



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Certificate of Determination EXEMPTION FROM ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Case No.: 2014.1020ENV
 Project Address: 1515 South Van Ness Avenue
 Zoning: Mission Street NCT (Neighborhood Commercial Transit) Use District
 55-X and 65-X Height and Bulk District
 Block/Lot: 6571/008, 001, 001A
 Lot Size: 35,714 square feet
 Plan Area: Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan
 Project Sponsor: Peter Schellinger – (415) 975-4982
 peter.schellinger@lennar.com
 Staff Contact: Melinda Hue – (415) 575-9041
 Melinda.Hue@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

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project site is located on the northern portion of a block bordered by South Van Ness Avenue, 26th Street, Shotwell Street, and Cesar Chavez Street in San Francisco's Mission neighborhood. The project site currently includes a two-story, 34-foot-tall, 31,680-square-foot, production, distribution, repair (PDR) building (constructed in 1948) with a surface parking lot. The building was vacated in December 2015 by McMillan Electric, an electrical contractor business that has since moved to a new location at 1950 Cesar Chavez Street in San Francisco. The proposed project would include the demolition of the existing building and the construction of a five- to six-story, 55- to 65-foot-tall (up to 75 feet tall with roof-top equipment), approximately 180,300-square-foot mixed-use building. The proposed building would consist of 157 residential dwelling units and approximately 1,080 square feet of retail uses. The proposed


(Continued on next page.)

EXEMPT STATUS

Exempt per Section 15183 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines and California Public Resources Code Section 21083.3

DETERMINATION

I do hereby certify that the above determination has been made pursuant to State and Local requirements.


 SARAH B. JONES
 Environmental Review Officer

July 12, 2016
 Date

cc: Peter Schellinger, Project Sponsor; Supervisor David Campos, District 9; Doug Vu, Current Planning Division; Eiliesh Tuffy, Preservation Planner; Virna Byrd, M.D.F.; Exemption/Exclusion File

PROJECT DESCRIPTION (continued)

project would also include six ground floor trade shop spaces ranging from 630 to 760 square feet each (approximately 4,200 square feet total). The spaces are anticipated to be retail units with some reserved space for goods production (e.g., jewelry making, bag making, ceramics). Usable open space would be provided in a courtyard, roof terrace and private patios. The proposed project would include a basement parking garage that would be accessed via an existing curb cut on Shotwell Street. The garage would include 79 parking spaces, two carshare spaces, and 150 Class I bicycle spaces. The proposed project would include eight Class II bicycle spaces provided on the sidewalks in front of the building entrances on South Van Ness Avenue and on 26th Street. Proposed streetscape improvements would include planting of 23 street trees, installation of corner bulb-outs on the southeast corner of South Van Ness Avenue and 26th Street and on the southwest corner of Shotwell Street and 26th Street, and the removal of a curb cut on South Van Ness Avenue. A new 40-foot-long on-street loading space is also proposed on 26th Street to accommodate larger delivery vehicles. Two service vehicle parking spaces would be located in the garage to accommodate smaller delivery vehicles.

Construction of the proposed project is expected to last 23 months. Construction of the proposed project would require excavation of up to approximately six feet and the removal of about 4,800 cubic yards of soil.

PROJECT APPROVAL

The proposed 1515 South Van Ness Avenue project would require the following approvals:

Actions by the Planning Commission

- Conditional Use Authorization for development on a lot larger than 10,000 square feet

Actions by other City Departments

- Approval of building permits from the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection (DBI) for demolition and new construction
- Approval of proposed streetscape improvements from San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA)
- Approval of street and sidewalk permits from San Francisco Public Works for any modifications to public streets, sidewalks, protected trees, street trees, or curb cuts

The approval of the Conditional Use Authorization is the Approval Action for the 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 1515 South Van Ness Avenue project described above, and incorporates by reference information contained in the Programmatic EIR for the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans (PEIR)¹. Project-specific studies were prepared for the proposed project to determine if the project would result in any significant environmental impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

After several years of analysis, community outreach, and public review, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was adopted in December 2008. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was adopted in part to support housing development in some areas previously zoned to allow industrial uses, while preserving an adequate supply of space for existing and future production, distribution, and repair (PDR) employment and businesses. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR also included changes to existing height and bulk districts in some areas, including the project site at 1515 South Van Ness Avenue.

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

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

² San Francisco Planning Department. Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Final Environmental Impact Report (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.

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. The proposed project and its relation to PDR land supply and cumulative land use effects is discussed further in the Community Plan Exemption (CPE) Checklist, under Land Use. The 1515 South Van Ness Avenue site, which is located in the Mission District of the Eastern Neighborhoods, was designated as a site with a building height up to 55 to 65 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 1515 South Van Ness Avenue 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 1515 South Van Ness Avenue project, and identified the mitigation measures applicable to the 1515 South Van Ness Avenue 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 1515 South Van Ness Avenue 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 site is located on the northern portion of a block bordered by South Van Ness Avenue, 26th Street, Shotwell Street, and Cesar Chavez Street in San Francisco's Mission neighborhood. The project site has frontage on 26th Street, South Van Ness Avenue, and Shotwell Street. The uses immediately south of the project site include auto repair and supply shops located within single-story buildings. A project is currently proposed at 1296 Shotwell Street, directly southeast of the project site, involving the demolition of the existing building and construction of a nine-story building with 96 senior affordable housing residential units. Uses further south, across Cesar Chavez Street, include two- to four-story residential uses. The areas to the west of the project site, across South Van Ness Avenue, include auto-related uses (gas station, auto repair), ground-floor retail and residential uses. Buildings range from one to three stories. A project is currently proposed at 3314 Cesar Chavez Street, west of the project site, involving the

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.

