



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

## Certificate of Determination EXEMPTION FROM ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Case No.: 2013.0485E  
 Project Address: 750 Harrison Street  
 Zoning: MUO (Mixed-Use Office)  
 85-X Height and Bulk District  
 Block/Lot: 3751/029  
 Lot Size: 6,398 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 north side of Harrison Street, just west of Lapu Lapu Street (a small street between 3rd and 4th Streets) in the East South of Market (SoMa) neighborhood. The subject block is bounded by Harrison Street to the south, 4th Street to the west, Folsom Street to the north, and 3rd Street to the east. The project site is an L-shaped through lot, with frontages on both Harrison Street and Rizal Street. The Interstate 80 freeway is located one-half block south of the project site, and the nearest access ramp is the westbound on-ramp located on the southwest corner of 4th and Harrison Streets approximately one-half block west of the project site. The subject lot measures approximately 6,400 square feet (sf) in area. The site currently contains a 5,300 sf, one-story commercial building constructed in 1954, which is occupied by a nightclub. A curb cut is present along the building's Harrison Street frontage, leading to a paved area used for informal (unstriped) parking of up to three cars. A curb cut and commercial loading door is present on the Rizal Street frontage.

(Continued on next page.)

### 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

May 7, 2015  
 Date

cc: Will Mollard, Project Sponsor; Supervisor Jane Kim, District 6; Doug Vu, Current Planning Division; Virna Byrd, M.D.F.; Exemption/Exclusion File

## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION (continued)**

The proposed project includes demolition of the existing building and construction of a new eight-story, 85-foot-tall mixed-use building. The ground floor would be used for commercial space and residential common areas, and the upper floors would contain dwelling units. In total, the proposed new 42,000-sf building would include 77 studio dwelling units, approximately 2,900 sf of ground floor commercial space, a 1,300 sf internal courtyard at the second floor, and a 3,100 sf roof deck located at the Harrison Street side of the building. The roof of the proposed building would be 85 feet above street level, with roof deck features and circulation penthouses extending an additional 10 feet above the roof level. No basement level is proposed, and the building's foundation system would require soil disturbance to approximately 22 feet below existing grade. No off-street vehicle parking is proposed, and the curb cuts on the Harrison Street and Rizal Street frontages would be removed. The project sponsor proposes to replace the site's Harrison Street curb cut with a 350-sf sidewalk bulb-out that would include six on-street (Class 2) bicycle parking spaces. The building's lobby would contain 78 indoor (Class 1) bicycle parking spaces for residents' use.

## **PROJECT APPROVAL**

Required approvals for the proposed project include 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 750 Harrison 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 PEIR.

---

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

After several years of analysis, community outreach, and public review, the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans were adopted in December 2008. The Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans were 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 Rezoning and Area Plans also included changes to existing height and bulk districts in some areas, including the project site at 750 Harrison Street.

The Planning Commission held public hearings to consider the various aspects of the proposed Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans and related Planning Code and Zoning Map amendments. On August 7, 2008, the Planning Commission certified the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR by Motion 17659 and adopted the Preferred Project for final recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.<sup>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-1 (Light Industrial) to MUO (Mixed Use Office) District. The MUO District is intended to encourage office uses and housing, as well as small-scale light industrial and arts activities. 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 750 Harrison Street site, which is located in the East SoMa District of the Eastern Neighborhoods, was designated as a site with building up to 85 feet in height (rezoned from 80 feet).

---

<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.

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 750 Harrison 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 750 Harrison Street project, and identified the mitigation measures applicable to the 750 Harrison Street project. The proposed project is also consistent with the zoning controls and the provisions of the Planning Code applicable to the project site.<sup>4,5</sup> Therefore, no further CEQA evaluation for the 750 Harrison 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 MUO (Mixed-Use Office) District and an 85-X Height and Bulk District. The surrounding properties contain a mix of warehouse, automotive repair, residential, office, and commercial retail land uses. The parcels fronting Harrison Street immediately adjacent to the project site both contain two-story office buildings. An additional parcel containing a single-story storage building also exists adjacent to the project site along Rizal Street. The warehouse and automotive repair businesses on the subject block are mostly housed in one- and two-story structures, reflective of the area's former industrial zoning. The office and residential buildings range from two to eight stories in height, and many of the residential buildings contain ground floor retail space. A community garden is located on the east side of Lapu Lapu Street (55 Lapu Lapu Street), approximately 100 feet north of the project site, and the Yerba Buena Gardens complex is located approximately one block north of the project site. The project site is located one-half block north of the Interstate 80 freeway, and a westbound on-ramp is located one-half block to the west, at the intersection of 4th and Harrison Streets. The major arterial streets surrounding the subject block (3rd, 4th, Harrison, and Folsom Streets) are multi-lane one-way streets that serve as primary access routes to and from the Interstate 80, Interstate 280, and Highway 101 freeways.

