable
E-7: Transit Accessibility	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	Not Applicable
E-8: Muni Storage and Maintenance	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	Not Applicable
E-9: Rider Improvements	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	Not Applicable
E-10: Transit Enhancement	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	Not Applicable
E-11: Transportation Demand Management	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	Not Applicable

Please see Exhibit 1 for the 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 June 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. Two individuals submitted comments. One individual requested a copy of the environmental document. The second individual shared their concerns about the proposed project’s potential to shadow the Victoria Manalo Draves Park. The proposed project would cast a shadow on Victoria Manalo Draves Park all year round and on the days of maximum shading, between 3:00 p.m. and 4:00 p.m. However, no single location within the park would be in continuous new shadow for longer than 15 minutes. This is further discussed in initial study checklist topic 8, Wind and Shadow.

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 project-specific initial study¹²:

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;

¹² The initial study is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, in Case File No. 2016-008438ENV.

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.

**EXHIBIT 1: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
(Including the Text of the Mitigation Measures)**

PROPOSED IMPROVEMENT MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Action and Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
---	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------

Mitigation Measures from the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan EIR

Archeology				
<p>Project Mitigation Measure 1- Archeological Testing (Implementing Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation J-2) Based on a reasonable presumption that archeological resources may be present within the project site, the following measures shall be undertaken to avoid any potentially significant adverse effect from the proposed project on buried or submerged historical resources. The project sponsor shall retain the services of an archaeological consultant from the rotational Department Qualified Archaeological Consultants List (QACL) maintained by the Planning Department archaeologist. The project sponsor shall contact the Department archeologist to obtain the names and contact information for the next three archeological consultants on the QACL. The archeological consultant shall undertake an archeological testing program as specified herein. In addition, the consultant shall be available to conduct an archeological monitoring and/or data recovery program if required pursuant to this measure. The archeological consultant's work shall be conducted in accordance with this measure at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer (ERO). All plans and reports prepared by the consultant as specified herein shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment, and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Archeological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction of the project for up to a maximum of four weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of construction can be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce to a less than significant level potential effects on a significant archeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Sect. 15064.5 (a) and (c).</p> <p><i>Consultation with Descendant Communities:</i> On discovery of an archeological site¹ associated with descendant Native Americans, the Overseas Chinese, or other² potentially interested descendant group an appropriate representative² of the descendant group and the ERO shall be contacted. The representative of the descendant group shall be given the opportunity to monitor archeological field investigations of the site and to</p>	<p>Project sponsor, archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO.</p> <p>Project sponsor's qualified archeological consultant.</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of site permits.</p> <p>In the event that an archeological site is uncovered during the construction period.</p>	<p>Project sponsor to retain a qualified archeological consultant who shall report to the ERO.</p> <p>Qualified archeological consultant will scope archeological testing program with ERO.</p> <p>Consult with descendent communities to determine appropriate treatment of archeological finds and</p>	<p>Considered complete when ERO approves archeological testing plan scope.</p> <p>Considered complete after Final Archeological Resources Report is approved and provide to descendant groups.</p>

¹ By the term "archeological site" is intended here to minimally include any archeological deposit, feature, burial, or evidence of burial.

² An "appropriate representative" of the descendant group is here defined to mean, in the case of Native Americans, any individual listed in the current Native American Contact List for the City and County of San Francisco maintained by the California Native American Heritage Commission and in the case of the Overseas Chinese, the Chinese Historical Society of America. An appropriate representative of other descendant groups should be determined in consultation with the Department archeologist.