⁵ Adam Varat, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning and Policy Analysis, 1515 South Van Ness Avenue, April 5, 2016. 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. 2014.1020ENV.

⁶ Jeff Joslin, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Current Planning Analysis, 1515 South Van Ness Avenue, April 6, 2016.

demolition of the existing building and the construction of a six-story building with 52 residential units and 1,740 square feet of commercial space. The areas north of the project site, across 26th Street, include auto repair and residential uses. Buildings range from one to three stories as well. The areas east of the project site, across Shotwell Street, include a four-story residential development. The project site is located within a half-mile of the 24th Street BART Station and Muni bus lines 14-Mission, 49-Van Ness/Mission, 12-Folsom/Pacific, and 27-Bryant.

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 1515 South Van Ness Avenue 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 1515 South Van Ness Avenue 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 conversion of the existing PDR use to a mixed-use residential use would not contribute to the significant and unavoidable cumulative land use impact identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. The project site was zoned NC-3 (Moderate-Scale Neighborhood Commercial District) prior to the rezoning of Eastern Neighborhoods, which did not encourage PDR uses and the rezoning of the project site to Mission Street NCT (Neighborhood Commercial Transit) was not included as part of the long-term PDR land supply loss that was considered a significant cumulative impact in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. The proposed project would not involve the demolition of a historic resource and is not located within a historic district. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to the significant historic resource impact identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. Transit ridership generated by the project would not considerably contribute to the transit impacts identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. Based on the shadow fan analysis, the proposed project is not expected to shade any Planning Code Section 295 or non-Section 295 open spaces. The proposed project would shade nearby private property at levels commonly expected in urban areas.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified feasible mitigation measures to address significant impacts related to noise, air quality, archeological resources, historical resources, hazardous materials, and transportation. **Table 1** below lists the mitigation measures identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and states whether each measure would apply to the proposed project.

Table 1 – Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
F. Noise		
F-1: Construction Noise (Pile Driving)	Applicable: though currently not proposed, piles could be	The project sponsor has agreed to, if piles for foundation

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
	needed in lieu of ground improvements for building foundation purposes	purposes are needed, implement noise and vibration attenuation measures during construction.
F-2: Construction Noise	Applicable: temporary construction noise from use of heavy equipment	The project sponsor has agreed to develop and implement a set of noise attenuation measures during construction.
F-3: Interior Noise Levels	Not Applicable: 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	Applicable: though noise-generating uses are not anticipated, exact uses for trade shop spaces are not yet known	The project sponsor has agreed to conduct and submit a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements if trade shops accommodate future noise-generating uses.
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: superseded by the Dust Control Ordinance and project site not located within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone	N/A

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
G-2: Air Quality for Sensitive Land Uses	Not Applicable: project site not located within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone and 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-3: Siting of Uses that Emit DPM	Not Applicable: proposed project would include uses (residential, ground floor commercial) that would not emit substantial levels of DPM	N/A
G-4: Siting of Uses that Emit other TACs	Not Applicable: proposed project would include uses (residential, ground floor commercial) that would not emit substantial levels of other TACs	N/A
J. Archeological Resources		
J-1: Properties with Previous Studies	Not Applicable: project site not located on site with previous studies	N/A
J-2: Properties with no Previous Studies	Applicable: project located on site with no previous studies	The project sponsor has agreed to implement the Planning Department's Standard Mitigation Measure #3 (Testing).
J-3: Mission Dolores Archeological District	Not Applicable: 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

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
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: proposed project would involve 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 buildings.
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 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	N/A

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
	mitigation by SFMTA	
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 October 8, 2015 to adjacent occupants, and owners of properties within 300 feet of the project site. Overall, concerns and issues raised by the public in response to the notice were taken into consideration and incorporated in the environmental review as appropriate for CEQA analysis. Concerns related to physical environmental effects include land use impacts resulting from the loss of PDR; air quality impacts; wind and shadow impacts; traffic and parking impacts; hazardous materials impacts; and cultural resources impacts. These concerns are addressed in the land use; air quality; wind and shadow; transportation; hazards and hazardous materials; and cultural and paleontological resources sections of the CPE Checklist. In regards to potential parking impacts, pursuant to Public Resources Code 21099(d), parking impacts are not to be considered significant CEQA impacts for mixed-use residential development projects on in-fill sites in a transit priority area. The proposed project meets the criteria, as discussed under the Senate Bill 743 section of the CPE Checklist.

