



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Certificate of Determination COMMUNITY PLAN EVALUATION

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.: 2013.1549E
Project Address: 265 Shipley Street
Zoning: MUR (Mixed Use Residential) District
South of Market Youth and Family Special Use District
45-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 3753/089 and 090
Lot Size: 3,746 square feet
Plan Area: Eastern Neighborhoods – East SoMa (existing)
Central SoMa (proposed)
Project Sponsor: Peter Naughton
c/o Robert Edmonds – Edmonds + Lee Architects, Inc.
(415) 285-1300, robert@edmondslee.com
Staff Contact: Michael Li
(415) 575-9107, michael.j.li@sfgov.org

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project site, which is on the south side of Shipley Street between 5th and 6th streets in San Francisco’s South of Market neighborhood, consists of two adjacent parcels: Assessor’s Block 3753, Lots 089 and 090. Each lot is 1,873 square feet (sf) and rectangular. Both lots have been vacant since the early 1950s; they are currently being used for the storage of vehicles by the adjacent auto body repair shop at 255 Shipley Street. There is a six-foot-tall wooden fence and a short concrete wall at the front of Lot 090.

(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.



LISA GIBSON
Environmental Review Officer

11/9/17

Date

cc: Peter Naughton, Project Sponsor
Linda Ajello Hoagland, Current Planning Division
Supervisor Jane Kim, District 6

Virna Byrd, M.D.F.
Exclusion/Exemption Dist. List

PROJECT DESCRIPTION (continued)

The proposed project consists of merging the two existing lots into a single 3,746-sf lot, demolishing the existing wooden fence and concrete wall, and constructing a five-story, 45-foot-tall building containing nine dwelling units, approximately 390 gross square feet of office space, and a basement-level garage for two parking spaces. A garage door, a new driveway, and a new curb cut would be provided on Shipley Street. A total of nine Class 1 bicycle parking spaces would be provided in a secure storage room on the ground floor of the building. Common usable open space for the residents of the proposed project would be provided in the form of a roof deck and a ground-level rear yard.

Construction of the proposed project is expected to last 16 months. The proposed building would be supported by a stiffened mat foundation; pile driving would not be required. Construction of the proposed project would require excavation to a depth of 14 feet below ground surface and the removal of about 1,568 cubic yards of soil.

PROJECT APPROVAL

The proposed project would require the following approvals:

- **Site/Building Permit** (*Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection*)

The proposed project is subject to notification under Planning Code Section 312. If discretionary review before the Planning Commission is requested, the discretionary review decision constitutes the Approval Action for the proposed project. If no discretionary review is requested, the issuance of the building permit by the Department of Building Inspection 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 EVALUATION OVERVIEW

California Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 provide that projects that are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan, or general plan policies for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was certified, shall not be subject to additional environmental review except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. Section 15183 specifies that examination of environmental effects shall be limited to those effects that: (a) are peculiar to the project or parcel on which the project would be located; (b) were not analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR on the zoning action, general plan, or community plan with which the project is consistent; (c) are potentially significant off-site and cumulative impacts that were not discussed in the underlying EIR; or (d) are previously identified in the EIR, but which, as a result of substantial new information that was not known at the time that the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than that discussed in the underlying EIR. Section 15183(c) specifies that if an impact is not peculiar to the parcel or to the proposed project, then an EIR need not be prepared for the project solely on the basis of that impact.

This determination evaluates the potential project-specific environmental effects of the 265 Shipley Street project described above, and incorporates by reference information contained in the Programmatic EIR

for the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans (PEIR).¹ Project-specific studies were prepared for the proposed project to determine if the project would result in any significant environmental impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

After several years of analysis, community outreach, and public review, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was adopted in December 2008. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was adopted in part to support housing development in some areas previously zoned to allow industrial uses, while preserving an adequate supply of space for existing and future production, distribution, and repair (PDR) employment and businesses. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR also included changes to existing height and bulk districts in some areas, including the project site at 265 Shipley 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 No. 17659 and adopted the Preferred Project for final recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.^{2,3}

In December 2008, after further public hearings, the Board of Supervisors adopted and the Mayor signed the Planning Code amendments related to the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans. 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 that 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*.

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

² San Francisco Planning Department, *Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Final Environmental Impact Report*, Case No. 2004.0160E, certified August 7, 2008. Available online at: <http://sf-planning.org/area-plan-eirs>, accessed September 25, 2017.

³ San Francisco Planning Commission Motion No. 17659, August 7, 2008. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=1268>, accessed September 25, 2017.

