



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Certificate of Determination EXEMPTION FROM ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Case No.: **2013.0784E**
Project Title: **2177 Third Street (590 19th Street)**
Zoning/Plan Area: **UMU (Urban Mixed Use) Use District
45-X / 85-X Height and Bulk District**
Plan Area: **Central Waterfront Subarea of the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area**
Block/Lot: **4045/003 and 003B**
Lot Size: **square feet**
Project Sponsor: **David Silverman, Reuben, Junius & Rose, LLP
(415) 567-9000**
Staff Contact: **Don Lewis, (415) 575-9168
don.lewis@sfgov.org**

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project site comprises a portion of the block bounded by 18th Street to the north, Illinois Street to the east, 19th Street to the south, and Third Street to the west, in San Francisco's Dogpatch neighborhood (see page 4 for more existing conditions information). The project site (Assessor's Block 4045, Lots 003 and 003B) is a roughly L-shaped lot, encompassing two contiguous parcels. It has frontages on both Third and 19th Streets. The 29,438-square-foot (sf) project site currently contains two two-story warehouse/office buildings, encompassing approximately 24,600 sf of space in total, separated by surface parking areas (containing 12 parking spaces). Of the approximately 24,600 sf of space currently in the two buildings on site, approximately 9,700 sf of space is vacant and approximately 5,300 sf of space is office uses.


(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

December 15, 2015
Date

cc: David Silverman, Project Sponsor's Representative; Supervisor Cohen, District 10; Doug Vu, Current Planning Division; Virna Byrd, M.D.F.; Exemption/Exclusion File

PROJECT DESCRIPTION (continued)

The remaining approximately 9,600 sf of space is occupied by several businesses, including a wood shop, a picture frame shop, and a photography studio, which are considered to be production, distribution, and repair (PDR) type uses. The project site has one curb cut along Third Street and four curb cuts along 19th Street. The existing on-site structures were constructed in 1987. Project site topography is generally flat.

The proposed project would demolish the existing structures on the site and construct two 7-story, 68-foot-tall mixed-use residential buildings above a two-level basement.¹ The proposed new buildings would have a total of approximately 180,000 gross sf of space and would include 109 dwelling units (approximately 96,600 sf), approximately 3,100 sf of ground-floor retail space, and 91 parking spaces (approximately 37,200 sf).

PROJECT APPROVAL

Approval of a Large Project Authorization from the Planning Commission, per Planning Code Section 329, constitutes the approval action for the proposed project. As part of the Large Project Authorization, the project sponsor would seek a modification to the requirements for rear yard (Planning Code Section 134), obstructions over streets and alleys and in required setbacks, yards and usable open space (Planning Code Section 136), dwelling unit exposure (Planning Code Section 140) and special bulk limitations and horizontal mass reductions. Approval of the Section 329 application by the Planning Commission would constitute the Approval Action date. 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 2177 Third Street project described above, and incorporates by reference information contained in the Programmatic EIR for the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans (PEIR)². Project-specific studies were prepared

¹ The proposed building would extend 84 feet to the top of the mechanical penthouse.

² Planning Department Case No. 2004.0160E and State Clearinghouse No. 2005032048

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 2177 Third 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.^{3,4}

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

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

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 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

3 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.

4 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.

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 2177 Third Street site, which is located in the Central Waterfront Subarea of the Eastern Neighborhoods, was designated as a site with allowable building up to 68 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 2177 Third 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 2177 Third Street project, and identified the mitigation measures applicable to the 2177 Third Street project. The proposed project is also consistent with the zoning controls and the provisions of the Planning Code applicable to the project site.^{5,6} Therefore, no further CEQA evaluation for the 2177 Third 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

As noted above, the project site is located on a block bound by 18th Street to the north, Illinois Street to the east, 19th Street to the south and Third Street to the west, in San Francisco's Potrero Hill neighborhood. Three of the four streets that border the project site (18th, 19th and Illinois Streets) are two-lane streets, with one travel lane in each direction and parking lanes on each side. Third Street is a four-lane streets, with two travel lanes in each direction, and Muni light rail tracks that run down the middle of the road. In terms of topography, the project site is fairly flat, with a very gradual decline toward the east (the City's eastern waterfront is about a block east of the project site).