Comments related to topics outside the scope of CEQA were also received. These comments concerned socioeconomic issues such as displacement of existing low-income resident and jobs, displacement of organizations that contribute to the Calle 24 Latino Cultural District, and rise in housing costs due to increased development of market-rate housing. The proposed project is subject to the Mission 2016 Interim Zoning Controls, effective January 2016, which require additional information and analysis regarding the economic and social effects of the proposed project such as housing affordability, displacement, and loss of PDR. The project sponsor has prepared such additional analysis and has submitted this analysis to the Planning Department.⁷ The Planning Commission will review and consider this analysis before making a decision and taking an approval action on the proposed project.

Environmental analysis under CEQA is required to focus on the direct and indirect physical changes to the environment that could reasonably result from a proposed project. Economic or social effects of a project are not considered significant environmental impacts, unless they lead to physical changes in the environment (CEQA Guidelines 15131). Accordingly, the displacement issue addressed under CEQA refers specifically to the direct loss of housing units that would result from proposed demolition of existing housing and the foreseeable construction of replacement housing elsewhere. This is because demolition of existing housing has the potential to result in displacement of substantial numbers of people and would necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. This would in turn

⁷ Mission 2015 Interim Controls Additional Findings for 1515 South Van Ness Ave. Case No. 2014.1020CUA, submitted to Doug Vu, San Francisco Planning Department.

result in a number of direct and indirect physical changes to the environment associated with demolition and construction activities and new operational impacts.

As discussed under the population and housing section of the CPE Checklist, the project site does not contain any existing residential units and the proposed project would not result in any direct displacement of low-income residents. The existing building was vacated in December 2015 by McMillan Electric, an electrical contractor business that has since moved to a new location at 1950 Cesar Chavez Street in San Francisco. The proposed project would include approximately 1,080 square feet of retail uses and six trade shop spaces ranging from 630 to 760 square feet each (approximately 4,200 square feet total). These spaces are anticipated to be retail units with some reserved space for goods production (e.g. jewelry making, bag making, ceramics). Therefore, the proposed project would result in a small increase in jobs within the city. Additionally, as discussed under the cultural and paleontological resources section of the CPE Checklist, the existing building is not a historic resource and the project site is not located within a historic district. Finally, the possibility that the proposed project would contribute to rising housing costs is speculative with regard to potential physical changes that would result, and therefore is not a physical environmental effect subject to analysis under CEQA. Additional comments received were related to the building design, the quality of ground floor spaces, the project outreach process, and requests to be on the distribution list for future documents. Comments on the merits of the project that are not related to environmental analyses topics will be provided to decision-makers for consideration in their review of approval actions for the proposed project.

The proposed project would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts associated with the issues identified by the public beyond those identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

CONCLUSION

As summarized above and further discussed in the CPE Checklist⁸:

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.

⁸ The CPE Checklist is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, in Case File No. 2014.1020ENV.

Therefore, the proposed project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW FORM

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Preservation Team Meeting Date:		Date of Form Completion	9/14/2015
--	--	--------------------------------	-----------

PROJECT INFORMATION:		
Planner:	Address:	
E. Tuffy	1515 South Van Ness Avenue	
Block/Lot:	Cross Streets:	
6571/008	Between 26th Street and Cesar Chavez Street	
CEQA Category:	Art. 10/11:	BPA/Case No.:
B		2014.1020ENV

PURPOSE OF REVIEW:		PROJECT DESCRIPTION:		
<input checked="" type="radio"/> CEQA	<input type="radio"/> Article 10/11	<input type="radio"/> Preliminary/PIC	<input type="radio"/> Alteration	<input type="radio"/> Demo/New Construction

DATE OF PLANS UNDER REVIEW:	Sept. 29, 2014 (massing only)
------------------------------------	-------------------------------


PROJECT ISSUES:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the subject Property an eligible historic resource?
<input type="checkbox"/>	If so, are the proposed changes a significant impact?
Additional Notes:	
<p>Proposal is for the demolition of a 1948 auto showroom & repair shop to construct a new mixed-use building with 160 units of rental housing in the Mission Street NCT district.</p> <p>Recorded in 2008 during the South Mission Survey, the property was noted to require further research in order to make a determination. An Historic Resource Evaluation report completed by architecture + history, llc was submitted to fulfil that requirement.</p>	

PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW:			
Historic Resource Present		<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No *
		<input type="radio"/> N/A	
Individual		Historic District/Context	
Property is individually eligible for inclusion in a California Register under one or more of the following Criteria:		Property is in an eligible California Register Historic District/Context under one or more of the following Criteria:	
Criterion 1 - Event:	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	Criterion 1 - Event:	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Criterion 2 -Persons:	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	Criterion 2 -Persons:	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Criterion 3 - Architecture:	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	Criterion 3 - Architecture:	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Criterion 4 - Info. Potential:	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	Criterion 4 - Info. Potential:	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Period of Significance:	n/a	Period of Significance:	n/a
		<input type="radio"/> Contributor <input type="radio"/> Non-Contributor	

Complies with the Secretary's Standards/Art 10/Art 11:	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	<input checked="" type="radio"/> N/A
CEQA Material Impairment:	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No	
Needs More Information:	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No	
Requires Design Revisions:	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	
Defer to Residential Design Team:	Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No	

* If No is selected for Historic Resource per CEQA, a signature from Senior Preservation Planner or Preservation Coordinator is required.

