



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

## Certificate of Determination EXEMPTION FROM ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

*Case No.:* 2013.1773E  
*Project Address:* 345 6th Street  
*Zoning:* MUR (Mixed Use-Residential) District  
85-X Height and Bulk District  
*Block/Lot:* 3753/081  
*Lot Size:* 9,375 square feet  
*Plan Area:* Eastern Neighborhoods (East SoMa)  
Central SoMa  
*Project Sponsor:* SST Investments, LLC  
c/o Reza Khoshnevisan – SIA Consulting Corporation  
(415) 922-0200, [reza@siaconsult.com](mailto:reza@siaconsult.com)  
*Staff Contact:* Michael Li  
(415) 575-9107, [michael.j.li@sfgov.org](mailto:michael.j.li@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**

### 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 M. GIBSON

Acting Environmental Review Officer

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

cc: SST Investments, LLC, Project Sponsor  
Dan Sirois, Current Planning Division  
Supervisor Jane Kim, District 6

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

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project site, which is in San Francisco's South of Market neighborhood, is on the southeast corner of 6th and Shipley streets; it has 75 feet of frontage on 6th Street and 125 feet of frontage on Shipley Street. The project site is occupied by a paved area and two one-story buildings. The entire property is used for public parking.

The proposed project consists of demolishing the existing buildings and surface parking lot and constructing a new nine-story, 85-foot-tall mixed-use building containing 102 single-room occupancy units and approximately 1,730 square feet of commercial space. No automobile parking would be provided, and the existing driveway and curb cut on 6th Street would be removed. Bicycle parking would be provided in a storage room on the ground floor of the proposed building and on the sidewalks adjacent to the project site. Usable open space for the residents of the proposed project would be provided in the form of private balconies and decks on the fourth through seventh floors and common decks on the eighth floor and the roof.

Construction of the proposed project is expected to last 16 months. The proposed building would be supported by deep piers with a mat slab. Construction of the proposed project would require excavation to a depth of two feet below ground surface and the removal of about 520 cubic yards of soil from the project site.

## PROJECT APPROVAL

The proposed project would require the following approvals:

- **Large Project Authorization** (*Planning Commission*)
- **Demolition Permit** (*Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection*)
- **Site/Building Permit** (*Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection*)

Large Project Authorization by 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 345 6th Street project described above, and incorporates by reference information contained in the Programmatic EIR for the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans (PEIR).<sup>1</sup> Project-specific studies were prepared for the proposed project to determine if the project would result in any significant environmental impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

After several years of analysis, community outreach, and public review, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was adopted in December 2008. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was adopted in part to support housing development in some areas previously zoned to allow industrial uses, while preserving an adequate supply of space for existing and future PDR employment and businesses.

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.<sup>2,3</sup>

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. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR projected that this level of development would result in a total population increase of approximately 23,900 to 33,000 people throughout the lifetime of the plan.<sup>4</sup>

---

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

<sup>2</sup> 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 August 31, 2016.

<sup>3</sup> San Francisco Planning Commission Motion No. 17659, August 7, 2008. Available online at: [http://sf-planning.org/sites/default/files/FileCenter/Documents/1268-EN\\_BOS\\_Vol4\\_CEQA\\_Part7\\_Web.pdf](http://sf-planning.org/sites/default/files/FileCenter/Documents/1268-EN_BOS_Vol4_CEQA_Part7_Web.pdf), accessed August 31, 2016.

<sup>4</sup> Table 2: Forecast Growth by Rezoning Option, in Chapter IV of the Eastern Neighborhoods Draft EIR, shows projected net growth based on proposed rezoning scenarios. A baseline for existing conditions in the year 2000 was included to provide context for the scenario figures for parcels affected by the rezoning.

