



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.: 2015-006512ENV
Project Address: 40 Cleveland Street
Zoning: Mixed Use-General (MUG)
SOMA Youth and Family Special Use District
45-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 3754/029
Lot Size: 1,875 square feet
Plan Area: Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan
Project Sponsor: Andrew Junius, Reuben Junius & Rose, 415-567-9000
Staff Contact: Josh Pollak, 415-575-8766, josh.pollak@sfgov.org

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project site is located on the north side of Cleveland Street, on the block surrounded by Folsom Street, 7th Street, and Sherman Street in the East Soma Plan subarea of the Eastern Neighborhoods plan area, in the South of Market neighborhood. The project site contains a 2-story industrial building, formerly used as a print shop. The proposed project would replace the existing building with a new 40-foot-tall, 4-story, 5-unit, 5,658 square foot residential condominium building. 1,008 square feet of private and common open space would be provided in the rear yard, private decks, and a common roof deck..


(Continued on next page.)

CEQA DETERMINATION

The project is eligible for streamlined environmental review 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

12/20/17

Date

cc: Andrew Junius, Project Sponsor; Supervisor Jane Kim, District 6; Kimberly Durandet, Current Planning Division; Virna Byrd, M.D.F.; Exemption/Exclusion File

PROJECT DESCRIPTION (continued)

A single parking space would be provided in a ground floor garage. Six Class 1 bicycle parking spaces will be provided in a bicycle storage room on the ground floor. An existing curb cut spans across all of 32 Cleveland to approximately the midpoint of 40 Cleveland. The existing curb cut would be modified to provide separate curb cuts for 32 Cleveland and 40 Cleveland. No street trees would be provided at 40 Cleveland due to the narrow width of the sidewalk.

The proposed building would be supported by a mat slab foundation. Excavation would occur across the entire site, excluding the rear yard setback area, to a depth of approximately 2 feet with an extra 10 inches of depth along the perimeter, for a total excavation of around 110 cubic yards over a 1,406 square-foot area.

PROJECT APPROVAL

If discretionary review before the Planning Commission is requested, the discretionary review hearing is the Approval Action for the project. If no discretionary review is requested, the issuance of demolition and building permits by the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) is the Approval Action. The Approval Action date establishes the start of the 30-day appeal period for this CEQA 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 proposed 40 Cleveland 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

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

and businesses. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR also included changes to existing height and bulk districts in some areas, including the project site at 40 Cleveland 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.^{2,3}

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). 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.⁴

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 MUG (Mixed Use-General) District. The MUG District is largely comprised of the low-scale, production, distribution, and repair uses mixed with housing and small-scale retail. The MUG is designed to maintain and facilitate the growth and expansion of small-scale light industrial, wholesale distribution, arts production and performance/exhibition activities, general commercial and neighborhood-serving retail

² 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.

³ 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.

⁴ Table 2 Forecast Growth by Rezoning Option 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.

and personal service activities while protecting existing housing and encouraging the development of housing at a scale and density compatible with the existing neighborhood.

The proposed project and its relation to PDR land supply and cumulative land use effects is discussed further in the Community Plan Evaluation (CPE) Checklist, under Land Use. The 40 Cleveland Street site, which is located in the East SoMa area of the Eastern Neighborhoods, was designated as a site with a height limit of 45 feet.

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 40 Cleveland 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 40 Cleveland Street project, and identified the mitigation measures applicable to the 40 Cleveland 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 40 Cleveland 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 evaluation necessary for the proposed project.

PROJECT SETTING

The project site is located on the north side of Cleveland Street between Sherman Street and 7th Street, with frontage along Cleveland Street. Cleveland Street is a narrow one-way street with parking on the south side of the street. The project vicinity is a mix of uses and structures with adjacent apartments, PDR spaces, and a child care center. Recently approved and proposed projects within one block include:

- 1075 and 1089 Folsom Street, which would demolish the existing buildings on the two lots to construct a new 6-story residential building with ground floor commercial space. The new buildings will include 48 SRO units on 6 floors, 1,480 square feet of ground-floor commercial space, and no off-street vehicle parking.

Bessie Carmichael Elementary School is located across the street from the site, as is the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of St. Michael. Victoria Manalo Draves Park is less than a block away, located at the corner of Cleveland and Sherman streets. The project site is also located within a Youth and Family Zone Special District, and the Filipino Cultural Heritage District.