As a result of the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning process, the project site's zoning has been reclassified from RSD (Residential Service District) to MUR (Mixed Use Residential). The MUR District serves as a buffer between the higher-density, predominantly commercial area of Yerba Buena Center to the east and the lower-density, mixed-use service/industrial and housing area west of Sixth Street. The MUR District is a major housing opportunity area within the eastern portion of the South of Market neighborhood. Zoning controls are intended to facilitate the development of high-density, mid-rise housing and to encourage the expansion of retail, business service, and cultural arts uses. Office uses are permitted but limited, and hotel, nighttime entertainment, adult entertainment, and heavy industrial uses are not permitted. The proposed project and its relation to PDR land supply and cumulative land use effects is discussed further in the Community Plan Evaluation (CPE) initial study checklist under topic 1, Land Use and Land Use Planning. The 265 Shipley Street site, which is located in the East SoMa Plan Area of the Eastern Neighborhoods program, was designated as a 45-X Height and Bulk District. This designation allows a building up to 45 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 265 Shipley 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 265 Shipley Street project and identifies the mitigation measures applicable to the 265 Shipley Street project. The proposed project is also consistent with the zoning controls and the provisions of the Planning Code applicable to the project site.^{4,5} Therefore, no further CEQA evaluation for the 265 Shipley Street project is required. In sum, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and this Certificate of Determination and accompanying project-specific initial study comprise the full and complete CEQA determination necessary for the proposed project.

PROJECT SETTING

The project vicinity is characterized by a mix of residential, retail, open space, and production/distribution/repair (PDR) uses. The scale of development in the project vicinity varies in height from 15 to 90 feet. There is an auto repair garage (255 Shipley Street) adjacent to and east of the project site, and there is a three-story, six-unit residential building (271 Shipley Street) adjacent to and west of the project site. The remainder of the project block is occupied by multi-story residential buildings, PDR buildings, a church, and a public parking lot. There are two- and three-story residential buildings on the north side of Shipley Street across from the project site. Other land uses in the area include Interstate 80 (0.1 mile southeast of the project site), Bessie Carmichael Elementary School (0.2 mile southwest), Victoria Manalo Draves Park (0.1 mile southwest), and the South of Market Recreation Center (0.1 mile west).

⁴ San Francisco Planning Department, *Community Plan Evaluation Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning and Policy Analysis, Case No. 2013.1549E, 265 Shipley Street*, October 26, 2017.

⁵ San Francisco Planning Department, *Community Plan Evaluation Eligibility Determination, Current Planning Analysis, Case No. 2013.1549E, 265 Shipley Street*, October 2, 2017.

The project site is well served by public transportation. Within one-quarter mile of the project site, the San Francisco Municipal Railway (Muni) operates the following bus lines: the 8 Bayshore, 8AX Bayshore A Express, 8BX Bayshore B Express, 12 Folsom/Pacific, 14X Mission Express, 19 Polk, 27 Bryant, 30 Stockton, 45 Union/Stockton, and the 47 Van Ness.

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 265 Shipley 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 265 Shipley Street project. As a result, the proposed project would not result in any new or substantially more severe impacts than were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

Significant and unavoidable impacts were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR for the following topics: land use, historic architectural resources, transportation and circulation, and shadow. The proposed project would contribute to the land use impact, because it would preclude future PDR development opportunities on the project site. The proposed project would not contribute to the impact on historic architectural resources, because it would not result in the demolition or alteration of any such resources. The volume of traffic and transit ridership generated by the proposed project would not contribute considerably to the traffic and transit impacts identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. The proposed project would not contribute to the shadow impact, because it would not cast shadow on any parks or 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** 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 |
|--|--|-------------------|
| E. Transportation | | |
| E-1: Traffic Signal Installation | Not Applicable: Automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis | Not Applicable |
| E-2: Intelligent Traffic Management | Not Applicable: Automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis | Not Applicable |
| E-3: Enhanced Funding | Not Applicable: Automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis | Not Applicable |
| E-4: Intelligent Traffic Management | Not Applicable: Automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis | Not Applicable |
| E-5: Enhanced Transit Funding | Not Applicable: Plan-level mitigation by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) | Not Applicable |
| E-6: Transit Corridor Improvements | Not Applicable: Plan-level mitigation by the SFMTA | Not Applicable |
| E-7: Transit Accessibility | Not Applicable: Plan-level mitigation by the SFMTA | Not Applicable |
| E-8: Muni Storage and Maintenance | Not Applicable: Plan-level mitigation by the SFMTA | Not Applicable |
| E-9: Rider Improvements | Not Applicable: Plan-level mitigation by the SFMTA | Not Applicable |
| E-10: Transit Enhancement | Not Applicable: Plan-level mitigation by the SFMTA | Not Applicable |
| E-11: Transportation Demand Management | Not Applicable: Superseded by TDM Ordinance | Not Applicable |
| F. Noise | | |
| F-1: Construction Noise (Pile Driving) | Not Applicable: Pile driving is not required or proposed | Not Applicable |