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'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 CPE Checklist under Topic 1, Land Use and Land Use Planning. The 345 6th Street site, which is located in the East SoMa Plan Area of the Eastern Neighborhoods program, was designated as a 85-X Height and Bulk District. This designation allows a building up to 85 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 345 6th 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 345 6th Street project and identifies the mitigation measures applicable to the 345 6th 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>5,6</sup> Therefore, no further CEQA evaluation for the 345 6th 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 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 a one-story church (363 6th Street) adjacent to and south of the project site, and there is a two-story residential building (285 Shipley Street) adjacent to and east of the project site. The remainder of the project block is occupied by multi-story residential buildings, PDR buildings, and an auto repair garage. There is a surface parking lot on the north side of Shipley Street across from

---

<sup>5</sup> Joshua Switzky, San Francisco Planning Department, *Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning and Policy Analysis, Case No. 2013.1773E, 345 6th Street*, October 26, 2016.

<sup>6</sup> Jeff Joslin, San Francisco Planning Department, *Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Current Planning Analysis, Case No. 2013.1773E, 345 6th Street*, October 18, 2016.

the project site, and there are four- and five-story residential buildings on the west side of 6th 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 (0.15 mile southwest), Victoria Manalo Draves Park (0.1 mile southwest), and the South of Market Recreation Center (0.05 mile west).

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, 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 345 6th 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 345 6th Street project. As a result, the proposed project would not result in any new or substantially more severe impacts than were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

Significant and unavoidable impacts were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR for the following topics: land use, historic architectural resources, transportation and circulation, and shadow. The proposed project would not contribute to the land use impact, because it would not remove any existing PDR uses, and it would not make a considerable contribution to the loss of PDR development opportunities. 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 contribute to the shadow impact, because it would cast shadow on the Gene Friend Recreation Center, but implementation of the proposed project would not result in new significant environmental effects or effects of greater severity than were already analyzed and disclosed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

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
<b>E. Transportation</b>		
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 and the San Francisco County Transportation Authority	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: Plan level mitigation by the SFMTA	Not Applicable

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
<b>F. Noise</b>		
F-1: Construction Noise – Pile Driving	Applicable: Pile driving could be required	The project sponsor has agreed to pre-drill piles wherever feasible, to use sonic or vibratory sheet pile drivers instead of impact drivers wherever sheet piles are needed, and to schedule pile driving activities during times of day that would minimize disturbance to neighbors (see Project Mitigation Measure 2).
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 3).
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 proposed 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
<b>G. Air Quality</b>		
G-1: Construction Air Quality	Applicable: The project site is in an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone	The project sponsor has agreed to implement a mitigation measure related to minimizing exhaust emissions from construction equipment and vehicles (see Project Mitigation Measure 4).

<b>Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Applicability</b>	<b>Compliance</b>
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
<b>J. Archeological Resources</b>		
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
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
<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	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



Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
<b>L. Hazardous Materials</b>		
L-1: Hazardous Building Materials	Applicable: The project includes demolition of an existing building	The project sponsor has agreed to remove and properly dispose of any hazardous building materials in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local laws prior to demolishing the existing building (see Project Mitigation Measure 5).

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 August 10, 2015 to adjacent occupants and owners of properties within 300 feet of the project site. After the proposed project’s unit count was increased from 88 to 102, a “Notification of REVISED PROJECT Receiving Environmental Review” was mailed to the same parties identified above on September 26, 2016. 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.

In response to the August 2015 notice, the Planning Department received comments from four members of the public. The comments expressed opposition to the project as well as concerns over increased shadow and the potential influx of vagrants into the neighborhood due to the types of dwelling units being proposed. The owner of The EndUp, a nightclub one-half block south of the project site, expressed concerns over how noise from the nightclub would affect the future residents of the proposed project.

In response to the September 2016 notice, the Planning Department received comments from three members of the public. The comments expressed concerns over increased shadow on adjacent residential properties and the Gene Friend Recreation Center. One comment stated that the analysis of the proposed project’s shadow impacts should be based on the future/proposed configuration and operating hours of the Gene Friend Recreation Center that are being considered by the Recreation and Park Department instead of the current configuration and operating hours. One comment included a list of suggestions regarding how the project could be operated in a manner that would minimize nuisances such as noise, loitering, and the accumulation of garbage.