## 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 750 Harrison 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 750 Harrison Street project. As a result, the proposed

---

<sup>4</sup> Adam Varat, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning and Policy Analysis, 750 Harrison Street, February 21, 2014. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2013.0485E.

<sup>5</sup> Jeff Joslin, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Current Planning Analysis, 750 Harrison Street, March 3, 2015. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2013.0485E.

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 the significant unavoidable land use impact identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR because it would not result in the removal of PDR space, adverse effects to historic resources, significant transportation impacts, or significant new shadow on public open spaces.

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

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

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
<b>F. Noise</b>		
F-1: Construction Noise (Pile Driving)	Applicable: piles would be necessary as part of the proposed building foundation	The project sponsor has agreed to avoid use of impact pile drivers unless absolutely necessary, and to use noise-shielding and muffling devices if impact pile drivers are employed.
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 noise attenuation measures during construction.
F-3: Interior Noise Levels	Applicable: noise-sensitive uses (dwelling units) where street noise exceeds 60dBA	The project sponsor has conducted and submitted a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements.
F-4: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses	Applicable: noise-sensitive uses (dwelling units) proposed	The project sponsor has conducted and submitted a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements.
F-5: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses	Not Applicable: no noise-generating uses proposed	N/A
F-6: Open Space in Noisy Environments	Applicable: courtyard and roof deck proposed where street noise exceeds 60 dBA	The project sponsor has conducted and submitted a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements.

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
<b>G. Air Quality</b>		
G-1: Construction Air Quality	Applicable: only the construction exhaust emissions portion of this mitigation measure is applicable because construction would occur within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone	The project sponsor has agreed to comply with the construction exhaust emissions reduction requirements.
G-2: Air Quality for Sensitive Land Uses	Not Applicable: superseded by applicable Article 38 requirements	N/A
G-3: Siting of Uses that Emit DPM	Not Applicable: proposed residential and retail uses would not emit substantial levels of DPM, and no backup diesel generator would be required	N/A
G-4: Siting of Uses that Emit other TACs	Not Applicable: proposed residential and retail uses would not emit substantial levels of DPM	N/A
<b>J. Archeological Resources</b>		
J-1: Properties with Previous Studies	Not Applicable: project site is not within this mitigation area	N/A
J-2: Properties with no Previous Studies	Applicable: soil disturbance to approximately 22 feet below grade proposed in this mitigation area	The project sponsor has agreed to retain a qualified consultant to perform archeological testing, and incorporate identified recommendations into construction plans.
J-3: Mission Dolores Archeological District	Not Applicable: project site is not within this mitigation area	N/A
<b>K. Historical Resources</b>		
K-1: Interim Procedures for Permit Review in the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area	Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation completed by Planning Department	N/A
K-2: Amendments to Article 10 of the Planning Code Pertaining to Vertical Additions in the South End	Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation completed by Planning Commission	N/A

<b>Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Applicability</b>	<b>Compliance</b>
Historic District (East SoMa)		
K-3: Amendments to Article 10 of the Planning Code Pertaining to Alterations and Infill Development in the Dogpatch Historic District (Central Waterfront)	Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation completed by Planning Commission	N/A
<b>L. Hazardous Materials</b>		
L-1: Hazardous Building Materials	Applicable: proposed project includes demolition of a building with known prior industrial use	The project sponsor has agreed to comply with hazardous building material abatement requirements.
<b>E. Transportation</b>		
E-1: Traffic Signal Installation	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A
E-2: Intelligent Traffic Management	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A
E-3: Enhanced Funding	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA & SFTA	N/A
E-4: Intelligent Traffic Management	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA & Planning Department	N/A
E-5: Enhanced Transit Funding	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A
E-6: Transit Corridor Improvements	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A
E-7: Transit Accessibility	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A
E-8: Muni Storage and Maintenance	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A
E-9: Rider Improvements	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A
E-10: Transit Enhancement	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A
E-11: Transportation Demand Management	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A

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

## PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT

A “Notification of Project Receiving Environmental Review” was mailed on February 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 the environmental document.

