

File No. 170974

Committee Item No. \_\_\_\_\_

Board Item No. 34

## COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

### AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: \_\_\_\_\_  
Board of Supervisors Meeting

Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date: September 19, 2017

#### Cmte Board

- |                          |                                     |  |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Motion                                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Resolution                                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Ordinance                                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Legislative Digest                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Budget and Legislative Analyst Report        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Youth Commission Report                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Introduction Form                            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | MOU  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Grant Information Form                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Grant Budget                                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Subcontract Budget                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Contract/Agreement                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Form 126 – Ethics Commission                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Award Letter                                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Application                                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Public Correspondence                        |

#### OTHER

- |                          |                                     |   |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>DPW Order No. 186325 - September 1, 2017</u>                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>Planning Decision - May 20, 2016</u>                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>Planning CEQA Exemption Determination - October 30, 2014</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>Tax Certificates - August 17, 2017</u>                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>Final Maps</u>   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | _____   |

Prepared by: Brent Jalipa  
Prepared by: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: September 14, 2017  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_

1 [Final Map 9025 - 1450-15th Street]

2  
3 **Motion approving Final Map 9025, a 23 residential unit condominium project, located**  
4 **at 1450-15th Street, being a subdivision of Assessor's Parcel Block Number 3549, Lot**  
5 **No. 064, and adopting findings pursuant to the General Plan, and the eight priority**  
6 **policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.**

7  
8       MOVED, That the certain map entitled "FINAL MAP 9025", a 23 residential unit  
9 condominium project, located at 1450-15th Street, being a subdivision of Assessor's Parcel  
10 Block Number 3549, Lot No. 064, comprising 4 sheets, approved September 01, 2017, by  
11 Department of Public Works Order No. 186325 is hereby approved and said map is adopted  
12 as an Official Final Map 9025; and, be it


13       FURTHER MOVED, That the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopts as its own  
14 and incorporates by reference herein as though fully set forth the findings made by the  
15 Planning Department, by its letter dated May 20, 2016, that the proposed subdivision is  
16 consistent with the objectives and policies of the General Plan and the eight priority policies of  
17 Planning Code, Section 101.1; and, be it

18       FURTHER MOVED, That the San Francisco Board of Supervisors hereby authorizes  
19 the Director of the Department of Public Works to enter all necessary recording information on  
20 the Final Map and authorizes the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors to execute the Clerk's  
21 Statement as set forth herein; and, be it

22       FURTHER MOVED, That approval of this map is also conditioned upon compliance by  
23 the subdivider with all applicable provisions of the San Francisco Subdivision Code and  
24 amendments thereto.


1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

RECOMMENDED:



Mohammed Nuru  
Director of Public Works

DESCRIPTION APPROVED:



Bruce R. Storrs, PLS  
City and County Surveyor



Office of the City and County Surveyor  
1155 Market Street, 3rd Floor  
San Francisco, Ca 94103  
(415) 554-5827 ■ www.SFPublicWorks.org



Edwin M. Lee, Mayor  
Mohammed Nuru, Director

Bruce R. Storrs, City and County Surveyor

**Public Works Order No: 186325**

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC WORKS**

APPROVING FINAL MAP 9025, 1450 15<sup>th</sup> STREET, A 23 UNIT RESIDENTIAL CONDOMINIUM PROJECT, BEING A SUBDIVISION OF ASSESSORS PARCEL NUMBER 3549-064

A 23 UNIT RESIDENTIAL CONDOMINIUM PROJECT

The City Planning Department in its letter dated May 20, 2016 stated that the subdivision is in conformity with the General Plan and the Priority Policies of City Planning Code Section 101.1.

The Director of Public Works, the Advisory Agency, acting in concurrence with other City agencies, has determined that said Final Map complies with all subdivision requirements related thereto. Pursuant to the California Subdivision Map Act and the San Francisco Subdivision Code, the Director recommends that the Board of Supervisors approve the aforementioned Final Map.

