



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

## Certificate of Determination EXEMPTION FROM ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Case No.: 2013.0321E  
 Project Address: 901 Tennessee Street  
 Zoning: UMU (Urban Mixed Use)  
 40-X Height and Bulk District  
 Block/Lot: 4108/017  
 Lot Size: 10,000 square feet  
 Plan Area: Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan  
 Project Sponsor: Will Mollard, Workshop1, (415) 523-0304  
 Staff Contact: Kansai Uchida – (415) 575-9048, kansai.uchida@sfgov.org

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

Reception:  
 415.558.6378

Fax:  
 415.558.6409

Planning  
 Information:  
 415.558.6377

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project site is located on the southeast corner of 20th Street and Tennessee Street, on the block bounded by 20th Street to the north, 22nd Street to the south, Third Street to the east, and Tennessee Street to the west. The project site is located in the Central Waterfront neighborhood, within the Dogpatch Historic District, and has frontage on both 20th Street and Tennessee Street. The subject lot measures approximately 10,000 square feet (sf) in area. The site currently contains a 9,000 sf, single-story warehouse constructed in 1948. No off-street parking currently exists on the project site. The proposed project includes demolition of the existing warehouse and construction of a new four-story-over-basement, approximately 42,400 sf residential building. The proposed new building would include 44 dwelling units (3 studio units, 23 one-bedroom units, 10 two-bedroom units, 5 two-bedroom "flexible occupancy" units, and 3 three-bedroom units), 33 underground parking spaces (accessed via a curb cut on 20th Street), 88 bicycle parking spaces, an approximately 1,700 square foot internal courtyard, and an approximately 3,700 square foot roof deck. Up to one-third of the square footage of each of the five ground-floor "flexible occupancy" units (the total combined square footage of these units would be approximately 4,200 sf) could be used for non-retail business services, such as small businesses or consulting office space. The roof of the proposed building would be 40 feet above street level, with roof deck features and circulation penthouses extending an additional six feet above the roof level.

### EXEMPT STATUS

Exempt 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.

SARAH B. JONES  
 Environmental Review Officer

March 26, 2015  
 Date

cc: Will Mollard, Project Sponsor; Supervisor Malia Cohen, District 10; Richard Sucre, Current Planning Division; Virna Byrd, M.D.F.; Exemption/Exclusion File

## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION (continued)**

The basement parking level would extend approximately 10 feet below street level, with additional excavation of up to four feet required to construct the proposed concrete slab foundation (14 feet in total). Depending on the type of foundation used, soil disturbance in some locations may extend an additional three feet below the slab.

## **PROJECT APPROVAL**

Required approvals for the proposed project include a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Historic Preservation Commission, a Planning Code Section 329 (Large Project Authorization) approval from the Planning Commission, and a building permit from the Department of Building Inspection (DBI). The Large Project Authorization approval from the Planning Commission constitutes the Approval Action for the proposed 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 EXEMPTION OVERVIEW**

California Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 provide an exemption from environmental review for 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, 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 901 Tennessee Street project described above, and incorporates by reference information contained in the Programmatic EIR for the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans (PEIR)<sup>1</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 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 901 Tennessee 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

---

<sup>1</sup> Planning Department Case No. 2004.0160E and State Clearinghouse No. 2005032048

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>2,3</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.

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 from M-2 (Heavy Industrial) to UMU (Urban Mixed Use) District. The UMU District is intended to promote a vibrant mix of uses while maintaining the characteristics of this formerly industrially-zoned area. It is also intended to serve as a buffer between residential districts and PDR districts in the Eastern Neighborhoods. The proposed project and its relation to PDR land supply and cumulative land use effects is discussed further in the Community Plan Exemption (CPE) Checklist, under Land Use. The 901 Tennessee Street site, which is located in the Central Waterfront area of the Eastern Neighborhoods, was designated as a site with a building up to 40 feet in height.