The project site is located within a quarter mile of several local transit lines including Muni lines 12, 14X, 19, 47, 8, 83X, 8AX and 8BX.

⁵ San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Evaluation Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning and Policy Analysis, 40 Cleveland Street, April 19, 2017. This document (and all other documents cited in this report, unless otherwise noted), is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2015-00651ENV.

⁶ San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Evaluation Eligibility Determination, Current Planning Analysis, 40 Cleveland Street, June 1, 2017.

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 40 Cleveland 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 40 Cleveland 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 identified land use impacts related to PDR loss because the amount of PDR space being removed is minor and redevelopment of the project site for residential uses could have occurred without the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning, nor would the project affect historic architectural resources as the subject building is not a historic resource nor is it a contributor to a historic district. In regards to significant and unavoidable transportation impacts related to traffic and transit, the proposed project would not contribute considerably to projects-specific and cumulative traffic and transit impacts identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that projects developed in the South of Market neighborhood in the area surrounding Victoria Manalo Draves Park could result in significant and unavoidable shadow impacts. However, the proposed project is not greater than 40 feet and Section 295 of the Planning Code would not be applicable. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute considerably to shadow impacts identified 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 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)	Not Applicable: pile driving or other particularly noisy construction procedures not proposed.	N/A
F-2: Construction Noise	Not Applicable: particularly noisy construction procedures not proposed.	N/A
F-3: Interior Noise Levels	Not Applicable: CEQA generally no longer requires	N/A

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
	the consideration of the effect of existing environmental conditions on a proposed project's future users or residents.	
F-4: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses	Not Applicable: CEQA generally no longer requires the consideration of the effect of existing environmental conditions on a proposed project's future users or residents.	N/A
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	Not Applicable: CEQA generally no longer requires the consideration of the effect of existing environmental conditions on a proposed project's future users or residents.	N/A
G. Air Quality		
G-1: Construction Air Quality	Applicable: the project site is located within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone. Project construction could exacerbate poor air quality.	The project sponsor has agreed to develop and implement a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan to reduce construction emissions.
G-2: Air Quality for Sensitive Land Uses	Not Applicable: The requirements of this measure are met by compliance with Health Code Article 38.	N/A
G-3: Siting of Uses that Emit DPM	Not Applicable: the proposed residential 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 uses are not expected to emit substantial levels of other TACs.	N/A

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
J. Archeological Resources		
J-1: Properties with Previous Studies	Not Applicable: no previous studies have been performed on the project site.	N/A
J-2: Properties with no Previous Studies	Applicable: Preliminary Archeological Review by the Planning Department indicates the potential to adversely affect archeological resources.	The project sponsor has agreed to implement archeological testing mitigation measure.
J-3: Mission Dolores Archeological District	Not Applicable: not within the 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 (Central Waterfront)	Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation completed by Planning Commission.	N/A
L. Hazardous Materials		
L-1: Hazardous Building Materials	Applicable: the project would demolish a building structure.	The project sponsor has agreed to dispose of demolition debris in accordance with applicable regulations.
E. Transportation		
E-1: Traffic Signal Installation	Not Applicable: automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis.	N/A
E-2: Intelligent Traffic Management	Not Applicable: automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis.	N/A
E-3: Enhanced Funding	Not Applicable: automobile delay removed from CEQA	N/A

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
	analysis.	
E-4: Intelligent Traffic Management	Not Applicable: automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis.	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 31, 2017 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. Two individuals submitted comments. One requested a copy of the environmental document. The second was supportive of the project, and requested the addition of more parking, as well as inclusion of an exterior video camera on the building. Neither comments addressed environmental topics covered in the Initial Study—Community Plan Evaluation. The proposed project would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts beyond those identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

CONCLUSION

As summarized above and further discussed in the CPE Checklist⁷:

⁷ The CPE Checklist is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, in Case File No. 2015-00651ENV.

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.