As discussed under Topic 5, Noise, in the attached CPE Checklist (pp. 30-33), CEQA does not require lead agencies to analyze how existing environmental conditions would affect a proposed project. Since the proposed project is within 300 feet of a place of entertainment, the proposed project is subject to a City ordinance that addresses the compatibility of new residential development with existing noise-generating uses. As discussed under Topic 8, Wind and Shadow, in the attached CPE Checklist (pp. 38-41), the

Planning Department evaluated the shadow impacts of the proposed project. The analysis is based on the current configuration and operating hours of the Gene Friend Recreation Center, not any future/proposed configuration and operating hours that may be under consideration by the Recreation and Park Department.

The comments expressing opposition to the proposed project or the types of dwelling units being proposed do not address the physical environmental impacts of the proposed project. Suggestions regarding how the project could be operated in a manner that would minimize nuisances could be incorporated as conditions of approval during the entitlement process if City decision-makers choose to do so. These comments are acknowledged and may be considered by City decision-makers during their review of the proposed project.

## CONCLUSION

As summarized above and further discussed in the attached CPE Checklist:

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.

**EXHIBIT 1: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

<u>Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures</u>	<b>MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM</b>			
	<b>Responsibility for Implementation</b>	<b>Mitigation Action and Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Schedule</b>
<p><b>MITIGATION MEASURES</b></p> <p><b>Project Mitigation Measure 1: Procedures for Accidental Discovery of Archeological Resources (Implementing Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure J-2)</b></p> <p>This mitigation measure is required to avoid any potential adverse effect on accidentally discovered buried or submerged historical resources as defined in <i>CEQA Guidelines</i> Section 15064.5(a) and (c).</p> <p>The project sponsor shall distribute the San Francisco Planning Department archeological resource “ALERT” sheet to the project prime contractor; to any project subcontractor (including demolition, excavation, grading, foundation, pile driving, etc. firms); and to utilities firms 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, and supervisory personnel. The project sponsor shall provide the ERO with a signed affidavit from the responsible parties (prime contractor, subcontractor(s), and utilities firms) to the ERO confirming that all field personnel have received copies of the “ALERT” sheet.</p> <p>Should any indication of an archeological resource be</p>	<p>Project sponsor/ archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO.</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of any permit for soils-disturbing activities and during construction activities.</p>	<p>Project sponsor/archeological consultant and ERO.</p>	<p>During soils-disturbing and construction activities.</p>

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

<b>Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility for Implementation</b>	<b>Mitigation Action and Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Schedule</b>
--	--	---------------------------------------	--	----------------------------

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.

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 San Francisco 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.

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 (EP) division guidelines for such

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

<b>Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility for Implementation</b>	<b>Mitigation Action and Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Schedule</b>
--	--	---------------------------------------	--	----------------------------

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.

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 describes 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.

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 copy and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Environmental Planning Division of the San Francisco Planning Department shall receive one bound copy, one unbound copy, and one unlocked, searchable PDF copy on a 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,

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

<b>Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility for Implementation</b>	<b>Mitigation Action and Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Schedule</b>
<p>format, and distribution from that presented above.</p> <p><b>Project Mitigation Measure 2: Construction Noise – Pile Driving (Implementing Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure F-1)</b></p> <p>The project sponsor shall ensure that piles are pre-drilled wherever feasible to reduce construction-related noise and vibration. No impact pile drivers shall be used unless absolutely necessary. Contractors shall 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 sheet pile drivers rather than impact drivers shall be used wherever sheet piles are needed. The project sponsor shall require that contractors schedule pile driving activities for times of day that would minimize disturbance to neighbors.</p>	Project sponsor, contractor(s).	Submit monthly reports to the Planning Department during construction period.	Project sponsor, Planning Department.	During construction period.
<p><b>Project Mitigation Measure 3: Construction Noise (Implementing Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure F-2)</b></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>	Project sponsor, construction contractor(s).	Submit noise attenuation plan to the Department of Building Inspection prior to start of demolition or construction activities.  Submit monthly	Project sponsor, Planning Department.	During demolition and construction period.

