

Certificate of Determination Community Plan Evaluation

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

415.558.6378

415.558.6409

415.558.6377

Reception:

Fax:

Planning

Information:

Case No.:

2016-008651ENV

Project Address:

600 20th Street

Zoning:

UMU (Urban Mixed Use) District

Life Science and Medical Special Use District Central Waterfront: Third Street Industrial District

68-X Height and Bulk District

Block/Lot:

4058/002

Lot Size:

5,497 square feet

Plan Area:

Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan (Central Waterfront)

Project Sponsor:

Will Mollard, Workshop1, - (415) 523-0304, Ext. 1, will@workshop1.com

Staff Contact:

Jennifer McKellar – (415) 575-8754, jennifer.mckellar@sfgov.org

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project site consists of an approximately 5,500-square-foot rectangular lot located on the northwest corner of 20th and Illinois streets within the block bound by 19th, 20th, Third and Illinois streets in the Potrero Hill neighborhood of San Francisco. The site contains a two-story, approximately 9,200-squarefoot, mixed commercial and residential building, constructed in 1972. The project site is located within the Central Waterfront: Third Street Industrial District, an eligible California Register Historic District. There is an existing 12-foot-wide curb cut located on the Illinois Street frontage of the site.

The proposed project would demolish the existing building and construct a new six-story, 68-foot-tall (80 feet to the top of the elevator/staircase penthouse), approximately 26,000-square-foot mixed-use building with 21 dwelling units (11 one-bedroom and 10 two bedroom units) and approximately 1,700 square feet of ground-floor retail space.

(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.

6/4/18

Lisa Gibson

Date

Environmental Review Officer

Will Mollard, Project Sponsor; Supervisor Malia Cohen, District 10; Esmeralda Jardines, Current Planning Division; Virna Byrd, M.D.F.; Exemption/Exclusion File

PROJECT DESCRIPTION (continued)

The upper-floor dwelling units would be accessed via a residential lobby entered from 20th Street; the ground-floor residential unit would be accessed from a private entrance located on Illinois Street. The retail space would be accessed from two entrances located on Illinois Street. A common roof deck (1,560 square feet), two private second-floor rear decks (totaling approximately 1,100 square feet) and two private decks associated with the ground-floor residential unit (totaling 87 square feet) would provide useable open space for the residential occupants.

The proposed project would include 40 class 1 bicycle parking spaces in a room located off the ground-floor lobby and four class 2 bicycle parking spaces located on the Illinois Street sidewalk, opposite the retail unit. Eight new street trees would be added to the project site: three along 20th Street and five along Illinois Street. The existing 12-foot-wide curb cut on Illinois Street would be removed. The new building would be supported by spread footings bearing on ground improved with drilled displacement sand-cement columns, extending at least three feet into bedrock (located 11.5 to 15 feet below ground surface). Construction of the proposed project would last 15-18 months and require excavation of the entire site to a maximum depth of four feet below ground surface and removal of about 815 cubic yards of soil.

PROJECT APPROVAL

The approval of a Large Project Authorization by the Planning Commission (per Planning Code section 329) constitutes the Approval Action for the proposed project. 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 600 20th Street project described above, and incorporates by reference information contained in the Programmatic EIR for the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans (PEIR)². Project-specific studies were prepared

¹ Section 155.1(a) of the planning code defines class 1 bicycle spaces as "spaces in secure, weather-protected facilities intended for use as long-term, overnight, and work-day bicycle storage by dwelling unit residents, nonresidential occupants, and employees" and class 2 bicycle spaces as "spaces located in a publicly accessible, highly visible location intended for transient or short-term use by visitors, guests, and patrons to the building or use."

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

for the proposed project to determine if the project would result in any significant environmental impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

After several years of analysis, community outreach, and public review, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was adopted in December 2008. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was adopted in part to support housing development in some areas previously zoned to allow industrial uses, while preserving an adequate supply of space for existing and future production, distribution, and repair (PDR) employment and businesses. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR also included changes to existing height and bulk districts in some areas, including the project site at 600 20th Street.