- One commenter stated that there is already too much residential development in the neighborhood, and that additional development will overwhelm neighborhood services and produce increased garbage. Another commenter asserted that the proposed project would overwhelm the sewer system. *As discussed in the Utilities and Service Systems section and the Public Services section of the CPE Checklist, the anticipated increase in residential units generated by the proposed project would not result in a significant impact to the provision of waste collection, wastewater collection and treatment, or other public services. The anticipated increase in population that would result from the proposed project would be within the development projected in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.*
- One commenter stated that she enjoys views of the freeway from her residence, which the proposed project would block, resulting in reduced availability of light and air. One additional commenter also expressed concern that the proposed project would cast shadow on his dwelling unit. One commenter also expressed concern that the proposed building would cast shadow on nearby residences and offices, causing property values to decrease. *Although changes to existing views from private properties can be a concern to property owners and tenants, such changes would not exceed those commonly accepted in urban areas and are generally not considered significant impacts under CEQA. Shading of private residences and offices also does not constitute a significant impact under CEQA.*
- Three commenters expressed concern that the proposed project would cast shadow on the community garden at 55 Lapu Lapu Street, and one commenter also mentioned a nearby private outdoor swimming pool. Another commenter asserted that the proposed project’s shadow on the community garden would be limited, and not of concern. *The proposed project’s shadow impacts on the community garden were analyzed in the Wind and Shadow section of the CPE Checklist. As describe therein, the proposed project would cast new shadow on a portion the community garden from approximately mid-October to mid-February each year. The maximum duration and size of the shadow would occur on the winter solstice. The shadow would last for a maximum duration of two hours, (occurring during the 11:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. time period, and the shadow would reach a maximum size of 1,630 sf, out of the garden’s total square footage of approximately 17,300 sf at 12:00 p.m.. Shadows on other days during the mid-October to mid-February period would be smaller and would last for less time. No shadow from the proposed project is anticipated on the majority of days during the year (days outside of the mid-October to mid-February period). Given the limited size, duration, and frequency of the new shadow on the community garden that would be caused by the proposed project, the use or enjoyment of the garden would not be substantially diminished. Shadow impacts on the community garden would therefore*



*be less than significant. Additionally, the community garden is not subject to Section 295 of the Planning Code because it is not under jurisdiction of the Recreation and Parks Department.*

- Two commenters expressed concern about potential conflicts between bicyclists and freeway-bound traffic, and one commenter also mentioned conflicts with supermarket delivery trucks. *The Project Setting section above notes that the surrounding streets serve as primary freeway access routes. Delivery trucks are required to use loading zones in accordance with existing traffic regulations, which would minimize conflicts with other modes. As discussed in the Transportation section of the CPE Checklist, the proposed project would increase the number of trips, including bicycle trips, to a magnitude that is consistent with the development projected and analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. The proposed project does not include changes to existing bicycle facilities, therefore no new conflicts with other modes would be created.*

Other comments submitted that do not relate to physical environmental impacts include general project support or opposition, requests to receive future project updates, requests for information, requests to consider arts/cultural development and the needs of senior citizens, concerns about a lack of resident-serving businesses in the area, suggestions to change the project to different types of land uses and reduce the height of the proposed building, questions about zoning requirements, and questions about design features of the proposed building. 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 impacts 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. 2013.0485E.

**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-1)</i></b></p> <p>For subsequent development projects within proximity to noise-sensitive uses that would include pile-driving, individual project sponsors shall ensure that piles be pre-drilled wherever feasible to reduce construction-related noise and vibration. No impact pile drivers shall be used unless absolutely necessary. Contractors would be required to use pile-driving equipment with state-of-the-art noise shielding and muffling devices. To reduce noise and vibration impacts, sonic or vibratory sheetpile drivers, rather than impact drivers, shall be used wherever sheetpiles are needed. Individual project sponsors shall also require that contractors schedule pile-driving activity for times of the day that would minimize disturbance to neighbors.</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>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 – 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> </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>