**EXHIBIT 1: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Including the Text of the Mitigation Measures)**

PROPOSED IMPROVEMENT MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Action and Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>offer recommendations to the ERO regarding appropriate archeological treatment of the site, of recovered data from the site, and, if applicable, any interpretative treatment of the associated archeological site. A copy of the Final Archaeological Resources Report shall be provided to the representative of the descendant group.</p> <p><i>Archeological Testing Program.</i> The archeological consultant shall prepare and submit to the ERO for review and approval an archeological testing plan (ATP). The archeological testing program shall be conducted in accordance with the approved ATP. The ATP shall identify the property types of the expected archeological resource(s) that 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>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. No archeological data recovery shall be undertaken without the prior approval of the ERO or the Planning Department archeologist. 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"> A) The proposed project shall be re-designed so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archeological resource; or B) A data recovery program shall be implemented, unless the ERO determines that the archeological resource is of greater interpretive than research significance and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible. 	<p>Project sponsor/Archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO.</p>	<p>Prior to soil disturbing activities.</p>	<p>report findings as appropriate.</p> <p>Submittal of draft ATP to ERO for review and approval. Archeological consultant undertake activities specified in ATP and immediately notify ERO of any encountered archeological resource.</p>	<p>Considered complete upon completion of the archeological testing program outlined in the ATP.</p>
<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 monitoring program shall minimally</p>	<p>Project sponsor/ archeological consultant at the</p>	<p>During soils-disturbing activities.</p>	<p>Project sponsor/archeological consultant shall meet</p>	<p>Considered complete upon completion of archeological monitoring</p>

**EXHIBIT 1: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Including the Text of the Mitigation Measures)**

PROPOSED IMPROVEMENT MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Action and Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>include the following provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the AMP reasonably prior to any project-related soils disturbing activities commencing. The ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant shall determine what project activities shall be archeologically monitored. In most cases, any soils- disturbing activities, such as demolition, foundation removal, excavation, grading, utilities installation, foundation work, driving of piles (foundation, shoring, etc.), site remediation, etc., shall require archeological monitoring because of the risk these activities pose to potential archaeological resources and to their depositional context; ▪ The archeological consultant shall advise all project contractors to be on the alert for evidence of the presence of the expected resource(s), of how to identify the evidence of the expected resource(s), and of the appropriate protocol in the event of apparent discovery of an archeological resource; ▪ The archeological monitor(s) shall be present on the project site according to a schedule agreed upon by the archeological consultant and the ERO until the ERO has, in consultation with project archeological consultant, determined that project construction activities could have no effects on significant archeological deposits; ▪ The archeological monitor shall record and be authorized to collect soil samples and artifactual/ecofactual material as warranted for analysis; ▪ If an intact archeological deposit is encountered, all soils-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit shall cease. The archeological monitor shall be empowered to temporarily redirect demolition/excavation/pile driving/construction activities and equipment until the deposit is evaluated. If in the case of pile driving or deep foundation activities (foundation, shoring, etc.), the archeological monitor has cause to believe that the pile driving or deep foundation activities may affect an archeological resource, the pile driving or deep foundation activities shall be terminated until an appropriate evaluation of the resource has been made in consultation with the ERO. The archeological consultant shall immediately notify the ERO of the encountered archeological deposit. The archeological consultant shall make a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the 	<p>direction of the ERO.</p>		<p>and consult with ERO on scope of AMP. Archeological consultant to monitor soils-disturbing activities specified in AMP and immediately notify ERO of any encountered archeological resource.</p>	<p>plan as outlined in the AMP.</p>