The Planning Commission held public hearings to consider the various aspects of the proposed Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans and related Planning Code and Zoning Map amendments. On August 7, 2008, the Planning Commission certified the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR by Motion 17659 and adopted the Preferred Project for final recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.^{3,4}

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

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR is a comprehensive programmatic document that presents an analysis of the environmental effects of implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, as well as the potential impacts under several proposed alternative scenarios. The Eastern Neighborhoods Draft EIR evaluated three rezoning alternatives, two community-proposed alternatives which focused largely on the Mission District, and a "No Project" alternative. The alternative selected, or the Preferred Project, represents a combination of Options B and C. The Planning Commission adopted the Preferred Project after fully considering the environmental effects of the Preferred Project and the various scenarios discussed in the PEIR. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR estimated that implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan could result in approximately 7,400 to 9,900 net dwelling units and 3,200,000 to 6,600,0000 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.⁵

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.

³ San Francisco Planning Department. Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), Planning Department Case No. 2004.0160E, certified August 7, 2008. Available online at: http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1893, accessed August 17, 2012.

⁴ San Francisco Planning Department. San Francisco Planning Commission Motion 17659, August 7, 2008. Available online at: http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=1268, accessed August 17, 2012.

⁵ 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.

As a result of the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning process, the project site has been rezoned to UMU (Urban Mixed Use) District. The UMU District is intended to promote a vibrant mix of uses while maintaining the characteristics of this formerly industrially-zoned area. It is also intended to serve as a buffer between residential districts and PDR districts in the Eastern Neighborhoods. The proposed 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 600 20th Street site, which is located in the Central Waterfront district of the Eastern Neighborhoods, was designated as a site with building up to 68 feet in height.

Individual projects that could occur in the future under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans will undergo project-level environmental evaluation to determine if they would result in further impacts specific to the development proposal, the site, and the time of development and to assess whether additional environmental review would be required. This determination concludes that the proposed project at 600 20th 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 600 20th Street project, and identified the mitigation measures applicable to the 600 20th Street project. The proposed project is also consistent with the zoning controls and the provisions of the Planning Code applicable to the project site. 6,7 Therefore, no further CEQA evaluation for the 600 20th 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

As previously noted, the project site is located within the block bound by 19th, 20th, Third and Illinois streets in the Potrero Hill neighborhood of San Francisco. Illinois, 19th and 20th streets are two-lane, two-way streets with parallel parking lanes on each side; Illinois Street runs north-south wheras 19th and 20th streets run east-west. Third Street is a four-lane, two-way street with parallel parking lanes on each side; Third Street runs north-south and is bisected by the Third Street and 20th Street light rail station stop. A class II bikeway runs in both directions along Illinois Street.⁸

The project block is zoned Urban Mixed Use (UMU) and is characterized by two- to six-story buildings containing a variety of uses, including residential, retail, and production, distribution and repair (PDR). Other land uses in the project vicinity include public, residential, light industrial and heavy industrial uses, which are consistent with the zoning in the area. Esprit Park, located three blocks west of the project site, is zoned as Public (P) use. To a limited degree, Residential House (Two-Family) (RH-2) and Residential House (Three-Family) (RH-3) zoning districts also exist in the project vicinity, to the northwest and southwest of the project site. The waterfront, located one block east of the project site, is zoned Heavy Industrial (M-2) whereas the adjacent blocks to the south of the project site are zoned Production, Distribution and Repair-1-General (PDR-1-G). The Mission Bay Redevelopment Area (currently under the jurisdiction of the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure), which

⁶ San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Evaluation Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning and Policy Analysis, 600 20th Street, May 15, 2018. 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. 2016-008651ENV.

⁷ San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Evaluation Eligibility Determination, Current Planning Analysis, 600 20th Street, May 3, 2018.