**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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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><b><i>Project Mitigation Measure 4 – Interior Noise Levels (Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure F-3)</i></b></p> <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>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 – 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</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</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>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>		occupancy		
<p><b><i>Project Mitigation Measure 6 – 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 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>	Project Architect of each subsequent development project undertaken pursuant to the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Project	Design measures to be incorporated into project design and evaluated in environmental/building permit review	San Francisco Planning Department and the Department of Building Inspection	Considered complete upon approval of final construction drawing set.
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>				
<p><b><i>Project Mitigation Measure 7 – Construction Air Quality (Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure G-1)</i></b></p> <p>The City shall condition approval of individual development proposals under the proposed project upon implementation of an appropriate dust abatement program, patterned after the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) approach described below.</p> <p>The BAAQMD approach to dust abatement, as put forth in the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, calls for “basic” control measures that should be</p>	Project Sponsor along with Project Contractor of each subsequent development project undertaken pursuant to the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Project.	During construction	Each Project Sponsor to provide Planning Department with monthly reports during construction period.	Considered complete upon receipt of final monitoring report at completion of construction.

**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>implemented at all construction sites, “enhanced” control measures that should be implemented at construction sites greater than four acres in area, and “optional” control measures that should be implemented on a case-by-case basis at construction sites that are large in area, located near sensitive receptors or which, for any other reason, may warrant additional emissions reductions.</p> <p>Elements of the “basic” dust control program for project components that disturb less than four acres shall include, but not necessarily be limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water all active construction areas at least twice daily. Watering should be sufficient to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. Increased watering frequency may be necessary whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour. Reclaimed water should be used whenever possible.</li> <li>• Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard (i.e., the minimum required space between the top of the load and the top of the trailer).</li> <li>• Pave, apply water (reclaimed if possible) three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.</li> <li>• Sweep streets (with water sweepers using reclaimed water if possible) at the end of each day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent paved roads.</li> </ul> <p>Elements of the “enhanced” dust abatement program for project components that disturb four or more acres are unlikely to be required, in that no sites anticipated for development in the Plan area are as large as four acres. Should a site this size be proposed for development, dust control shall include all of the “basic” measures in addition to the following measures to be implemented by the construction contractor(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for one month or more).</li> <li>▪ Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).</li> <li>▪ Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour.</li> <li>▪ Limit the amount of the disturbed area at any one time, where possible.</li> <li>▪ Pave all roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc. as soon as possible. In addition, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading</li> </ul>				

**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>unless seeding or soil binders are used.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.</li> <li>▪ Designate a person or persons to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering, as necessary, to prevent transport of dust offsite. Their duties shall include holidays and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the BAAQMD prior to the start of construction.</li> </ul> <p>The "optional" dust-control measures supplement the "basic" and "enhanced" programs to address site-specific issues. They include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto streets, or wash off trucks and equipment leaving the site.</li> <li>▪ Install windbreaks, or plant tree/vegetative wind breaks at windward side(s) of construction areas.</li> <li>▪ Suspend excavation and grading activity when winds (instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph.</li> </ul> <p>Ordinance 175-91, passed by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors on May 6, 1991, requires that non-potable water be used for dust control activities. Therefore, project sponsors would require that construction contractors obtain reclaimed water from the Clean Water Program for this purpose.</p> <p>The City would also condition project approval such that each subsequent project sponsor would require the contractor(s) to maintain and operate construction equipment so as to minimize exhaust emissions of particulates and other pollutants, by such means as a prohibition on idling motors when equipment is not in use or when trucks are waiting in queues, and implementation of specific maintenance programs to reduce emissions for equipment that would be in frequent use for much of the construction period. Implementation of Mitigation Measure G-1 would reduce construction-related air quality effects to a less-than-significant level.</p>				
<p><b>HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</b></p>				
<p><b><i>Project Mitigation Measure 8 – 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</p>	<p>Project Sponsor/project archeologist of each subsequent development project</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</p>	<p>Considered complete upon approval of each subsequent project.</p>

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

<b>MITIGATION MEASURES</b>	<b>Responsibility for Implementation</b>	<b>Mitigation Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring/Report Responsibility</b>	<b>Status/Date Completed</b>
<p>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>undertaken pursuant to the Eastern Neighborhoods Areas Plans and Rezoning</p>		<p>Sponsor or contractor shall submit a monitoring report to DPH, with a copy to Planning Department and DBI, at end of construction.</p>	