PRESERVATION TEAM COMMENTS:	
<p>The subject property, which is a 1948 auto showroom and repair shop, was reviewed as part of this project proposal based on a preservation consultant's Historic Resource Evaluation (dated Sept. 8, 2015). The existing building is located at the southeast corner of 26th Street and South Van Ness and occupies almost 1/3 of a city block. Directly across 26th Street to the north is Landmark #206, the Howard / 26th Street Cottages, which is a grouping of 2-1/2 story row houses with mid-block open space.</p> <p>While the subject block was historically part of the larger Cogswell Polytechnical College campus grounds, the school's industrial skills' classrooms and workshop buildings were demolished around the time of the existing building's construction in the late-1940s. A local businessman, J.W. Allen, hired the engineering firm of Ellison & King to draw up plans for an auto sales and service building, which was expanded 2 years after its initial construction. The property housed auto-related uses for 40 years until it was occupied by McMillan Electric beginning in the 1980s.</p> <p>Planning Department records, prior studies on the history of the city's automotive industry, and the consultant report did not produce any information to suggest that the property is eligible for listing due to connections with important events in history (Criterion 1). When asked to expand upon auto-related buildings in San Francisco after World War II, the report states that a small cluster of such buildings seems to have been focused west of the subject property, between Mission and Valencia streets.</p> <p>J.W. Allen had only a brief, 2-year connection to the subject property. William Ellison, a partner in the named engineering firm, was known in his field but does not appear to be connected to this commission as an exemplary work of his or of the firm. And although the materials and overall architecture of the auto showroom is indicative of its time, it does not rise to a level to be considered a fine example of Mid-20th Century Modernism. For these reasons the property is not eligible for either significant persons (Criterion 2) or architecture (Criterion 3). Integrity of the original exterior design remains high, with changes limited to interior alterations.</p> <p>Based on further research, the subject property does not appear eligible as either an individual resource, or as part of an historic district.</p>	

Signature of a Senior Preservation Planner / Preservation Coordinator:	Date:
	9/28/2015

1515 South Van Ness
(1948, Ellison & King, structural engineers)



(Top photo) View of the subject property, at the southeast corner of 26th St. and South Van Ness
(Bottom photo) Rear of the subject property, from the down-sloping east end of the lot

**ATTACHMENT A:
MITIGATION MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

<i>MITIGATION MEASURES</i>	<i>Responsibility for Implementation</i>	<i>Mitigation Schedule</i>	<i>Mitigation Action</i>	<i>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</i>	<i>Monitoring Schedule</i>
----------------------------	--	----------------------------	--------------------------	--	----------------------------

MITIGATION MEASURES AGREED TO BY PROJECT SPONSOR

Cultural Resources

<p>Project Mitigation Measure 1: Archeological Testing (Mitigation Measure J-2 in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR).</p> <p>Based on a reasonable presumption that archeological resources may be present within the project site, the following measures shall be undertaken to avoid any potentially significant adverse effect from the proposed project on buried or submerged historical resources. The project sponsor shall retain the services of an archaeological consultant from the rotational Department Qualified Archaeological Consultants List (QACL) maintained by the Planning Department archaeologist. The project sponsor shall contact the Department archeologist to obtain the names and contact information for the next three archeological consultants on the QACL. The archeological consultant shall undertake an archeological testing program as specified herein. In addition, the consultant shall be available to conduct an archeological monitoring and/or data recovery program if required pursuant to this 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>Project sponsor/ archeological consultant at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer (ERO).</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of grading or building permits</p>	<p>Project sponsor to retain a qualified archeological consultant who shall report to the ERO.</p>	<p>Project sponsor/ archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO.</p>	<p>Archeological consultant shall be retained prior to any soil disturbing activities.</p> <p>Date Archeological consultant retained:</p> <p>_____</p>
--	--	---	--	---	--

**ATTACHMENT A:
 MITIGATION MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

<i>MITIGATION MEASURES</i>	<i>Responsibility for Implementation</i>	<i>Mitigation Schedule</i>	<i>Mitigation Action</i>	<i>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</i>	<i>Monitoring Schedule</i>
<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 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>Project sponsor / archeological consultant in consultation with the ERO.</p>	<p>In the event archeological sites associated with descendent communities are found.</p>	<p>Project sponsor/ archeological consultant to contact and consult with ERO and representative of descendant group. Project sponsor/ archeological consultant to distribute Final Archaeological Resources Report to representative of the descendant group.</p>	<p>Project sponsor / archeological consultant in consultation with the ERO.</p>	<p>Archeological site associated with descendent communities found? Y N Date: _____ Persons contacted: Date: _____ Persons contacted: Date: _____ Persons contacted: Date: _____ Date of distribution of Final FARR: _____</p>

¹ 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.