To the north, the project site is bordered by 2121 Third Street, a seven-story mixed-use building (105 residential condominiums) that is currently under construction (this structure has frontages along Third and Illinois Street), beyond which is an existing six-story residential building. To the east of the project site is a vacant lot, currently used for parking. To the west, across Third Street, are mid-rise residential over ground-floor retail uses. To the south, across 19th Street, are low- to mid-rise industrial and residential uses. Other uses in the project vicinity (within an approximately one block radius) are generally residential, commercial, and light industrial. Buildings in the project vicinity generally range from one to six stories in height and these buildings are a combination of early Twentieth Century and more contemporary architectural styles. Most structures are built to the property line. The elevated I-280 freeway runs in a north-south direction approximately four blocks to the west of the project site.

5 Adam Varat, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning and Policy Analysis, 2177 Third Street, May 27, 2015. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2013.0784E.

6 Jeff Joslin, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Current Planning Analysis, 2177 Third Street, July 29, 2015. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2013.0784E.

The project block, as well as blocks immediately to the north, south, and west of the project block, are zoned Urban Mixed Use (UMU) and contain a variety of uses, including residential, retail, PDR, and office. Blocks to the east of the project block are zoned Heavy Industrial (M-2), reflecting the maritime uses along the City's eastern waterfront. Several Public (P) zoned districts are also scattered throughout the project vicinity – these districts contain public parks and other public uses, such as Port-owned land. Two blocks to the north is the Mission Bay Redevelopment Area (currently under the jurisdiction of the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure). The UCSF's Benioff Children's Hospital is about two blocks north of the project site, on the corner of Third and Mariposa Streets. The site proposed for the future development of the Golden State Warriors Area is located approximately one-half mile north of the project site, on Third Street, between South and 16th Streets. The project is located within the Central Waterfront Third Street Industrial Historic District.

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 2177 Third 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 2177 Third 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 considerably to the significant and unavoidable land use impacts from the loss of PDR uses. This is because the project would remove approximately 9,600 square feet of an existing PDR use, which is not substantial in light of the existing PDR supply; therefore, the proposed project and would not contribute considerably to this impact. Moreover, the site does not appear to be part of a larger PDR cluster and existing non-PDR uses (such as residential) are the predominant land use in the project vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the significant and unavoidable cumulative land use impact related to the loss of PDR use. In regards to significant and unavoidable transportation impacts related to traffic and transit, project-generated vehicle and transit trips would not contribute considerably to significant and unavoidable cumulative traffic and transit impacts identified in the PEIR and would not result in a substantial portion of the overall additional traffic and transit volume anticipated to be generated by Plan Area projects. The proposed project would not contribute to significant and unavoidable historic architectural resources impacts since the proposed project would not involve the demolition of a historic resource and would not cause a significant adverse impact upon any nearby historic resources, including the Central Waterfront Third Street Industrial Historic District. The proposed project would not contribute to significant and unavoidable shadow impacts since the proposed project would not result in net-new shadow on any nearby park.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified feasible mitigation measures to address significant impacts related to noise, air quality, archeological resources, historical resources, hazardous materials, and

transportation. **Table 1** below lists the mitigation measures identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and states whether each measure would apply to the proposed project.

Table 1 – Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
F. Noise		
F-1: Construction Noise (Pile Driving)	Applicable: pile driving may be required during the construction phase.	The project sponsor has agreed to implement measures to reduce noise impacts associated with pile driving.
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	Not Applicable: mitigation measure applies to single-family housing projects, whereas the proposed project is a multi-family project.	N/A
F-4: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses	Applicable: project includes the siting of noise-sensitive uses in an area where noise levels exceed 60 dBA (Ldn).	The project sponsor has conducted and submitted a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements.
F-5: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses	Not Applicable: the project does not include any noise-generating uses	N/A
F-6: Open Space in Noisy Environments	Applicable: project includes open space in a noisy environment and proposes noise-sensitive uses.	The project sponsor has conducted and submitted a detailed analysis of proposed measures to reduce noise on the proposed podium-level open space and the roof deck.
G. Air Quality		
G-1: Construction Air Quality	Not Applicable: the project would comply with the San Francisco Dust Control Ordinance.	N/A
G-2: Air Quality for Sensitive Land Uses	Not Applicable: the project is not in the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone.	N/A