Transmitted herewith are the following:

1. One (1) paper copy of the Motion approving said map – one (1) copy in electronic format.
2. One (1) mylar signature sheet and one (1) paper set of the "Final Map 9025", each comprising 4 sheets.
3. One (1) copy of the Tax Certificate from the Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector certifying that there are no liens against the property for taxes or special assessments collected as taxes.
4. One (1) copy of the letter dated May 20, 2016, from the City Planning Department verifying conformity of the subdivision with the General Plan and the Priority Policies set forth in City Planning Code Section 101.1.

It is recommended that the Board of Supervisors adopt this legislation.

RECOMMENDED:

APPROVED:

RECEIVED  
 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
 SAN FRANCISCO  
 2017 SEP - 8 PM 2:48



9/1/2017

9/1/2017

X Bruce R. Storrs

Storrs, Bruce  
City and County Surveyor  
Signed by: Storrs, Bruce

X Mohammed Nuru

Nuru, Mohammed  
Director, DPW  
Signed by: Nuru, Mohammed





### TENTATIVE MAP DECISION

Date: April 21, 2016


Department of City Planning  
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400  
San Francisco, CA 94103

Project ID: 9025			
Project Type: 23 Residential New Construction Condominium Units			
Address#	StreetName	Block	Lot
1450 - 1490	15TH ST	3549	064
Tentative Map Referral			

Attention: Mr. Scott F. Sanchez

Please review and respond to this referral within 30 days in accordance with the Subdivision Map Act.

Sincerely,

 James Ryan  
2016.04.21 15:06:59 -08'00'

for, Bruce R. Storrs, P.L.S.  
City and County Surveyor

The subject Tentative Map has been reviewed by the Planning Department and does comply with applicable provisions of the Planning Code. On balance, the Tentative Map is consistent with the General Plan and the Priority Policies of Planning Code Section 101.1 based on the attached findings. The subject referral is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) environmental review as categorically exempt Class 3, CEQA Determination Date 12/5/14, based on the attached checklist.

The subject Tentative Map has been reviewed by the Planning Department and does comply with applicable provisions of the Planning Code subject to the attached conditions.

The subject Tentative Map has been reviewed by the Planning Department and does not comply with applicable provisions of the Planning Code due to the following reason(s):

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Signed Jeffrey Speirs  
Digitally signed by Jeffrey Speirs  
DN: cn=jeff.speirs, ou=CityPlanning, ou=Current Planning, ou=Jeffrey Speirs,  
email=Jeffrey.Speirs@sf.gov, o=City and County of San Francisco  
Date: 2016.05.20 13:32:06 -0700

Date 5/20/16

Planner's Name jeff speirs  
for, Scott F. Sanchez, Zoning Administrator



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

## Certificate of Determination EXEMPTION FROM ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Case No.: 2013.0124E  
 Project Address: 1450 15<sup>th</sup> Street  
 Zoning: UMU (Urban Mixed Use) District  
 50-X Height and Bulk District  
 Block/Lot: 3549/064  
 Lot Size: 8,224 square feet  
 Plan Area: Eastern Neighborhoods (Mission Plan Area)  
 Project Sponsor: Daniel Frattin; Reuben, Junius & Rose; (415)567-9000  
 Staff Contact: Erik Jaszewski, (415) 575-6813, Erik.Jaszewski@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 northwest corner of 15th and Shotwell Streets on the block bounded by 15th, Shotwell, and 14th Streets and South Van Ness Avenue in the Mission neighborhood. The proposed project includes the demolition of an existing single-story warehouse occupying the site's entirety, and the construction of a five-story, approximately 50-foot-tall multi-family residential building consisting of 23 residential dwelling units. The approximately 24,000-square-foot residential building would contain a lobby, multi-purpose room, 12 bicycle parking spaces and 16 automobile parking spaces. The 16-space ground-floor parking garage would be accessed from a 10-foot-wide curb cut on Shotwell Street. A 2,100-square-foot outdoor seating area would be located at the rear of the building.

### 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

October 30, 2014  
 Date

cc: Daniel Frattin, Project Sponsor; Supervisor David Campos, District 9; Erika Jackson, Current Planning Division; Virna Byrd, M.D.F.; Exemption/Exclusion File

## PROJECT APPROVAL

The proposed project would require the following approvals:

- **Large Project Authorization** (*Planning Commission*). The proposed project would require a Large Project Authorization from the Planning Commission per Planning Code Section 329.
- **Variances** (*Zoning Administrator*). The proposed project would require variances from the Planning Code as the project would neither meet the required rear yard under Section 134, nor the required exposure under Section 140.
- **Building Permit** (*Department of Building Inspection*). The proposed project would require approval from DBI for a site permit.