| Mitigation Measure | Applicability | Compliance |
|--|--|--|
| F-2: Construction Noise | Applicable: Temporary construction noise from use of heavy equipment | The project sponsor has agreed to develop and implement noise attenuation measures during construction (see Project Mitigation Measure 2). |
| F-3: Interior Noise Levels | Not Applicable: Impacts of the environment on proposed projects removed from CEQA analysis | Not Applicable |
| F-4: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses | Not Applicable: Impacts of the environment on proposed projects removed from CEQA analysis | Not Applicable |
| F-5: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses | Not Applicable: The project does not include noise-generating uses | Not Applicable |
| F-6: Open Space in Noisy Environments | Not Applicable: Impacts of the environment on proposed projects removed from CEQA analysis | Not Applicable |
| G. Air Quality | | |
| G-1: Construction Air Quality | Not Applicable: The project site is not in an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone | Not Applicable |
| G-2: Air Quality for Sensitive Land Uses | Not Applicable: Superseded by Health Code Article 38 | Not Applicable |
| G-3: Siting of Uses that Emit DPM | Not Applicable: The project does not include uses that emit DPM | Not Applicable |
| G-4: Siting of Uses that Emit other TACs | Not Applicable: The project does not include uses that emit TACs | Not Applicable |
| J. Archeological Resources | | |
| J-1: Properties with Previous Studies | Not Applicable: The project site is not in an area for which a previous archeological study has been conducted | Not Applicable |

| Mitigation Measure | Applicability | Compliance |
|--|---|--|
| J-2: Properties with No Previous Studies | Applicable: The project site is in an area for which no previous archeological study has been conducted | The Planning Department has conducted a Preliminary Archeological Review. The project sponsor has agreed to implement a mitigation measure related to the accidental discovery of archeological resources (see Project Mitigation Measure 1) |
| J-3: Mission Dolores Archeological District | Not Applicable: The project site is not in the Mission Dolores Archeological District | Not Applicable |
| 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 | Not Applicable |
| K-2: Amendments to Article 10 of the Planning Code Pertaining to Vertical Additions in the South End Historic District (East SoMa) | Not Applicable: Plan-level mitigation completed by Planning Commission | Not Applicable |
| K-3: Amendments to Article 10 of the Planning Code Pertaining to Alterations and Infill Development in the Dogpatch Historic District (Central Waterfront) | Not Applicable: Plan-level mitigation completed by Planning Commission | Not Applicable |
| L. Hazardous Materials | | |
| L-1: Hazardous Building Materials | Not Applicable: The project does not include demolition or renovation of an existing building | Not Applicable |

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 3, 2015 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. One member of the public requested that a copy of the CPE be mailed to him upon publication, but no other members of the public commented on the proposed project or the environmental review 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 initial study checklist:⁶

1. The proposed project is consistent with the development density established for the project site in the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans;
2. The proposed project would not result in effects on the environment that are peculiar to the project or the project site that were not identified as significant effects in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR;
3. The proposed project would not result in potentially significant off-site or cumulative impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR;
4. The proposed project would not result in significant effects, which, as a result of substantial new information that was not known at the time the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was certified, would be more severe than were already analyzed and disclosed in the PEIR; and
5. The project sponsor will undertake feasible mitigation measures specified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR to mitigate project-related significant impacts.

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

⁶ The initial study checklist is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2013.1549E.

EXHIBIT 1: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

| MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures | Responsibility for Implementation | Mitigation Schedule | Monitoring and Reporting Actions and Responsibility | Status / Date Completed |
| MITIGATION MEASURES | | | | |
| <p>Project Mitigation Measure 1: Accidental Discovery (Implementing Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure J-2)</p> <p>The following mitigation measure is required to avoid any potential adverse effect from the proposed project on accidentally discovered buried or submerged historical resources as defined in <i>CEQA Guidelines</i> Section 15064.5(a) and (c). The project sponsor shall distribute the Planning Department archeological resource “ALERT” sheet to the project prime contractor; to any project subcontractor (including demolition, excavation, grading, foundation, pile driving, etc. firms); or utilities firm involved in soils-disturbing activities within the project site. Prior to any soils-disturbing activities being undertaken, each contractor is responsible for ensuring that the “ALERT” sheet is circulated to all field personnel, including machine operators, field crew, pile drivers, supervisory personnel, etc. The project sponsor shall provide the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) with a signed affidavit from the responsible parties (prime contractor, subcontractor(s), and utilities firm) to the ERO confirming that all field personnel have received copies of the Alert Sheet.</p> | Project sponsor at the direction of the ERO. | Prior to and during soils-disturbing activities. | Project sponsor shall distribute Alert sheet and shall submit a signed affidavit confirming the distribution to the ERO. | Considered complete when ERO receives signed affidavit. |