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
J. Archeological Resources		
J-1: Properties with Previous Studies	Not Applicable: the project site does not have any previous archaeological studies associated with it.	N/A
J-2: Properties with no Previous Studies	Applicable: the project site is a property with no previous archeological study.	The project underwent a preliminary archeology review and the Planning Department's archeologist determined that the Archeological Testing mitigation measure would be required for the proposed project, which the project sponsor has agreed to implement.
J-3: Mission Dolores Archeological District	Not Applicable: the project site is not located within the Mission Dolores Archeological District.	N/A
K. Historical Resources		
K-1: Interim Procedures for Permit Review in the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area	Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation completed by Planning Department	N/A
K-2: Amendments to Article 10 of the Planning Code Pertaining to Vertical Additions in the South End Historic District (East SoMa)	Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation completed by Planning Commission	N/A
K-3: Amendments to Article 10 of the Planning Code Pertaining to Alterations and Infill Development in the Dogpatch Historic District	Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation completed by Planning Commission	N/A

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
(Central Waterfront)		
L. Hazardous Materials		
L-1: Hazardous Building Materials	Applicable: the proposed project includes demolition of a building with known prior and current light industrial uses.	The project sponsor has agreed to comply with hazardous building material abatement requirements.
E. Transportation		
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 March 14, 2014 to adjacent occupants and owners of properties within 300 feet of the project site and other interested parties. One public comment was received during the public comment period seeking clarification regarding the timeline of the environmental process. 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 Checklist⁷:

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.

⁷ The CPE Checklist is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, in Case File No. 2013.0784E.

2177 Third Street (590 19th Street) - MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
(Also includes text for Improvement Measures)

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM					
Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Mitigation Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
MITIGATION MEASURES AGREED TO BY PROJECT SPONSOR					
ARCHEOLOGICAL RESOURCES					
<p>Project Mitigation Measure 1 – Archeological Testing (Implements Mitigation Measure J-2 of the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR). 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 requirement. The archeological consultant’s work shall be conducted in accordance with this requirement 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 requirement 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)(c).</p>	Project sponsor.	Prior to issuance of grading or building permits.	Project sponsor to retain archeological consultant to undertake archaeological testing and, if required, archeological monitoring program in consultation with ERO.	Project sponsor, archeologist, and ERO.	Complete when project sponsor retains a qualified archeological consultant.
<p><i>Consultation with Descendant Communities:</i> On discovery of an archeological site¹ associated with descendant Native Americans or the Overseas Chinese an appropriate representative² of the descendant group and the ERO shall be contacted. The representative of the</p>	Project sponsor/archeol	In the event of discovery of an	Contact any individual listed	Archeological consultant and	Considered complete

1 By the term “archeological site” is intended here to minimally included 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.

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Mitigation Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p>descendant group shall be given the opportunity to monitor archeological field investigations of the site and to consult with 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>ogical consultant in consultation with any individual listed in the current Native American Contact List and Chinese Historical Society of America.</p>	<p>archeological site associated with descendant Native Americans or Overseas Chinese.</p>	<p>in the current Native American Contact List and Chinese Historical Society of America and implement any further mitigation advised.</p>	<p>ERO.</p>	<p>upon notification of appropriate organization and implementation of any further mitigation as advised.</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>Project sponsor/ archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO.</p>	<p>Prior to soil-disturbing activities on the project site.</p>	<p>Prepare and submit draft ATP, implement ATP.</p>	<p>Archeological consultant and ERO.</p>	<p>After consultation with and approval by ERO of ATP. Considered complete on submittal to ERO of report on ATP findings.</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. 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>	<p>Project sponsor/ archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO.</p>	<p>After completion of ATP.</p>	<p>Submit report to ERO of the findings of the ATP.</p>	<p>Archeological consultant and ERO.</p>	<p>Considered complete on submittal to ERO of report on ATP findings.</p>

A) The proposed project shall be re-designed so as to avoid any adverse effect on the

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Mitigation Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p>significant archeological resource; or</p> <p>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> <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 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; <p>The archeological monitor shall record and be authorized to collect soil samples and artifactual/ecofactual material as warranted for analysis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 activity (foundation, shoring, etc.), the archeological monitor has cause to believe that the pile driving activity may affect an archeological resource, the pile driving activity shall be 	<p>Project sponsor/ archeological consultant/ archeological monitor / contractor(s) at the direction of the ERO.</p> <p>Archeological consultant.</p>	<p>ERO and archeological consultant meet prior to commencement of soil- disturbing activity. If ERO determines that an AMP is necessary, monitor throughout all soil-disturbing activities.</p>	<p>Implement AMP.</p> <p>Notify ERO if intact archeological deposit is encountered.</p>	<p>Archeological consultant and ERO.</p>	<p>Considered complete on findings by ERO that AMP implemented.</p>