The proposed project is subject to Large Project Authorization approval from the Planning Commission, which 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 1450 15<sup>th</sup> Street project described above, and incorporates by reference information contained in the Programmatic EIR for the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans (PEIR)<sup>1</sup>. Project-specific studies were prepared for the proposed project to determine if the project would result in any significant environmental impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

After several years of analysis, community outreach, and public review, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was adopted in December 2008. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was adopted in part to support housing development in some areas previously zoned to allow industrial uses, while preserving an adequate supply of space for existing and future 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 1450 15<sup>th</sup> 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

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



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.<sup>2,3</sup>

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.

A major issue of discussion in the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning process was the degree to which existing industrially-zoned land would be rezoned to primarily residential and mixed-use districts, thus reducing the availability of land traditionally used for PDR employment and businesses. Among other topics, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR assesses the significance of the cumulative land use effects of the rezoning by analyzing its effects on the City's ability to meet its future PDR space needs as well as its ability to meet its housing needs as expressed in the City's General Plan.

As a result of the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning process, the project site has been rezoned to 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 Exemption (CPE) Checklist, under Land Use. The 1450 15<sup>th</sup> Street site, which is located in the Mission Plan Area of the Eastern Neighborhoods, was designated as within the 50-X Height and Bulk District, which would allow a building up to 50 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 1450 15<sup>th</sup> Street is consistent with and was encompassed within the analysis in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. This determination also finds that the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR adequately anticipated and described the impacts of the proposed 1450 15<sup>th</sup> Street project, and identified the mitigation measures applicable to the 1450 15<sup>th</sup> Street project. The proposed project is also consistent with the zoning controls and the provisions of the Planning Code applicable to the project site.<sup>4,5</sup>

<sup>2</sup> San Francisco Planning Department. Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Final Environmental Impact Report (PEIR), 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.

<sup>3</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> Varat, Adam, San Francisco Planning Department. Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning and Policy Analysis, Case No. 2013.0124E, 1450 15<sup>th</sup> Street. October 14, 2014. This document is on file and available for review as part of Case File No. 2013.0124E.

Therefore, no further CEQA evaluation for the 1450 15<sup>th</sup> Street project is required. In sum, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and this Certificate of Exemption for the proposed project comprise the full and complete CEQA evaluation necessary for the proposed project.

## PROJECT SETTING

The block bounded by 15th, Shotwell, and 14th Streets and South Van Ness Avenue in the Mission neighborhood, on which the project site is located, consists of residential, commercial, and industrial uses. The surrounding buildings vary in appearance and height; two- and three-story buildings are generally multi-family residential in character and consist of wood frame construction, while the shorter one- and two-story buildings are of more industrial appearance consisting of masonry and concrete construction materials. Along both Shotwell and 15<sup>th</sup> Streets, taller residential buildings are interspersed with shorter industrial buildings. The area is near Highway 101 and the Van Ness Avenue onramp and off-ramp.

## 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 1450 15<sup>th</sup> 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 1450 15<sup>th</sup> Street project. As a result, the proposed project would not result in any new or substantially more severe impacts than were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

Significant and unavoidable impacts were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR for the following topics: land use, historic architectural resources, transportation and circulation, and shadow. The proposed project would not remove any existing PDR uses and would therefore not contribute to any land use impact. The project would not result in demolition, alteration, or modification of any historic resources. Therefore, the project would not contribute to any historic resource impact. Traffic and transit ridership generated by the project would not considerably contribute to the traffic and transit impacts identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. Although the proposed project would reach approximately 50 feet in height, the project would not cast shadow on any parks or open spaces.

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

---

<sup>5</sup> Jeff Joslin, San Francisco Planning Department. Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Current Planning, Case No. 2013.0124E, 1450 15<sup>th</sup> Street. October 29, 2013. This document is on file and available for review as part of Case File No. 2013.0124E.