**EXHIBIT 1: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Including the Text of the Mitigation Measures)**

<p align="center">PROPOSED IMPROVEMENT MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL</p>	<p align="center">Responsibility for Implementation</p>	<p align="center">Mitigation Action and Schedule</p>	<p align="center">Monitoring/Report Responsibility</p>	<p align="center">Status/Date Completed</p>
<p>encountered archeological deposit, and present the findings of this assessment to the ERO.</p> <p>Whether or not significant archeological resources are encountered, the archeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings of the monitoring program to the ERO.</p> <p><i>Archeological Data Recovery Program.</i> The archeological data recovery program shall be conducted in accord with an archeological data recovery plan (ADRP). The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the ADRP prior to preparation of a draft ADRP. The archeological consultant shall submit a draft ADRP to the ERO. The ADRP shall identify how the proposed data recovery program will preserve the significant information the archeological resource is expected to contain. That is, the ADRP will identify what scientific/historical research questions are applicable to the expected resource, what data classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions. Data recovery, in general, should be limited to the portions of the historical property that could be adversely affected by the proposed project. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be applied to portions of the archeological resources if nondestructive methods are practical.</p> <p>The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Field Methods and Procedures.</i> Descriptions of proposed field strategies, procedures, and operations. ▪ <i>Cataloguing and Laboratory Analysis.</i> Description of selected cataloguing system and artifact analysis procedures. ▪ <i>Discard and Deaccession Policy.</i> Description of and rationale for field and post-field discard and deaccession policies. ▪ <i>Interpretive Program.</i> Consideration of an on-site/off-site public interpretive program during the course of the archeological data recovery program. ▪ <i>Security Measures.</i> Recommended security measures to protect the archeological resource from vandalism, looting, and non-intentionally damaging activities. ▪ <i>Final Report.</i> Description of proposed report format and distribution of results. ▪ <i>Curation.</i> Description of the procedures and recommendations for the curation of any recovered data having potential research 	<p>ERO, archeological consultant, and project sponsor.</p>	<p>In the event that an archeological site is uncovered during the construction period.</p>	<p>Archeological consultant to prepare an ADRP and to undertake the archeological data recovery program in consultation with ERO.</p>	<p>Considered complete upon completion of archeological data recovery plan as outlined in the ADRP.</p>

**EXHIBIT 1: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Including the Text of the Mitigation Measures)**

PROPOSED IMPROVEMENT MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Action and Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>in a separate removable insert within the final report.</p> <p>Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: 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, 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>Archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO.</p>	<p>archeological data. Following completion of FARR and review and approval by ERO.</p>	<p>Following approval from the ERO, archeological consultant to distribute FARR.</p>	<p>Considered complete upon certification to ERO that copies of FARR have been distributed.</p>
Noise				
<p>Project Mitigation Measure 2- Construction Noise (Implementing Portions of Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure F-2)</p> <p>The project sponsor shall develop a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant. Prior to commencing construction, a plan for such measures shall be submitted to the Department of Building Inspection to ensure that maximum feasible noise attenuation will be achieved. These attenuation measures shall include as many of the following control strategies as feasible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Erect temporary plywood noise barriers around the construction site, particularly where a site adjoins noise-sensitive uses; ▪ Utilize noise control blankets on the building structure as the building is erected to reduce noise emission from the site; ▪ Evaluate the feasibility of noise control at the receivers by temporarily improving the noise reduction capability of adjacent buildings housing sensitive uses; ▪ Monitor the effectiveness of noise attenuation measures by taking noise measurements; and ▪ Post signs on-site pertaining to permitted construction days and hours and complaint procedures and who to notify in the event of a problem, with telephone numbers listed. 	<p>Project sponsor, contractor(s), and acoustical consultant.</p>	<p>Prior to and during demolition and construction activities.</p>	<p>Project sponsor, contractor(s) to submit a noise attenuation to the Department of Building Inspection.</p>	<p>Considered complete upon receipt of final monitoring report at completion of construction.</p>
Air Quality				
<p>Project Mitigation Measure 3- Construction Air Quality (Implementing Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR</p>	<p>Project sponsor, contractor(s).</p>	<p>Submit certification</p>	<p>Project sponsor, contractor(s) to submit</p>	<p>Considered complete upon submittal of</p>

**EXHIBIT 1: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Including the Text of the Mitigation Measures)**

PROPOSED IMPROVEMENT MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Action and Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>Mitigation Measure G-1). The project sponsor or the project sponsor's Contractor shall comply with the following:</p> <p><i>A. Engine Requirements.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 offroad 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 offroad emission standards automatically 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 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. 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. <p><i>B. Waivers.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Planning Department's Environmental Review Officer or 		statement prior to construction activities requiring the use of off-road equipment.	certification statement to the ERO.	certification statement.