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Mitigation Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p>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 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. 	<p>Archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO.</p>	<p>If there is determination by the ERO that an ADRP is required.</p>	<p>Prepare an ARDP.</p>	<p>Archeological consultant and ERO.</p>	<p>Considered complete on findings by ERO that ADRP is implemented.</p>

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Mitigation Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <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 value, identification of appropriate curation facilities, and a summary of the accession policies of the curation facilities. 					
<p><i>Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects.</i> The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and Federal laws. This shall include immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the Coroner’s determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (Pub. Res. Code Sec. 5097.98). The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and MLD shall make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of, with appropriate dignity, human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects (CEQA Guidelines. Sec. 15064.5(d)). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects.</p>	Project sponsor/ archeological consultant in consultation with the San Francisco Coroner, NAHC, and MLD.	In the event human remains and/or funerary objects are encountered.	Contact San Francisco County Coroner. Implement regulatory requirements, if applicable, regarding discovery of Native American human remains and associated/ unassociated funerary objects.	Archeological consultant and ERO.	Considered complete on notification of the San Francisco County Coroner and NAHC, if necessary.
<p><i>Final Archeological Resources Report.</i> The archeological consultant shall submit a Draft Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archeological resource and describes the archeological and historical research methods employed in the archeological testing/monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the final report.</p>	Project sponsor/ archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO.	After completion of archeological data recovery, inventorying, analysis, and interpretation.	Submit a draft FARR.	Archeological consultant and ERO.	Considered complete on submittal of FARR.
<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</p>	Archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO.	Written certification submitted to ERO that required FARR distribution has	Distribute FARR.	Archeological consultant and ERO.	Considered compete on distribution of FARR.

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Mitigation Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
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.		been completed.			
NOISE					
Project Mitigation Measure 2 - Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses (Implements Mitigation Measure F-4 of the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR). 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.	Project sponsor; project contractor(s).	During environmental review process.	Design measures to be incorporated into project design; prior to issuance of a building permit.	Planning Department; Department of Building Inspection.	Considered complete upon approval of final construction drawing set.
Project Mitigation Measure 3 - Open Space in Noisy Environments (Implements Mitigation Measure F-6 of the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR). 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.	Project sponsor; project contractor(s).	During environmental review process.	Design measures to be incorporated into project design; prior to issuance of a building permit.	Planning Department; Department of Building Inspection.	Considered complete upon approval of final construction drawing set.

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Mitigation Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
HAZARDOUS MATERIALS					
Project Mitigation Measure 4 – Hazardous Building Materials (Implements Mitigation Measure L-1 of the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR). The project sponsor shall ensure that any equipment containing PCBs or DEPH, such as fluorescent light ballasts, are removed and property 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.	Project sponsor, contractor(s).	Prior to demolition of structures.	Ensure equipment containing PCBs or DEHP and other hazardous materials is properly disposed.	Project sponsor, contractor(s), DPH, various federal and state agencies.	Considered complete when equipment containing PCBs or DEHP or other hazardous materials is properly disposed.