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

<b>Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility for Implementation</b>	<b>Mitigation Action and Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Schedule</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Erect temporary plywood noise barriers around a construction site, particularly where a site adjoins noise-sensitive uses;</li> <li>• Utilize noise control blankets on a building structure as the building is erected to reduce noise emission from the site;</li> <li>• Evaluate the feasibility of noise control at the receivers by temporarily improving the noise reduction capability of adjacent buildings housing sensitive uses;</li> <li>• Monitor the effectiveness of noise attenuation measures by taking noise measurements; and</li> <li>• Post signs on-site pertaining to permitted construction days and hours and complaint procedures and who to notify in the event of a problem, with telephone numbers listed.</li> </ul>		reports to the Planning Department during construction period.		
<p><b>Project Mitigation Measure 4: Construction Air Quality (Implementing Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-1)</b></p> <p>The project sponsor or the project sponsor’s Contractor shall comply with the following:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">A. <i>Engine Requirements.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All off-road equipment greater than 25 hp and operating for more than 20 total hours over the entire duration of construction activities</li> </ol>	Project sponsor, contractor(s).	Submit certification statement prior to construction activities requiring the use of off-road equipment.	Project sponsor, contractor(s), and the ERO.	Considered complete upon submittal of certification statement.

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

<b>Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility for Implementation</b>	<b>Mitigation Action and Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Schedule</b>
<p>shall have engines that meet or exceed either U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) or California Air Resources Board (ARB) Tier 2 off-road emission standards, and have been retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy. Equipment with engines meeting Tier 4 Interim or Tier 4 Final off-road emission standards automatically meet this requirement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Where access to alternative sources of power are available, portable diesel engines shall be prohibited.</li> <li>3. Diesel engines, whether for off-road or on-road equipment, shall not be left idling for more than two minutes, at any location, except as provided in exceptions to the applicable state regulations regarding idling for off-road and on-road equipment (e.g., traffic conditions, safe operating conditions). The Contractor shall post legible and visible signs in English, Spanish, and Chinese, in designated queuing areas and at the construction site to remind operators of the two-minute idling limit.</li> <li>4. The Contractor shall instruct construction workers and equipment operators on the</li> </ol>				



**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

<b>Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility for Implementation</b>	<b>Mitigation Action and Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Schedule</b>
<p style="text-align: center;">maintenance and tuning of construction equipment, and require that such workers and operators properly maintain and tune equipment in accordance with manufacturer specifications.</p> <p>B. <i>Waivers.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Planning Department’s Environmental Review Officer (ERO) or designee may waive the alternative source of power requirement of Subsection (A)(2) if an alternative source of power is limited or infeasible at the project site. If the ERO grants the waiver, the Contractor must submit documentation that the equipment used for on-site power generation meets the requirements of Subsection (A)(1).</li> <li>2. The ERO may waive the equipment requirements of Subsection (A)(1) if: a particular piece of off-road equipment with an ARB Level 3 VDECS is technically not feasible; the equipment would not produce desired emissions reduction due to expected operating modes; installation of the equipment would create a safety hazard or impaired visibility for the operator; or, there is a compelling emergency need to use off-road equipment that is not retrofitted with an ARB</li> </ol>				

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

<b>Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility for Implementation</b>	<b>Mitigation Action and Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Schedule</b>
--	--	---------------------------------------	--	----------------------------

Level 3 VDECS. If the ERO grants the waiver, the Contractor must use the next cleanest piece of off-road equipment, according to the table below.