**ATTACHMENT A:
MITIGATION MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

MITIGATION MEASURES	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<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>	Project sponsor/ archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO.	Prior to any soil-disturbing activities on the project site.	Archeologist shall prepare and submit draft ATP to the ERO. ATP to be submitted and reviewed by the ERO prior to any soils disturbing activities on the project site.	Project sponsor/ archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO.	<p>Date ATP submitted to the ERO: _____</p> <p>Date ATP approved by the ERO: _____</p> <p>Date of initial soil disturbing activities: _____</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> <p>A) The proposed project shall be re-designed so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archeological resource; or</p> <p>B) A data recovery program shall be implemented, unless the ERO determines that the archeological resource is of greater interpretive than research significance and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible.</p>	Project sponsor/ archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO.	After completion of the Archeological Testing Program.	Archeological consultant shall submit report of the findings of the ATP to the ERO.	Project sponsor/ archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO.	<p>Date archeological findings report submitted to the ERO: _____</p> <p>ERO determination of significant archeological resource present? Y N</p> <p>Would resource be adversely affected? Y N</p> <p>Additional mitigation to be undertaken by project sponsor? Y N</p>

**ATTACHMENT A:
 MITIGATION MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

<i>MITIGATION MEASURES</i>	<i>Responsibility for Implementation</i>	<i>Mitigation Schedule</i>	<i>Mitigation Action</i>	<i>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</i>	<i>Monitoring Schedule</i>
<p><i>Archeological Monitoring Program.</i> If the ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant determines that an archeological monitoring program shall be implemented the archeological monitoring program shall minimally include the following provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the AMP reasonably prior to any project-related soils disturbing activities commencing. The ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant shall determine what project activities shall be archeologically monitored. In most cases, any soils- disturbing activities, such as demolition, foundation removal, excavation, grading, utilities installation, foundation work, driving of piles (foundation, shoring, etc.), site remediation, etc., shall require archeological monitoring because of the risk these activities pose to potential archaeological resources and to their depositional context; ■ The archeological consultant shall advise all project contractors to be on the alert for evidence of the presence of the expected resource(s), of how to identify the evidence of the expected resource(s), and of the appropriate protocol in the event of apparent discovery of an archeological resource; ■ The archeological monitor(s) shall be present on the project site according to a schedule agreed upon by the archeological consultant and the ERO until the ERO has, in consultation with project archeological consultant, determined that project construction activities could have no effects on significant archeological deposits; ■ 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 activity (foundation, shoring, etc.), the archeological monitor has cause to believe that the pile driving activity may affect an archeological resource, the pile driving activity shall be terminated until an appropriate 	<p>Project sponsor/ archeological consultant/ archeological monitor/ contractor(s), at the direction of the ERO.</p> <p>Archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO.</p>	<p>ERO & archeological consultant shall meet prior to commencement of soil-disturbing activity. If the ERO determines that an Archeological Monitoring Program is necessary, monitor throughout sensitive soil-disturbing activities.</p>	<p>Project sponsor/ archeological consultant/ archeological monitor/ contractor(s) shall implement the AMP, if required by the ERO.</p> <p>Identify and evaluate archeological resources.</p>	<p>Project sponsor/ archeological consultant/ archeological monitor/ contractor(s), at the direction of the ERO.</p>	<p>AMP required? Y N Date: _____</p> <p>Date AMP submitted to the ERO: _____</p> <p>Date AMP approved by the ERO: _____</p> <p>Date AMP implementation complete: _____</p> <p>Date written report regarding findings of the AMP received: _____</p>

**ATTACHMENT A:
 MITIGATION MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

<i>MITIGATION MEASURES</i>	<i>Responsibility for Implementation</i>	<i>Mitigation Schedule</i>	<i>Mitigation Action</i>	<i>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</i>	<i>Monitoring Schedule</i>
<p>evaluation of the resource has been made in consultation with the ERO. The archeological consultant shall immediately notify the ERO of the encountered archeological deposit. The archeological consultant shall make a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archeological deposit, and present the findings of this assessment to the ERO.</p> <p>Whether or not significant archeological resources are encountered, the archeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings of the monitoring program to the ERO.</p>					

ATTACHMENT A:
MITIGATION MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

<i>MITIGATION MEASURES</i>	<i>Responsibility for Implementation</i>	<i>Mitigation Schedule</i>	<i>Mitigation Action</i>	<i>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</i>	<i>Monitoring Schedule</i>
<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. 	Project Sponsor/archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO	If there is a determination that an ADRP program is required.	Project sponsor/ archeological consultant/ archeological monitor/ contractor(s) shall prepare and implement an ADRP if required by the ERO.	Project sponsor/ archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO.	<p>ADRP required? Y N Date: _____</p> <p>Date of scoping meeting for ADRP: _____</p> <p>Date Draft ADRP submitted to the ERO: _____</p> <p>Date ADRP approved by the ERO: _____</p> <p>Date ADRP implementation complete: _____</p>

ATTACHMENT A:
MITIGATION MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

<i>MITIGATION MEASURES</i>	<i>Responsibility for Implementation</i>	<i>Mitigation Schedule</i>	<i>Mitigation Action</i>	<i>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</i>	<i>Monitoring Schedule</i>
<p><i>Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects.</i> The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and Federal laws. This shall include immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the Coroner's determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (Pub. Res. Code Sec. 5097.98). The archeological consultant, project sponsor, ERO, and MLD shall have up to but not beyond six days of discovery 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, custodianship, curation, 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.</p>	<p>Project sponsor / archeological consultant in consultation with the ERO, San Francisco Coroner, NAHC, and MDL.</p>	<p>In the event human remains and/or funerary objects are found.</p>	<p>Project sponsor/ archeological consultant/ERO to contact the San Francisco Coroner/ NAHC/ MDL</p>	<p>Project sponsor / archeological consultant in consultation with the ERO, San Francisco Coroner, NAHC, and MDL.</p>	<p>Human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects found? Y N Date:_____</p> <p>Persons contacted: Date:_____</p> <p>Persons contacted: Date:_____</p> <p>Persons contacted: Date:_____</p> <p>Persons contacted: Date:_____</p>