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

| Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures | Responsibility for Implementation | Mitigation Schedule | Monitoring and Reporting Actions and Responsibility | Status / Date Completed |
|---|--|----------------------------|--|--|
| <p>Should any indication of an archeological resource be encountered during any soils-disturbing activity of the project, the project Head Foreman and/or project sponsor shall immediately notify the ERO and shall immediately suspend any soils-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the discovery until the ERO has determined what additional measures should be undertaken.</p> <p>If the ERO determines that an archeological resource may be present within the project site, the project sponsor shall retain the services of an archeological consultant from the pool of qualified archeological consultants maintained by the Planning Department archeologist. The archeological consultant shall advise the ERO as to whether the discovery is an archeological resource retains sufficient integrity and is of potential scientific/historical/cultural significance. If an archeological resource is present, the archeological consultant shall identify and evaluate the archeological resource. The archeological consultant shall make a recommendation as to what action, if any, is warranted. Based on this information, the ERO may require, if warranted, specific additional measures to be implemented by the project sponsor.</p> <p>Measures might include: preservation in situ of the archeological resource; an archeological monitoring program; or an archeological testing program. If an archeological monitoring program or archeological testing program is required, it shall be consistent with the Environmental Planning Division guidelines for such</p> | Project sponsor / Head Foreman and archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO. | Accidental discovery | In the event of accidental discovery, the project sponsor shall suspend soils-disturbing activities, notify the ERO, and retain a qualified archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO. The archeological consultant shall identify and evaluate the archeological resources and recommend actions for review and approval by the ERO. The archeological consultant shall undertake additional measures at the direction of the ERO. | Considered complete when archeological consultant completes additional measures as directed by the ERO as warranted. |

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

| Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures | Responsibility for Implementation | Mitigation Schedule | Monitoring and Reporting Actions and Responsibility | Status / Date Completed |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>programs. The ERO may also require that the project sponsor immediately implement a site security program if the archeological resource is at risk from vandalism, looting, or other damaging actions.</p> | | | | |
| <p>The project archeological consultant shall submit a Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archeological resource and describing the archeological and historical research methods employed in the archeological monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the final report.</p> | <p>Archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO.</p> | <p>Following completion of additional measures by archeological consultant as determined by the ERO.</p> | <p>Submittal of draft FARR to ERO for review and approval. Distribution of the FARR by the archeological consultant.</p> | <p>Considered complete upon distribution of approved FARR.</p> |
| <p>Copies of the Draft FARR shall be sent to the ERO for review and approval. 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 copy, one unbound copy and one unlocked, searchable PDF copy on CD of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest or interpretive value, the ERO may require a different final report content, format,</p> | | | | |

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

| Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures | Responsibility for Implementation | Mitigation Schedule | Monitoring and Reporting Actions and Responsibility | Status / Date Completed |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| <p>and distribution than that presented above.</p> <p>Project Mitigation Measure 2: Construction Noise (Implementing Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure F-2)</p> <p>The project sponsor shall develop a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant. Prior to commencing construction, a plan for such measures shall be submitted to the Department of Building Inspection to ensure that maximum feasible noise attenuation will be achieved. These attenuation measures shall include as many of the following control strategies as feasible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Erect temporary plywood noise barriers around a construction site, particularly where a site adjoins noise-sensitive uses; • Utilize noise control blankets on a building structure as the building is erected to reduce noise emission from the site; • Evaluate the feasibility of noise control at the receivers by temporarily improving the noise reduction capability of adjacent buildings housing sensitive uses; • Monitor the effectiveness of noise attenuation measures by taking noise measurements; and • Post signs on-site pertaining to permitted construction days and hours and complaint | Project sponsor, contractor(s). | Prior to the start of demolition or construction activities and during the construction period. | Project sponsor, contractor(s) to submit noise attenuation plan to the Department of Building Inspection and monthly reports to the Planning Department. | Considered complete upon submittal of final monthly report. |

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

| Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures | Responsibility for Implementation | Mitigation Schedule | Monitoring and Reporting Actions and Responsibility | Status / Date Completed |
|--|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| procedures and who to notify in the event of a problem, with telephone numbers listed. | | | | |