**Table – Off-Road Equipment Compliance Step-down Schedule**

<b>Engine Emission Standard</b>	<b>Emissions Control</b>
Tier 2	ARB Level 2 VDECS
Tier 2	ARB Level 1 VDECS
Tier 2	Alternative Fuel*

How to use the table: If the ERO determines that the equipment requirements cannot be met, then the project sponsor would need to meet Compliance Alternative 1. If the ERO determines that the Contractor cannot supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 1, then the Contractor must meet Compliance Alternative 2. If the ERO determines that the Contractor cannot supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 2, then the Contractor must meet Compliance Alternative 3. Alternative fuels are not a VDECS.

<p>C. <i>Construction Emissions Minimization Plan.</i> Before starting on-site construction activities, the Contractor shall submit a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan (Plan) to the ERO for review and approval. The Plan shall state, in reasonable detail, how the Contractor will meet the requirements of Section A.</p>	<p>Project sponsor, contractor(s).</p>	<p>Prepare and submit a Plan prior to issuance of a permit specified in Section 106A.3.2.6 of the San Francisco Building Code.</p>	<p>Project sponsor, contractor(s), and the ERO.</p>	<p>Considered complete upon findings by the ERO that the Plan is complete.</p>
<p>1. The Plan shall include estimates of the construction timeline by phase, with a description of each piece of off-road equipment required for every</p>				

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

<b>Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility for Implementation</b>	<b>Mitigation Action and Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Schedule</b>
<p>construction phase. The description may include, but is not limited to: equipment type, equipment manufacturer, equipment identification number, engine model year, engine certification (Tier rating), horsepower, engine serial number, and expected fuel usage and hours of operation. For VDECS installed, the description may include: technology type, serial number, make, model, manufacturer, ARB verification number level, and installation date and hour meter reading on installation date. For off-road equipment using alternative fuels, the description shall also specify the type of alternative fuel being used.</p> <p>2. The ERO shall ensure that all applicable requirements of the Plan have been incorporated into the contract specifications. The Plan shall include a certification statement that the Contractor agrees to comply fully with the Plan.</p> <p>3. The Contractor shall make the Plan available to the public for review on-site during working hours. The Contractor shall post at the construction site a legible and visible sign summarizing the Plan. The sign shall also state that the public</p>				

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

<b>Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility for Implementation</b>	<b>Mitigation Action and Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Schedule</b>
<p>may ask to inspect the Plan for the project at any time during working hours and shall explain how to request to inspect the Plan. The Contractor shall post at least one copy of the sign in a visible location on each side of the construction site facing a public right-of-way.</p>				
<p>D. <i>Monitoring.</i> After start of construction activities, the Contractor shall submit quarterly reports to the ERO documenting compliance with the Plan. After completion of construction activities and prior to receiving a final certificate of occupancy, the project sponsor shall submit to the ERO a final report summarizing construction activities, including the start and end dates and duration of each construction phase, and the specific information required in the Plan.</p>	Project sponsor/ contractor(s).	Submit quarterly reports.	Project sponsor, contractor(s), and the ERO.	Considered complete upon findings by the ERO that the Plan is being/has been implemented.
<p><b>Project Mitigation Measure 5: Hazardous Building Materials (Implementing PEIR Mitigation Measure L-1)</b></p> <p>The project sponsor shall ensure that any equipment containing PCBs or DEPH, such as fluorescent light ballasts, are removed and properly disposed of according to applicable federal, state, and local laws prior to the start of renovation, and that any fluorescent light tubes, which could contain mercury, are similarly removed and properly disposed of. Any other hazardous materials identified, either before or during work, shall be abated</p>	Project sponsor, construction contractor(s).	Project sponsor shall submit a report to the Department of Public Health, with copies to the Planning Department and the Department of	Project sponsor, Department of Public Health, Department of Building Inspection, and Planning Department.	Prior to and during demolition or construction activities.

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

<b>Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility for Implementation</b>	<b>Mitigation Action and Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Schedule</b>
according to applicable federal, state, and local laws.		Building Inspection, at the end of the construction period.		