Table 1 – Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure	Applicability
<b>E. Transportation</b>	
E-1: Traffic Signal Installation	Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation by San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA)
E-2: Intelligent Traffic Management	Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation by SFMTA
E-3: Enhanced Funding	Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation by SFMTA & SFTA
E-4: Intelligent Traffic Management	Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation by SFMTA & Planning Department
E-5: Enhanced Transit Funding	Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation by SFMTA
E-6: Transit Corridor Improvements	Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation by SFMTA
E-7: Transit Accessibility	Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation by SFMTA
E-8: Muni Storage and Maintenance	Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation by SFMTA
E-9: Rider Improvements	Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation by SFMTA
E-10: Transit Enhancement	Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation by SFMTA
E-11: Transportation Demand Management	Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation by SFMTA
<b>F. Noise</b>	
F-1: Construction Noise (Pile Driving)	Not Applicable: pile driving not proposed.
F-2: Construction Noise	Applicable: temporary construction noise from use of heavy equipment. Project Mitigation Measure 2.
F-3: Interior Noise Levels	Applicable: noise-sensitive uses where street noise exceeds 60 dBA. Requirement satisfied by sponsor.
F-4: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses	Applicable: project includes siting of residential space in where street noise exceeds 60 dBA. Requirement satisfied by sponsor.
F-5: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses	Not Applicable: project would not include

Mitigation Measure	Applicability
	noise-generating uses.
F-6: Open Space in Noisy Environments	Applicable: project includes open space where street noise exceeds 60 dBA. Project Mitigation Measure 3.
<b>G. Air Quality</b>	
G-1: Construction Air Quality	Not Applicable: Project required to comply with Construction Dust Ordinance; not located in area of poor air quality.
G-2: Air Quality for Sensitive Land Uses	Not Applicable: Project not located in area of poor air quality.
G-3: Siting of Uses that Emit Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM)	Not Applicable: Project would not include uses that emit DPM.
G-4: Siting of Uses that Emit other Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs)	Not Applicable: Project would not include uses that emit TACs.
<b>J. Archeological Resources</b>	
J-1: Properties with Previous Studies	Not Applicable: Project located in Mission Dolores Archeological District.
J-2: Properties with no Previous Studies	Not Applicable: Project located in Mission Dolores Archeological District.
J-3: Mission Dolores Archeological District	Applicable: project involves 13 feet of soil excavation/disturbance where resources may be present in Mission Dolores Archeological District. Project Mitigation Measure 1.
<b>K. Historical Resources</b>	
K-1: Interim Procedures for Permit Review in the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area	Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation completed by Planning Department.
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.
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.
<b>L. Hazardous Materials</b>	
L-1: Hazardous Building Materials	Applicable: demolition of existing building. Project Mitigation Measure 4.

Please see the attached Exhibit C:<sup>6</sup> Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the complete text of the applicable mitigation measures. With implementation of these mitigation measures, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

### **PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT**

A "Notification of Project Receiving Environmental Review" was mailed on August 19, 2014 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. Six public comments were received regarding physical environmental effects; these include: (1) the height of the proposed building as being taller than neighboring buildings, (2) the scale of the building as being out of context with the neighborhood character, (3) the effect of the project in shading plants and neighboring structures, (4) the project's potential to worsen existing traffic congestion, (5) disturbance of potentially hazardous soil, and (6) the potential for parking spillover on surrounding streets. These concerns are addressed in the CPE Checklist under the 'Land Use' section, the 'Aesthetics and Parking' section, the 'Shadow' section, the 'Hazardous Materials' section, and the 'Transportation' section. 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 Checklist:<sup>7</sup>

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

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

---

<sup>6</sup> The mitigation measures would be adopted as Conditions of Approval and the MMRP would be attached to approved Planning Commission documents as Exhibit C.

<sup>7</sup> The CPE Checklist is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, in Case File No. 2013.0124E.