**EXHIBIT 1: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Including the Text of the Mitigation Measures)**

PROPOSED IMPROVEMENT MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
---	-----------------------------------	---------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------

Mitigation Measures from the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan EIR

Archeology				
<p>Project Mitigation Measure 1- Archeological Testing (Implementing Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation J-2) 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 archaeologist 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 measure. The archeological consultant's work shall be conducted in accordance with this measure 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 measure 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) and (c).</p> <p><i>Consultation with Descendant Communities:</i> On discovery of an archeological site¹ associated with descendant Native Americans, the Overseas Chinese, or other potentially interested descendant group an appropriate representative² of the descendant group and the ERO shall be contacted. The representative of the descendant group shall be given the opportunity to monitor archeological field investigations of the site and to offer recommendations to the ERO regarding appropriate archeological</p>	<p>Project Sponsor, project contractor, and project archeologist.</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of any permit for soil-disturbing activities and during construction activities.</p>	<p>The Environmental Review Officer (ERO) to review and approve the Archeological Research Design and Treatment Plan (ARDTP).</p>	<p>The project archeologist to report on progress bi-monthly to the ERO. Considered complete after review and approval of ARDTP by the ERO.</p>

¹ By the term "archeological site" is intended here to minimally include 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. An appropriate representative of other descendant groups should be determined in consultation with the Department archeologist.

**EXHIBIT 1: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Including the Text of the Mitigation Measures)**

PROPOSED IMPROVEMENT MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>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><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>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. No archeological data recovery shall be undertaken without the prior approval of the ERO or the Planning Department archeologist. 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) The proposed project shall be re-designed so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archeological resource; or 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><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 				

**EXHIBIT 1: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Including the Text of the Mitigation Measures)**

PROPOSED IMPROVEMENT MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>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;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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; ▪ The archeological monitor shall record and be authorized to collect soil samples and artifactual/ecofactual material as warranted for analysis; ▪ 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 or deep foundation activities (foundation, shoring, etc.), the archeological monitor has cause to believe that the pile driving or deep foundation activities may affect an archeological resource, the pile driving or deep foundation activities shall be 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. 				

**EXHIBIT 1: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Including the Text of the Mitigation Measures)**

PROPOSED IMPROVEMENT MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<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. ▪ <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, Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects.</i> The</p>				

**EXHIBIT 1: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Including the Text of the Mitigation Measures)**

PROPOSED IMPROVEMENT MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>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, including 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 ERO shall also be immediately notified upon discovery of human remains. The archeological consultant, project sponsor, ERO, and MLD shall have up to but not beyond six days after the discovery to make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects with appropriate dignity (CEQA Guidelines, Sec. 15064.5(d)). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, curation, possession, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects. Nothing in existing State regulations or in this mitigation measure compels the project sponsor and the ERO to accept recommendations of an MLD. The archeological consultant shall retain possession of any Native American human remains and associated or unassociated burial objects until completion of any scientific analyses of the human remains or objects as specified in the treatment agreement if such as agreement has been made or, otherwise, as determined by the archeological consultant and the ERO. If no agreement is reached State regulations shall be followed including the reinterment of the human remains and associated burial objects with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance (Pub. Res. Code Sec. 5097.98).</p> <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> <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</p>				

**EXHIBIT 1: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Including the Text of the Mitigation Measures)**

PROPOSED IMPROVEMENT MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>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 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.</p>				
Air Quality				
<p>Project Mitigation Measure 2- Construction Air Quality (Implementing Portions of Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-1) The project sponsor shall ensure that contractor(s) maintain and operate construction equipment so as to minimize exhaust emissions of particulates and other pollutants, by such means as a prohibition on idling motors when equipment is not in use or when trucks are waiting in queues, and implementation of specific maintenance programs to reduce emissions for equipment that would be in frequent use for much of the construction period.</p>	Project Sponsor and project contractor	During construction	Project Sponsor to provide Planning Department with monthly reports during construction period.	Considered complete upon receipt of final monitoring report at completion of construction.
Hazardous Building Materials				
<p>Project Mitigation Measure 3 (Implementing Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure L-1) The sponsor shall ensure that any equipment containing PCBs or DEHP, such as fluorescent light ballasts, are removed and properly disposed of according to applicable federal, state, and local laws prior to the start of renovation, and that any fluorescent light tubes, which could contain mercury, are similarly removed and properly disposed of. Any other hazardous materials identified, either before or during work, shall be abated according to applicable federal, state, and local laws.</p>	Project Sponsor	Prior to demolition activities.	Planning Department, in consultation with Department of Public Health (DPH); Project Sponsor or contractor will submit a monitoring report to DPH, with a copy to Planning Department and DBI, at end of construction.	Considered complete upon submittal of a monitoring report.