⁸ A class II bikeway provides a striped lane for on-way bike travel on a street or highway.

contains the UCSF Mission Bay campus and hospital, is located approximately three blocks northeast of the project site.

Height limits in the project vicinity range from 40 feet to 85 feet. The project block and immediate blocks to the north and south of the project site are located within a 68-X height and bulk district. To the east of the project site, the waterfront is designated 40-X, except for a narrow corridor fronting Illinois Street, which is designated 65-X. To the west and south, the height and bulk districts range to include 40-X, 45-X, 58-X, 85-X and OS districts.

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 600 20th 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 600 20th 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 considerably to the significant and unavoidable cumulative land use impact related to the loss of PDR uses that was identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. This is because the proposed project would eliminate (conservatively) approximately 9,200 square feet of wholesale sales uses (a PDR use). Moreover, the proposed project would preclude an opportunity for development of PDR space on the project site because it would construct a mixed-use building with residential and retail uses. However, this loss and preclusion of PDR uses would not result in new or more severe impacts than were disclosed in the PEIR. As such, the project's contribution to this cumulative impact does not require any additional environmental review beyond that provided in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and the project-specific initial study. The proposed project would not contribute to the significant and unavoidable impacts identified in the PEIR associated with historic architectural resources, transportation and circulation, and shadow.

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. No | ise | | | | | | |
| F-1: Drivii | | Noise | (Pile | Not Applicable: pile driving not proposed | N/A | | |

| 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 a set of noise attenuation measures during construction per Project Mitigation Measure 2: Construction Noise. |
| F-3: Interior Noise Levels | Not Applicable: CEQA generally no longer requires the consideration of the effects of existing environmental conditions on a proposed project's future users or residents. | N/A |
| F-4: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses | Not Applicable: CEQA generally no longer requires the consideration of the effects 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 noisegenerating uses. | N/A |
| F-6: Open Space in Noisy Environments | Not Applicable: CEQA generally no longer requires the consideration of the effects of existing environmental conditions on a proposed project's future users or residents. | N/A |
| G. Air Quality | | |
| G-1: Construction Air Quality | Not Applicable: Construction emission (unmitigated) would be below thresholds of significance for all criteria air pollutants. | N/A |
| G-2: Air Quality for Sensitive Land Uses | The project site is not in an area of poor air quality. | N/A |
| G-3: Siting of Uses that Emit DPM | Not Applicable: the proposed residential and commercial uses are not expected to emit | N/A |

| Mitigation Measure | Applicability | Compliance |
|--|---|--|
| | substantial levels of DPM. | |
| G-4: Siting of Uses that Emit other TACs | Not Applicable: the proposed residential and commercial uses are not expected to emit substantial levels of other TACs. | N/A |
| J. Archeological Resources | | |
| J-1: Properties with Previous Studies | Not Applicable: the project site does not have any previous archaeological studies associated with it. | N/A |
| J-2: Properties with no Previous Studies | Applicable: the project site is a property with no previous archeological study. | The Planning Department archeologist conducted a preliminary archeology review of the proposed project and determined that a mitigation measure of archeological testing would be required for the proposed project; the project sponsor has agreed to implement this mitigation measure as Project Mitigation Measure 1: Archeological Testing. |
| J-3: Mission Dolores Archeological District | Not Applicable: the project site is not located within the Mission Dolores Archeological District. | N/A |
| K. Historical Resources | | |
| K-1: Interim Procedures for Permit Review in the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area | Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation completed by Planning Department | N/A |
| K-2: Amendments to Article 10 of the Planning Code Pertaining to Vertical Additions in the South End Historic District (East SoMa) | Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation completed by Planning Commission | N/A |
| K-3: Amendments to Article 10 of the Planning Code Pertaining to Alterations and Infill Development in the Dogpatch Historic District | Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation completed by Planning Commission | N/A |

| Mitigation Measure | Applicability | Compliance |
|---|---|--|
| (Central Waterfront) | | |
| L. Hazardous Materials | | |
| | Applicable: the proposed project includes demolition of a building with suspected hazardous building materials. | The project sponsor has agreed to comply with hazardous building material abatement requirements as described in Project Mitigation Measure 3: Hazardous Building Materials. |
| E. Transportation | | |
| | 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 analysis | N/A |
| 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 29, 2018 to adjacent occupants and owners of properties within 300 feet of the project site. Two comments were received in response to the notification; however, these comments did not include any concerns related to potential physical environmental impacts of the proposed project. Therefore, 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 Checklist:9

- 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.

SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

⁹ The CPE Checklist is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, in Case File No. 2016-008651ENV.



Agreement to Implement Mitigation Measure(s)

Case No.: 2016-008651ENV
Project Title: 600 20th Street
BPA Nos: To be determined

Zoning: UMU (Urban Mixed Use) District

Life Science and Medical Special Use District Central Waterfront: Third Street Industrial District 1650 Mission St.

CA 94103-2479

415.558.6378

415.558.6409

415.558.6377

Suite 400 San Francisco,

Reception:

Planning Information:

68-X Height and Bulk District

Block/Lot: 4058/002

Lot Size: 5,497 square feet

Project Sponsor: William Mollard, Workshop1, (415) 523-0304

Lead Agency: San Francisco Planning Department
Staff Contact: Jennifer McKellar, (415) 575-8754
Jennifer.McKellar@sfgov.org

MITIGATION MEASURES

• **Project Mitigation Measure 1:** Archeological Testing (Implementing Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure J-2)

• **Project Mitigation Measure 2:** Construction Noise (Implementing Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure F-2)

• **Project Mitigation Measure 3:** Hazardous Building Materials (Implementing Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure L-1)

| Х | I agree to implement the above mitigation measure(s), which are detailed in |
|---|--|
| | ATTACHMENT A: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR |
| | 600 20 [™] STREET (attached below), as a condition of project approval. |
| | |

Property Owner or Legal Agent Signature

Date

05-30-18

| | MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| Mitigation Measures Adopted as Conditions of Approval | Implementation Responsibility | Schedule | Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility | Status/Date Completed | |
| Project Mitigation Measure 1: Archeological Testing (Implementing Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure 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 | Project sponsor/construction contractor (head foreman) and archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO. | Prior to issuance of any permit for soils-disturbing activities and during construction activities. | The project sponsor shall retain a qualified archeological consultant that shall undertake an archeological testing program approved by the ERO. 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). | Considered complete upon the ERO's determination that all required activities and reports have been completed and approved. | |

the direction of the ERO, the suspension of construction can be

| _ | MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|----------|--|-----------------------|
| Mitigation Measures Adopted as Conditions of Approval | Implementation Responsibility | Schedule | Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility | Status/Date Completed |
| | | | | |

MONITORING AND DEPORTING DESCRIPTION

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).

Consultation with Descendant Communities. 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 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.

Archeological Testing Program. 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

_

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.

| | MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM | | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|----------|--|-----------------------|--|
| Mitigation Measures Adopted as Conditions of Approval | Implementation Responsibility | Schedule | Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility | Status/Date Completed | |

MONITORING AND DEPORTING DESCRIPTION

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.

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:

- 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

| | MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM | | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|----------|--|-----------------------|--|
| Mitigation Measures Adopted as Conditions of Approval | Implementation Responsibility | Schedule | Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility | Status/Date Completed | |

interpretive than research significance and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible.