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 901 Tennessee Street is consistent with and was encompassed within the analysis in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. This determination also finds that the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR adequately anticipated and described the impacts of the proposed 901 Tennessee Street project, and identified the mitigation measures applicable to the 901 Tennessee Street project. The proposed project is also consistent with the zoning controls and the provisions of the Planning Code applicable to the project

---

<sup>2</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>3</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.

site.<sup>4,5</sup> Therefore, no further CEQA evaluation for the 901 Tennessee Street project is required. In sum, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and this Certificate of Exemption for the proposed project comprise the full and complete CEQA evaluation necessary for the proposed project.

## PROJECT SETTING

The project site is within the UMU (Urban Mixed Use) Use District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District, and is located in the Dogpatch Historic District. The surrounding properties contain a mix of light manufacturing, warehouse, multi-unit residential, institutional, and industrial land uses. Immediately adjacent to the project site are a vacant former police station, zoned as a P (Public) Use District, and a vacant former fire station. A number of PDR buildings exist near the project site, owing to the area's former manufacturing zoning, prior to implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans. Several buildings along Third Street, located one half-block east of the project site, also contain ground floor restaurant and retail uses. The La Scuola Italian International School is located across 20th Street, to the north of the project site. Buildings are primarily low-rise in scale, ranging from one to four stories. The 20th Street Muni T-Third Street light rail station is located in the median of Third Street, to the east of the subject block.

## 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 901 Tennessee 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 901 Tennessee 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 contribute to the significant unavoidable land use impact identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR because it would result in the removal of 9,000 sf of PDR space. The PEIR identified cumulative loss of PDR employment and businesses in the Eastern Neighborhoods plan area as a significant unavoidable impact.

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.

---

<sup>4</sup> Adam Varat, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning and Policy Analysis, 901 Tennessee Street, January 24, 2014. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2013.0321E.

<sup>5</sup> Jeff Joslin, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Current Planning Analysis, 901 Tennessee Street, January 23, 2015. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2013.0321E.

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

<b>Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Applicability</b>
<b>F. Noise</b>	
F-1: Construction Noise (Pile Driving)	Not Applicable: no impact pile driving proposed
F-2: Construction Noise	Applicable: temporary construction noise from use of heavy equipment. This measure requires the project sponsor to use site-specific construction noise attenuation measures under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant.
F-3: Interior Noise Levels	Applicable: new noise-sensitive uses (dwelling units) proposed where street noise exceeds 60 dBA. This measure requires the project sponsor to obtain a noise analysis conducted by a qualified acoustical consultant. The project sponsor would be required to include noise insulation features identified by the analysis in the design of the project.
F-4: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses	Applicable: new noise-sensitive uses (dwelling units) proposed. This measure requires the project sponsor to obtain a noise analysis conducted by a qualified acoustical consultant to demonstrate that Title 24 interior noise standards can be met.
F-5: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses	Not Applicable: no noise-generating uses proposed (residential use only)
F-6: Open Space in Noisy Environments	Applicable: new noise-sensitive uses (dwelling units) proposed. This measure requires design features to be incorporated into the project to protect the proposed common and private open space from existing ambient noise.
<b>G. Air Quality</b>	
G-1: Construction Air Quality	Not Applicable: project is subject to the Dust Control Ordinance and is not in an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone
G-2: Air Quality for Sensitive Land Uses	Not Applicable: project is not in an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone

Mitigation Measure	Applicability
G-3: Siting of Uses that Emit DPM	Not Applicable: proposed residential use would not emit substantial levels of DPM
G-4: Siting of Uses that Emit other TACs	Not Applicable: proposed residential use would not emit substantial levels of other TACs
<b>J. Archeological Resources</b>	
J-1: Properties with Previous Studies	Not Applicable: project site is not within this mitigation area
J-2: Properties with no Previous Studies	Applicable: proposed project includes excavation within this mitigation area. This measure requires the project sponsor to have an archeological study prepared by a qualified consultant, as directed by the Environmental Review Officer, and to implement the appropriate actions determined necessary by the study to reduce the potential effects of the project on archeological resources.
J-3: Mission Dolores Archeological District	Not Applicable: project site is not within this mitigation area
<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
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
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
<b>L. Hazardous Materials</b>	
L-1: Hazardous Building Materials	Applicable: proposed project includes demolition of an industrial building. This measure requires the project sponsor to properly dispose of and abate hazardous building materials according to applicable state, federal, and local laws.
<b>E. Transportation</b>	
E-1: Traffic Signal Installation	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA

Mitigation Measure	Applicability
E-2: Intelligent Traffic Management	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA
E-3: Enhanced Funding	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA & SFTA
E-4: Intelligent Traffic Management	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA & Planning Department
E-5: Enhanced Transit Funding	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA
E-6: Transit Corridor Improvements	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA
E-7: Transit Accessibility	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA
E-8: Muni Storage and Maintenance	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA
E-9: Rider Improvements	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA
E-10: Transit Enhancement	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA
E-11: Transportation Demand Management	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA

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 24, 2014 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. Responses included the concerns shown in the bulleted list below. Text in italics indicates how the identified concerns have been addressed in this environmental document.

- One commenter expressed concern about increased traffic (auto traffic and moving vans) along Tennessee Street, noise, a shortage of parking (double parking), and increased numbers of people in the neighborhood due to the proposed project. Another commenter indicated that the project should include off-street parking at a ratio of one parking space per unit to avoid a shortage of parking. *As discussed in the Transportation section of the CPE Checklist, the proposed project would not substantially increase traffic volumes. The effects of additional trips generated by new development were*

*analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. Unmet parking demand associated with the proposed project would not materially affect the overall parking conditions in the project vicinity such that hazardous conditions or significant delays would be created.*

- The same commenter expressed concern about blockage of private views by the proposed building, including views of the sky. *Though changes to existing views from nearby private properties can be a concern to property owners or tenants, such changes would not exceed those commonly accepted in an urban setting and are not significant impacts under CEQA.*
- The same commenter expressed concerns about increased loitering, crime, and garbage accumulation in the street due to the proposed project. In particular, the commenter noted concerns about increased vehicle break-ins in garages. *As discussed in the Utilities and Service Systems section and the Public Services section of the CPE Checklist, the anticipated increase in population generated by the proposed project would not result in a significant impact to the provision of waste collection or police protection services.*
- One commenter indicated that the existing building on the project site is historic, and should be retained in order to preserve the character of the neighborhood. *As discussed in the Historic Architectural Resources section of the CPE Checklist, though the existing building on the project site is located in a historic district, it is not individually eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources. Therefore, demolition of the existing building would not destroy or damage any contributing elements to the historic district.*
- The same commenter asserted that the height of the proposed building should not exceed the height of the nearby residential building at 701 Minnesota Street. *As discussed in the Land Use and Land Use Planning section of the CPE Checklist, the proposed building's 40-foot height would be consistent with the 40-X height and bulk district in which the project site is located. As discussed in the Wind and Shadow section, the building's 40-foot height (plus rooftop features) would not be great enough to cause significant wind or shadow impacts.*
- One commenter expressed concern that the proposed flexible occupancy units would become legal commercial units that are later used as fully residential units, and that the building should be analyzed as both 100% commercial and 100% residential. The commenter also expressed concern that the Planning Department will not enforce conditions of approval related to the flexible occupancy units. *The flexible occupancy units are already analyzed in this environmental document as residential units. Future change of use would be subject to additional environmental review. The mitigation measures in this environmental document would be implemented as described in the attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and would be included as conditions of approval for the proposed project's required Planning Department entitlements.*

Other non-environmental comments submitted include recommendations for the proposed mix of dwelling unit sizes, general project support or opposition, requests to receive future project updates, concerns about affordability of the proposed dwelling units, and concerns about the lack of grocery stores and other amenities within walking distance of the project site. These comments have been noted in the project record, but do not pertain to CEQA environmental review topics. 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>6</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, the proposed project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.

---

<sup>6</sup> The CPE Checklist is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, in Case File No. 2013.0321E.



**MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM  
 (Including the Text of the Mitigation Measures Adopted as Conditions of Approval)**

MITIGATION MEASURES	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
---------------------	-----------------------------------	---------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------

<b>ARCHEOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>				
<p><b><i>Project Mitigation Measure 1 – Properties With No Previous Studies (Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure J-2)</i></b></p> <p>This measure would apply to those properties within the project area for which no archeological assessment report has been prepared or for which the archeological documentation is incomplete or inadequate to serve as an evaluation of potential effects on archeological resources under CEQA (CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5(a)(1)(3) and (c)(1)(2)), with the exception of those properties within Archeological Mitigation Zone B as shown in Figure 29 in Chapter IV, for which Mitigation Measure J-3, below, is applicable). That is, this measure would apply to the entirety of the study area outside of Archeological Mitigation Zones A and B.</p> <p>For projects proposed outside Archeological Mitigation Zones A and B, a Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Study must be prepared by an archeological consultant with expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archeology. The Sensitivity Study should contain the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Determine the historical uses of the project site based on any previous archeological documentation and Sanborn maps;</li> <li>2) Determine types of archeological resources/properties that may have been located within the project site and whether the archeological resources/property types would potentially be eligible for listing in the CRHR;</li> <li>3) Determine if 19th or 20th century soils-disturbing activities may adversely affected the identified potential archeological resources;</li> <li>4) Assess potential project effects in relation to the depth of any identified potential archeological resource;</li> <li>5) Conclusion: assessment of whether any CRHP-eligible archeological resources could be adversely affected by the proposed project and recommendation as to appropriate further action.</li> </ol> <p>Based on the Sensitivity Study, the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) shall determine if an Archeological Research Design/Treatment Plan (ARD/TP) shall be required to more definitively identify the potential for CRHP-eligible archeological resources to be present within the project site and determine the appropriate action necessary to reduce the potential effect</p>	<p>Project Sponsor/project archeologist of each subsequent development project undertaken pursuant to the Eastern Neighborhoods Areas Plans and Rezoning</p>	<p>Prior to construction</p>	<p>The ERO to review and approve the ARDTEP</p>	<p>The project archeologist to report on progress bi-monthly to the ERO. Considered complete after review and approval of ARDTEP by the ERO.</p>

**MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**  
 (Including the Text of the Mitigation Measures Adopted as Conditions of Approval)

MITIGATION MEASURES	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>of the project on archeological resources to a less than significant level. The scope of the ARD/TP shall be determined in consultation with the ERO and consistent with the standards for archeological documentation established by the Office of Historic Preservation for purposes of compliance with CEQA, in Preservation Planning Bulletin No. 5).</p>				
<b>NOISE</b>				
<p><b><i>Project Mitigation Measure 2 – Construction Noise (Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure F-2)</i></b></p> <p>Where environmental review of a development project undertaken subsequent to the adoption of the proposed zoning controls determines that construction noise controls are necessary due to the nature of planned construction practices and the sensitivity of proximate uses, the Planning Director shall require that the sponsors of the subsequent development project 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"> <li>• Erect temporary plywood noise barriers around a construction site, particularly where a site adjoins noise-sensitive uses;</li> <li>• Utilize noise control blankets on a building structure as the building is erected to reduce noise emission from the site;</li> <li>• Evaluate the feasibility of noise control at the receivers by temporarily improving the noise reduction capability of adjacent buildings housing sensitive uses;</li> <li>• Monitor the effectiveness of noise attenuation measures by taking noise measurements; and</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<p>Project Sponsor along with Project Contractor of each subsequent development project undertaken pursuant to the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Project.</p>	<p>During construction</p>	<p>Each Project Sponsor to provide Planning Department with monthly reports during construction period.</p>	<p>Considered complete upon receipt of final monitoring report at completion of construction.</p>
<p><b><i>Project Mitigation Measure 3 – Interior Noise Levels (Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure F-3)</i></b></p>	<p>Project Sponsor along with Project Contractor of each subsequent</p>	<p>Design measures to be incorporated into project design</p>	<p>San Francisco Planning Department and the Department of Building Inspection</p>	<p>Considered complete upon approval of final construction drawing set.</p>

**MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**  
**(Including the Text of the Mitigation Measures Adopted as Conditions of Approval)**

MITIGATION MEASURES	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>For new development including noise-sensitive uses located along streets with noise levels above 60 dBA (Ldn), as shown in EIR Figure 18, where such development is not already subject to the California Noise Insulation Standards in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, the project sponsor shall conduct a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements. Such analysis shall be conducted by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering. Noise insulation features identified and recommended by the analysis shall be included in the design, as specified in the San Francisco General Plan Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Community Noise to reduce potential interior noise levels to the maximum extent feasible.</p>	<p>development project undertaken pursuant to the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Project.</p>	<p>and evaluated in environmental/building permit review, prior to issuance of a final building permit and certificate of occupancy</p>		
<p><b><i>Project Mitigation Measure 4 – Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses (Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure F-4)</i></b></p> <p>To reduce potential conflicts between existing noise-generating uses and new sensitive receptors, for new development including noise-sensitive uses, the Planning Department shall require the preparation of an analysis that includes, at a minimum, a site survey to identify potential noise-generating uses within 900 feet of, and that have a direct line-of-sight to, the project site, and including at least one 24-hour noise measurement (with maximum noise level readings taken at least every 15 minutes), prior to the first project approval action. The analysis shall be prepared by persons qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering and shall demonstrate with reasonable certainty that Title 24 standards, where applicable, can be met, and that there are no particular circumstances about the proposed project site that appear to warrant heightened concern about noise levels in the vicinity. Should such concerns be present, the Department may require the completion of a detailed noise assessment by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering prior to the first project approval action, in order to demonstrate that acceptable interior noise levels consistent with those in the Title 24 standards can be attained.</p>	<p>Project Sponsor along with Project Contractor of each subsequent development project undertaken pursuant to the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Project.</p>	<p>Design measures to be incorporated into project design and evaluated in environmental/building permit review, prior to issuance of a final building permit and certificate of occupancy</p>	<p>San Francisco Planning Department and the Department of Building Inspection</p>	<p>Considered complete upon approval of final construction drawing set.</p>
<p><b><i>Project Mitigation Measure 5 – Open Space in Noisy Environments (Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure F-6)</i></b></p> <p>To minimize effects on development in noisy areas, for new development including noise-sensitive uses, the Planning Department shall, through its</p>	<p>Project Architect of each subsequent development project undertaken pursuant to the Eastern</p>	<p>Design measures to be incorporated into project design and evaluated in</p>	<p>San Francisco Planning Department and the Department of Building Inspection</p>	<p>Considered complete upon approval of final construction drawing set.</p>

**MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM  
 (Including the Text of the Mitigation Measures Adopted as Conditions of Approval)**

MITIGATION MEASURES	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>building permit review process, in conjunction with noise analysis required pursuant to Mitigation Measure F-4, require that open space required under the Planning Code for such uses be protected, to the maximum feasible extent, from existing ambient noise levels that could prove annoying or disruptive to users of the open space. Implementation of this measure could involve, among other things, site design that uses the building itself to shield on-site open space from the greatest noise sources, construction of noise barriers between noise sources and open space, and appropriate use of both common and private open space in multi-family dwellings, and implementation would also be undertaken consistent with other principles of urban design.</p>	<p>Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Project</p>	<p>environmental/building permit review</p>		
<b>HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</b>				
<p><b><i>Project Mitigation Measure 6 – Hazardous Building Materials (Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure L-1)</i></b></p> <p>The City shall condition future development approvals to require that the subsequent project sponsors ensure that any equipment containing PCBs or DEPH, 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>Project Sponsor/project archeologist of each subsequent development project undertaken pursuant to the Eastern Neighborhoods Areas Plans and Rezoning</p>	<p>Prior to approval of each subsequent project, through Mitigation Plan.</p>	<p>Planning Department, in consultation with DPH; where Site Mitigation Plan is required, Project Sponsor or contractor shall submit a monitoring report to DPH, with a copy to Planning Department and DBI, at end of construction.</p>	<p>Considered complete upon approval of each subsequent project.</p>