**EXHIBIT 1: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Including the Text of the Mitigation Measures)**

PROPOSED IMPROVEMENT MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Action and Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
---	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------

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 documentation that the equipment used for onsite power generation meets the requirements of Subsection (A)(1).

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 equipment available, according to the Table below:

Table—Off-Road Equipment Compliance Step-Down Schedule

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*

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.

- A. *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.

Project sponsor, contractor(s).

Prepare and submit a Plan prior to issuance of a permit specified in

Project sponsor, contractor(s) and the ERO.

Considered complete upon findings by the ERO that the Plan is complete.

**EXHIBIT 1: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Including the Text of the Mitigation Measures)**

PROPOSED IMPROVEMENT MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Action and Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>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 type, equipment manufacturer, equipment identification number, engine model year, engine certification (Tier rating), horsepower, engine serial number, and expected fuel usage and hours of operation. For 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.</p> <p>2. The project sponsor 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>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.</p> <p>C. <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 required in the Plan.</p>	<p>Project sponsor, contractor(s).</p>	<p>Section 106A.3.2.6 of the San Francisco Building Code.</p> <p>Submit quarterly reports.</p>	<p>Project sponsor, contractor(s) and the ERO.</p>	<p>Considered complete upon findings by the ERO that the Plan is being/has been implemented.</p>
Hazardous Materials				
<p>Project Mitigation Measure 4- Hazardous Building Materials (Implementing Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure L-1)</p>	<p>Project sponsor and construction contractor(s).</p>	<p>Prior to and during demolition and construction</p>	<p>The project sponsor and construction contractor(s) to submit</p>	<p>Considered complete upon submittal of a monitoring report.</p>

**EXHIBIT 1: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Including the Text of the Mitigation Measures)**

PROPOSED IMPROVEMENT MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Action and Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>The sponsor shall ensure that any equipment containing PCBs or DEHP, 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 tubes, which could contain mercury, are similarly removed 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.</p>		<p>activities.</p>	<p>a report to the Department of Public Health, with copies to the Planning Department and the Department of Building Inspection, at end of the construction period.</p>	

Improvement Measures

Historical Resources				
<p>Project Improvement Measure 1- Interpretive Program on Site History</p> <p>The project sponsor shall facilitate the development of an interpretive program focused on the history of the project site. The interpretive program should be developed and implemented by a qualified professional with demonstrated experience in displaying information and graphics to the public in a visually interesting manner, such as a museum or exhibit curator. This program shall be initially outlined in a proposal for an interpretive plan subject to review and approval by Planning Department Preservation Staff. The proposal shall include the proposed format and location of the interpretive content, as well as high-quality graphics and written narratives. The proposal prepared by the qualified consultant describing the general parameters of the interpretive program shall be approved by Planning Department Preservation Staff prior to issuance of the architectural addendum to the Site Permit. The detailed content, media and other characteristics of such interpretive program shall be approved by Planning Department Preservation Staff prior to issuance of a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy.</p> <p>The interpretative program shall include but not be limited to the installation of permanent on-site interpretive displays or screens in publicly accessible locations. Historical photographs may be used to illustrate the site's history.</p> <p>The primary goal is to educate visitors and future residents about the property's historical themes, associations, and lost contributing features within broader historical, social, and physical landscape contexts. These themes would include but not be limited to the subject property's original</p>	<p>Project sponsor and museum or exhibit curator in consultation with the Planning Department Preservation Technical Specialist.</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of the architectural addendum, develop an interpretive display.</p>	<p>Planning Department Preservation Technical Specialist to review and approve interpretive display.</p>	<p>Considered complete upon installation of interpretive display.</p>

**EXHIBIT 1: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Including the Text of the Mitigation Measures)**

PROPOSED IMPROVEMENT MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Action and Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
function as well as the history of the surrounding neighborhood as a mixed residential and industrial area largely reconstructed after the 1906 Earthquake and Fire.				