Archeological Monitoring Program. 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:

- The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the AMP reasonably prior to any project-related soils disturbing activities commencing. The ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant shall determine what project activities shall be archeologically monitored. In most cases, any soils-disturbing activities, such as demolition, foundation removal, excavation, grading, utilities installation, foundation work, driving of piles (foundation, shoring, etc.), site remediation, etc., shall require archeological monitoring because of the risk these activities pose to potential archaeological resources and to their depositional context;
- The archeological consultant shall advise all project contractors to be on the alert for evidence of the presence of the expected resource(s), of how to identify the evidence of the expected resource(s), and of the appropriate protocol in the event of apparent discovery of an archeological resource;
- The archeological monitor(s) shall be present on the project site according to a schedule agreed upon by the archeological

| | MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM | | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|----------|--|-----------------------|--|
| Mitigation Measures Adopted as Conditions of Approval | Implementation Responsibility | Schedule | Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility | Status/Date Completed | |

MONITORING AND DEPORTING DESCRIPTION

- 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 soilsdisturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit shall cease. The archeological monitor shall be empowered to demolition/excavation/pile temporarily redirect 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. 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.

Whether or not significant archeological resources are encountered,

| | MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM | | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|----------|--|-----------------------|--|
| Mitigation Measures Adopted as Conditions of Approval | Implementation Responsibility | Schedule | Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility | Status/Date Completed | |

the archeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings of the monitoring program to the ERO.

Archeological Data Recovery Program. 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.

The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements:

- Field Methods and Procedures. Descriptions of proposed field strategies, procedures, and operations.
- Cataloguing and Laboratory Analysis. Description of selected cataloguing system and artifact analysis procedures.
- *Discard and Deaccession Policy*. Description of and rationale for field and post-field discard and deaccession policies.

| Mitigation Measures Adopted as Conditions of Approval | Implementation Responsibility | Schedule | Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility | Status/Date Completed |
|---|----------------------------------|----------|--|-----------------------|

MONITORING AND DEPOPTING DECIDAN

- *Interpretive Program*. Consideration of an on-site/off-site public interpretive program during the course of the archeological data recovery program.
- Security Measures. Recommended security measures to protect the archeological resource from vandalism, looting, and non-intentionally damaging activities.
- Final Report. Description of proposed report format and distribution of results.
- Curation. 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.

Human Remains, Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects. The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and Federal Laws, including immediate notification of the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the Medical Examiner'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

| | WONTOKING AND REPORTING PROGRAW | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|----------|--|-----------------------|
| Mitigation Measures Adopted as Conditions of Approval | Implementation Responsibility | Schedule | Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility | Status/Date Completed |

MONITORING AND DEPORTING DESCRIPTION

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 reburial 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).

Final Archeological Resources Report. 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

| | MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Mitigation Measures Adopted as Conditions of Approval | Implementation Responsibility | Schedule | Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility | Status/Date Completed | |
| provided in a separate removable insert within the final report. Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one (1) copy and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Environmental Planning division of the Planning Department shall receive one bound, one unbound and one unlocked, searchable PDF copy on CD of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination 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. | | | | | |
| Project Mitigation Measure 2: Construction Noise (Implementing Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure F-2) The project sponsor(s) 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: • Erect temporary plywood noise barriers around a construction | Project sponsor and construction contractor(s). | Prior to and during construction. | Project sponsor and contractor(s) shall provide the Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection with monthly reports during construction period. | Considered complete upon receipt of final monitoring report at completion of construction. | |

| | MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| Mitigation Measures Adopted as Conditions of Approval | Implementation Responsibility | Schedule | Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility | Status/Date Completed |
| 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 procedures and who to notify in the event of a problem, with telephone numbers listed. | | | | |
| Project Mitigation Measure 3: Hazardous Building Materials (Implementing Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure L-1) The project sponsor shall ensure that any existing equipment containing PCBs or DEPH, such as fluorescent light ballasts (that may be present within the existing buildings on the project site), are removed and property disposed of according to applicable federal, state, and local laws prior to the start of renovation, and that any fluorescent light tubes, which could contain mercury, are similarly removed and properly disposed of. Any other hazardous materials identified, either before or during work, shall be abated according to applicable federal, state, and local laws. | Project sponsor and construction contractor(s). | Prior to and during construction activities. | Project sponsor and construction contractor(s). | Considered complete when demolition activities and all required abatement activities have been completed. |