IMPROVEMENT MEASURES AGREED TO BY PROJECT SPONSOR

	Responsibility for Implementation	Implementation Schedule	Implementation Action	Implementation Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION					
<p>Project Improvement Measure 1 - Implement Transportation Demand Management Strategies to Reduce Single-Occupancy Vehicle Trips</p> <p>The project sponsor and subsequent property owner should implement a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program that seeks to minimize the number of single-occupancy vehicle (SOV) trips generated by the proposed project for the lifetime of the project. The TDM Program targets a reduction in SOV trips by encouraging persons to select other modes of transportation, including: walking, bicycling, transit, car-share, carpooling and/or other modes.</p> <p>The project sponsor has agreed to implement the following TDM measures:</p> <p>Transportation and Trip Planning Information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move-in packet: Provide a transportation insert for the move-in packet that includes information on transit service (local and regional, schedules and fares), information on where transit passes could be purchased, information on the 511 Regional Rideshare Program and nearby bike and car-share programs, and information on where to find additional web-based alternative transportation materials (e.g., NextMuni phone app). This move-in packet should be continuously updated as local transportation options change, and the packet should be provided to each new building occupant. Provide Muni maps, San Francisco Bicycle and Pedestrian maps upon request. • New-hire packet: Provide a transportation insert in the new-hire packet that includes information on transit service (local and regional, schedules and fares), information on where transit passes could be purchased, information on the 511 Regional Rideshare Program and nearby bike and car-share programs, and information on where to find additional web-based alternative transportation materials (e.g., NextMuni phone app). This new-hire packet should be continuously updated as local transportation options change, and the packet should be provided to each new building occupant. Provide Muni maps, San Francisco Bicycle and Pedestrian maps upon request. • Posted and real-time information: A local map and real-time transit information could be installed on-site in a prominent and visible location, such as within a 	Project sponsor, building management, Planning Department staff.	Prior to and during occupancy.	Implement TDM measures.	Project sponsor.	Ongoing during occupancy.

building lobby. The local map should clearly identify transit, bicycle, and key pedestrian routes, and also depict nearby destinations and commercial corridors. Real-time transit information via NextMuni and/or regional transit data should be displayed on a digital screen.

- Current transportation resources: Maintain an available supply of Muni maps, San Francisco Bicycle and Pedestrian maps, schedules, information and updates.

Project Improvement Measure 2 - Queue Abatement Condition of Approval

It shall be the responsibility of the owner/operator of the project parking garage to ensure that recurring vehicle queues do not occur on the public right-of-way (19th Street). A vehicle queue is defined as one or more vehicles (destined to the parking facility) blocking any portion of any public street, alley, or sidewalk for a consecutive period of three minutes or longer on a daily or weekly basis.

If a recurring queue occurs, the owner/operator of the parking garage shall employ abatement methods as needed to abate the queue. Suggested abatement methods include, but are not limited to, the following: redesign of facility to improve vehicle circulation and/or on-site queue capacity; employment of parking attendants; use of valet parking or other space-efficient parking techniques; or travel demand management strategies such as additional bicycle parking.

If the Planning Director, or his or her designee, suspects that a recurring queue is present, the Department shall notify the property owner in writing. Upon request, the owner/operator shall hire a qualified transportation consultant to evaluate the conditions at the site for no less than seven days. The consultant shall prepare a monitoring report to be submitted to the Department for review. If the Department determines that a recurring queue does exist, the facility owner/operator shall have 90 days from the date of the written determination to abate the queue.

Owner/operator of off-street parking facility.

Upon operation of the off-street parking facility.

Ensure a vehicle queue does not block any portion of public street, alley, or sidewalk for a consecutive period of three minutes or longer on a daily or weekly basis.

Hire transportation consultant to evaluate conditions.

Employ abatement methods.

Owner/operator; Planning Department.

Ongoing during operation.

Project Improvement Measure 3 – Construction Management

Traffic Control Plan for Construction: As an improvement measure to reduce potential conflicts between construction activities and pedestrians, transit and autos at the project site, the contractor shall add certain measures to the required traffic control plan for project construction. In addition to the requirements for a construction traffic control/management plan, the project shall include the following measures.

- Non-peak Construction Traffic Hours: To minimize the construction-related disruption of the general traffic flow on adjacent streets during the AM and PM peak periods, truck movements and deliveries should be limited during peak hours (generally 7:00 to 9:00 AM and 4:00 to 6:00 PM, or other times, as determined by SFMTA and its Transportation Advisory Staff Committee [TASC]).

Project sponsor, contractor(s).

Prior to and during construction.

Implement Construction Management Plan.

Project sponsor.

Upon completion of project construction.

- Carpool and Transit Access for Construction Workers: To minimize parking demand and vehicle trips associated with construction workers, the construction contractor shall include methods to encourage carpooling and transit access to the project site by construction workers in the Construction Management Plan.
- Project Construction Updates for Adjacent Businesses and Residents: To minimize construction impacts on access for nearby institutions and businesses, the Project Sponsor shall provide nearby residences and adjacent businesses with regularly-updated information regarding project construction, including a project construction contact person, construction activities, duration, peak construction activities (e.g., concrete pours), travel lane closures, and lane closures.