**ATTACHMENT A:
 MITIGATION MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

<i>MITIGATION MEASURES</i>	<i>Responsibility for Implementation</i>	<i>Mitigation Schedule</i>	<i>Mitigation Action</i>	<i>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</i>	<i>Monitoring Schedule</i>
<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 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>	Project sponsor/ archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO.	After completion of the archeological data recovery, inventorying, analysis and interpretation.	Archeological consultant to submit a Draft Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO and once approved by the ERO, distribution of the Final FARR	Project sponsor/ archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO	<p>Following completion of soil disturbing activities. Considered complete upon distribution of final FARR.</p> <p>Date Draft FARR submitted to ERO: _____</p> <p>Date FARR approved by ERO: _____</p> <p>Date of distribution of Final FARR: _____</p> <p>Date of submittal of Final FARR to information center: _____</p>
Noise					
<p>Project Mitigation Measure 2: Construction Noise (Pile-Driving). (Mitigation Measure F-1 in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR).</p> <p>For subsequent development projects within proximity to noise-sensitive uses that would include pile-driving, individual project sponsors shall ensure that piles be pre-drilled wherever feasible to reduce construction-related noise and vibration. No impact pile drivers shall be used unless absolutely necessary. Contractors would 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 sheetpile drivers, rather than impact drivers, shall be used wherever sheetpiles are needed. Individual project sponsors shall also require that contractors schedule pile-driving activity for times of the day that would minimize disturbance to neighbors.</p>	Project Sponsor/Project Contractor	During construction	Project Sponsor to provide Planning Department with monthly reports during construction period.	Project Sponsor/contractor(s)	Considered complete upon receipt of final monitoring report at completion of construction.

**ATTACHMENT A:
 MITIGATION MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

<i>MITIGATION MEASURES</i>	<i>Responsibility for Implementation</i>	<i>Mitigation Schedule</i>	<i>Mitigation Action</i>	<i>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</i>	<i>Monitoring Schedule</i>
<p>Project Mitigation Measure 3: Construction Noise (Mitigation Measure F-2 in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR).</p> <p>Where environmental review of a development project undertaken subsequent to the adoption of the proposed zoning controls determines that construction noise controls are necessary due to the nature of planned construction practices and the sensitivity of proximate uses, the Planning Director shall require that the sponsors of the subsequent development project develop a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant. Prior to commencing construction, a plan for such measures shall be submitted to the Department of Building Inspection to ensure that maximum feasible noise attenuation will be achieved. These attenuation measures shall include as many of the following control strategies as feasible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Erect temporary plywood noise barriers around a construction site, particularly where a site adjoins noise-sensitive uses; ■ Utilize noise control blankets on a building structure as the building is erected to reduce noise emission from the site; ■ Evaluate the feasibility of noise control at the receivers by temporarily improving the noise reduction capability of adjacent buildings housing sensitive uses; ■ Monitor the effectiveness of noise attenuation measures by taking noise measurements; and ■ Post signs on-site pertaining to permitted construction days and hours and complaint procedures and who to notify in the event of a problem, with telephone numbers listed. 	Project Sponsor/Project Contractor	During construction	Project Sponsor to provide Planning Department with monthly reports during construction period.	Project Sponsor/contractor(s)	Considered complete upon receipt of final monitoring report at completion of construction.
<p>Project Mitigation Measure 4: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses (Mitigation Measure F-5 in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR).</p> <p>To reduce potential conflicts between existing sensitive receptors and new noise-generating uses, for new development including commercial, industrial or other uses that would be expected to generate noise levels in excess of ambient noise, either short-term, at nighttime, or as a 24-hour average, in the proposed project site vicinity, the Planning Department shall</p>	Project Sponsor/Project Architect	Prior to issuance of a final building permit and certificate of occupancy	Design measures to be incorporated into project design and evaluated in environmental/building permit review	San Francisco Planning Department and the Department of Building Inspection	Considered complete upon approval of final construction drawing set.

**ATTACHMENT A:
MITIGATION MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

<i>MITIGATION MEASURES</i>	<i>Responsibility for Implementation</i>	<i>Mitigation Schedule</i>	<i>Mitigation Action</i>	<i>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</i>	<i>Monitoring Schedule</i>
<p>require the preparation of an analysis that includes, at a minimum, a site survey to identify potential noise-sensitive uses within 900 feet of, and that have a direct line-of-sight to, the project site, and including at least one 24-hour noise measurement (with maximum noise level readings taken at least every 15 minutes), prior to the first project approval action. The analysis shall be prepared by persons qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering and shall demonstrate with reasonable certainty that the proposed use would comply with the use compatibility requirements in the General Plan and in Police Code Section 2909I, would not adversely affect nearby noise-sensitive uses, and that there are no particular circumstances about the proposed project site that appear to warrant heightened concern about noise levels that would be generated by the proposed use. Should such concerns be present, the Department may require the completion of a detailed noise assessment by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering prior to the first project approval action.</p>					
HAZARDOUS MATERIALS					
<p>Project Mitigation Measure 5: Hazardous Building Materials (Mitigation Measure L-1 in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR).</p> <p>The City shall condition future development approvals to require that the subsequent project sponsors 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 according to applicable federal, state, and local laws</p>	Project Sponsor/Project Contractor	Prior to approval of project	Comply with applicable laws during removal and disposal of any equipment containing PCBs or DEPH and document this process	Planning Department, in consultation with DPH; where Site Mitigation Plan is required, Project Sponsor or contractor shall submit a monitoring report to DPH, with a copy to Planning Department and DBI, at end of construction.	Considered complete upon approval of each subsequent project.

**ATTACHMENT B:
IMPROVEMENT MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

<i>IMPROVEMENT MEASURES</i>	<i>Responsibility for Implementation</i>	<i>Mitigation Schedule</i>	<i>Mitigation Action</i>	<i>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</i>	<i>Monitoring Schedule</i>
-----------------------------	--	----------------------------	--------------------------	--	----------------------------

IMPROVEMENT MEASURES AGREED TO BY PROJECT SPONSOR

Transportation

<p>Improvement Measure 1: Transportation Demand Management Measures</p> <p>The project sponsor and subsequent property manager should implement a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program that seeks to minimize the number of single occupancy vehicle trips (SOV) generated by the proposed project for the lifetime of the proposed project. The TDM Program targets a reduction in SOV trips by encouraging persons to select other modes of transportation, including walking, bicycling, transit, carshare, carpooling, and/or other modes.</p> <p>The project sponsor has agreed to implement the following TDM measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ TDM Coordinator: The project sponsor will identify a TDM coordinator for the Project site who will be responsible for the implementation and ongoing operation of all other TDM measures included in proposed project. ■ Move-in packet: The project sponsor will provide a transportation insert for the move-in packet that includes information on transit service, where transit passes could be purchased, the 511 Regional Rideshare Program, and nearby bike and car share programs. ■ New-hire packet: The project sponsor will provide a transportation insert for the new-hire packet that includes information on transit service, where transit passes could be purchased, the 511 Regional Rideshare Program, and nearby bike and car share programs. ■ Posted and real-time information: The project sponsor will provide a local map clearly identifying transit, bicycle, and key pedestrian routes as well as real-time transit information on-site in a prominent and visible location. ■ City Access: The project sponsor will provide City staff access to the project site to perform trip counts, intercept surveys, and/or other types of data collection. The project sponsor will periodically administer a City- 	<p>Project sponsor, building management, Planning Department staff</p>	<p>Prior to and during occupancy</p>	<p>Implement TDM measures</p>	<p>Project sponsor</p>	<p>Ongoing during occupancy</p>
---	--	--------------------------------------	-------------------------------	------------------------	---------------------------------

**ATTACHMENT B:
IMPROVEMENT MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

<i>IMPROVEMENT MEASURES</i>	<i>Responsibility for Implementation</i>	<i>Mitigation Schedule</i>	<i>Mitigation Action</i>	<i>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</i>	<i>Monitoring Schedule</i>
<p>approved survey to residential and commercial tenants.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Bicycle Parking: The project sponsor will increase the number of on-site secured bicycle parking beyond the Planning Code requirements and/or provide additional bicycle facilities in the public right-of-way adjacent to the site. The project sponsor will provide signage indicating the location of bicycle parking at points of access to the proposed project. ■ Bay Area Bike Share: The project sponsor will cooperate with City agencies and the Bay Area Bike Share to allow installation of a bike share station in the public right-of-way along the project's frontage. ■ Bicycle Share Funding: The project sponsor will contact City agencies and the Bay Area Bike Share to fund the installation of up to 20 new bicycle racks and/or one or more bike share stations near the site within one year after Final Certification of Completion for the Project. ■ Bicycle Share Membership: The project sponsor will offer a 100 percent subsidy for one annual bike share membership for new employees or residents. ■ Carshare Parking: The project sponsor will provide carshare spaces as described in the Planning Code. ■ Carshare Membership: The project sponsor will offer one annual carshare membership for each new resident (one per household) or employee. 					
<p>Improvement Measure 2: Queue Abatement</p> <p>The owner/operator of the off-street parking facility should ensure that recurring vehicle queues do not occur on the public right-of-way. A vehicle queue is defined as one or more vehicles (destined for the parking facility) blocking any portion of any public street, alley or sidewalk for a consecutive period of three minutes or longer on a daily or weekly basis.</p> <p>If a recurring queue occurs, the owner/operator of the parking facility should employ abatement methods as needed to abate the queue. Suggested abatement methods include but are not limited to the following: redesign of facility to improve vehicle circulation and/or on-site queue capacity; employment of parking attendants; use of valet parking or other space-</p>	Property owner or building manager	Upon operation of the proposed project	Ensure a vehicle queue does not block any portion of public street, alley, or sidewalk for a consecutive period of three minutes or longer on a daily or weekly basis Hire transportation consultant to evaluate conditions	Owner/operator; Planning Department	Ongoing during operation

**ATTACHMENT B:
IMPROVEMENT MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

<i>IMPROVEMENT MEASURES</i>	<i>Responsibility for Implementation</i>	<i>Mitigation Schedule</i>	<i>Mitigation Action</i>	<i>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</i>	<i>Monitoring Schedule</i>
<p>efficient parking techniques; use of off-site parking facilities or shared parking with nearby uses; use of parking occupancy sensors and signage directing drivers to available spaces; or travel demand management strategies such as additional bicycle parking.</p> <p>If the Planning Director, or his or her designee, suspects that a recurring queue is present, the Planning Department should notify the property owner in writing. Upon request, the owner/operator should hire a qualified transportation consultant to evaluate the conditions at the site for no less than seven days. The consultant should prepare a monitoring report to be submitted to the Planning Department for review. If the Planning Department determines that a recurring queue does exist, the facility owner/operator should have 90 days from the date of the written determination to abate the queue.</p>			Employ abatement methods.		
<p>Improvement Measure 3: No Parking Adjacent to Project Driveway to Increase Visibility</p> <p>The project sponsor should coordinate with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency and Public Works to establish a restricted parking and landscaping area on both sides of the proposed project driveway entrance to increase visibility. Additionally, an advance warning sign and pavement marking should be installed on Shotwell Street north of the proposed project driveway to caution southbound drivers and bicyclists that a driveway is present.</p>	Project Sponsor	During project construction	Restrict parking and landscaping areas on both sides of the project driveway entrance; install advance warning sign and pavement marking on Shotwell north of project driveway	Planning Department/DBI/DPW	Upon completion of project construction
<p>Improvement Measure 4: Traffic Calming Devices and Notification at Driveway</p> <p>The project sponsor should implement appropriate traffic calming devices in the garage exit aisle to slow exiting traffic, such as speed bumps, rumble strips, and/or "slow speed" signage. The project sponsor should also provide visible/audible warning notification at the driveway entrance to alert pedestrians to the possibility of conflicting vehicles entering and exiting the driveway. Conditions at the driveway should be monitored to determine whether an additional audible warning signal is necessary to enhance the traffic calming controls and visible warning signal.</p>	Project Sponsor	During project construction	Implement traffic calming devices at garage exit; Monitor driveway conditions to see if additional calming devices are warranted.	Planning Department	During project construction and ongoing during project operations

**ATTACHMENT B:
IMPROVEMENT MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

<i>IMPROVEMENT MEASURES</i>	<i>Responsibility for Implementation</i>	<i>Mitigation Schedule</i>	<i>Mitigation Action</i>	<i>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</i>	<i>Monitoring Schedule</i>
<p>Improvement Measure 5: Pedestrian Mid-Block Crossing on Shotwell Street</p> <p>The project sponsor should monitor pedestrian behavior at the garage driveway and determine whether observed conflict with vehicles on Shotwell Street merits provision of a pedestrian mid-block crossing on Shotwell Street north of the proposed project driveway and the jog in the roadway (approximately 110 feet south of the intersection of Shotwell Street and 26th Street). The crossing would allow pedestrians exiting the proposed project on Shotwell Street to cross to the east side of the street and walk south on a sidewalk, avoiding the west side of Shotwell Street south of the project site where no sidewalk is provided. Implementation of the crossing would be coordinated with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency and Public Works.</p>	Project Sponsor	Upon operation of the proposed project	Monitor pedestrian behavior at garage driveway; install mid-block crossing on Shotwell Street if warranted	Project Sponsor/Planning Department/DBI/DPW	Ongoing during project operations
<p>Improvement Measure 6: Construction Management</p> <p>As an improvement measure to reduce potential conflicts between construction activities and pedestrians, transit and autos at the project site, the contractor should add certain measures to the required traffic control plan for proposed project construction. In addition to the requirements for a construction traffic control/management plan, the proposed project should include the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Non-peak Construction Traffic Hours - In addition, to minimize the construction-related disruption of the general traffic flow on adjacent streets during the PM peak period, truck movements and deliveries should be limited during peak hours (generally 4:00 to 6:00 PM, or other times as determined by San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency and its Transportation Advisory Staff Committee [TASC]). ■ Carpool and Transit Access for Construction Workers –To minimize parking demand and vehicle trips associated with construction workers, the construction contractor should include methods to encourage carpooling and transit access to the project site by construction workers in the Construction Management Plan. On-site construction workers should also be encouraged to consider cycling and walking as alternatives to driving alone to and from the site. 	Project sponsor, contractor(s)	Prior to and during construction	Implement Construction Management Plan	Project Sponsor	Upon completion of project construction

**ATTACHMENT B:
 IMPROVEMENT MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

<i>IMPROVEMENT MEASURES</i>	<i>Responsibility for Implementation</i>	<i>Mitigation Schedule</i>	<i>Mitigation Action</i>	<i>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</i>	<i>Monitoring Schedule</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Project Construction Updates for Adjacent Businesses and Residents – To minimize construction impacts on access for nearby institutions and businesses, the project sponsor should provide nearby residences and adjacent businesses with regularly-updated information regarding proposed project construction, including a construction contact person, construction activities, duration, peak construction activities (e.g., concrete pours), travel lane closures, and lane closures. 					