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## Community Plan Exemption Checklist

*Case No.:* 2013.0124E  
*Project Address:* 1450 15<sup>th</sup> Street  
*Zoning:* UMU (Urban Mixed Use) District  
50-X Height and Bulk District  
*Block/Lot:* 3549/064  
*Lot Size:* 8,224 square feet  
*Plan Area:* Eastern Neighborhoods (Mission Plan Area)  
*Project Sponsor:* Daniel Frattin; Reuben, Junius & Rose; (415)567-9000  
*Staff Contact:* Erik Jaszewski, (415) 575-6813, Erik.Jaszewski@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 northwest corner of 15th and Shotwell Streets on the block bounded by 15th, Shotwell, and 14th Streets and South Van Ness Avenue in the Mission neighborhood (Figure 1). The proposed project includes the demolition of an existing single-story warehouse occupying the site's entirety, and the construction of a five-story, approximately 50-foot-tall multi-family residential building consisting of 23 residential dwelling units (Figures 2 through 4). The approximately 24,000-square-foot residential building would contain a lobby, multi-purpose room, 12 bicycle parking spaces and 16 automobile parking spaces. The 16-space ground-floor parking garage would be accessed from a 10-foot-wide curb cut on Shotwell Street. A 2,100-square-foot outdoor seating area would be located at the rear of the building.

### PROJECT APPROVAL


The proposed project would require the following approvals:

- **Large Project Authorization** (*Planning Commission*). The proposed project would require a Large Project Authorization from the Planning Commission per Planning Code Section 329.
- **Variances** (*Zoning Administrator*). The proposed project would require variances from the Planning Code as the project would neither meet the required rear yard under Section 134, nor the required exposure under Section 140.
- **Building Permit** (*Department of Building Inspection*). The proposed project would require approval from DBI for a site permit.

The proposed project is subject to Large Project Authorization approval from the Planning Commission, which 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.

FIGURE 1 – PROJECT LOCATION

SAN FRANCISCO  
PLANNING DEPARTMENT



(This space intentionally left blank.)




FIGURE 2 – PROPOSED SITE PLAN

Source: Ian Birchall and Associates Architecture





FIGURE 3 – PROPOSED 15<sup>TH</sup> STREET  
ELEVATION

Source: Ian Birchall and Associates Architecture



SHOTWELL STREET ELEVATION  
3/32" = 1'-0"

FIGURE 4 – PROPOSED SHOTWELL  
STREET ELEVATION

Source: Ian Birchall and Associates Architecture

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

This Community Plan Exemption (CPE) Checklist evaluates whether the environmental impacts of the proposed project are addressed in the Programmatic Environmental Impact Report for the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans (Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR).<sup>1</sup> The CPE Checklist indicates whether the proposed project would result in significant impacts that: (1) are peculiar to the project or project site; (2) were not identified as significant project-level, cumulative, or off-site effects in the PEIR; or (3) are previously identified significant effects, which as a result of substantial new information that was not known at the time that the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the PEIR. Such impacts, if any, will be evaluated in a project-specific Mitigated Negative Declaration or Environmental Impact Report. If no such impacts are identified, the proposed project is exempt from further environmental review in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.

Mitigation measures identified in the PEIR are discussed under each topic area, and measures that are applicable to the proposed project are provided under the Mitigation Measures Section at the end of this checklist.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified significant impacts related to land use, transportation, cultural resources, shadow, noise, air quality, and hazardous materials. Additionally, the PEIR identified significant cumulative impacts related to land use, transportation, and cultural resources. Mitigation measures were identified for the above impacts and reduced all impacts to less-than-significant except for those related to land use (cumulative impacts on PDR use), transportation (program-level and cumulative traffic impacts at nine intersections; program-level and cumulative transit impacts on seven Muni lines), cultural resources (cumulative impacts from demolition of historical resources), and shadow (program-level impacts on parks).

The proposed project would include construction of a five-story multi-family residential building consisting of 23 dwelling units and a 16-space parking garage. As discussed below in this checklist, the proposed project would not result in new, significant environmental effects, or effects of greater severity than were already analyzed and disclosed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

**AESTHETICS AND PARKING IMPACTS FOR TRANSIT PRIORITY INFILL DEVELOPMENT**

Public Resources Code Section 21099(d), effective January 1, 2014, provides that, "aesthetics and parking impacts of a residential, mixed-use residential, or employment center project on an infill site located within a transit priority area shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment." Accordingly, aesthetics and parking are no longer to be considered in determining if a project has the potential to result in significant environmental effects for projects that meet all of the following three criteria:

- a) The project is in a transit priority area;
- b) The project is on an infill site; and
- c) The project is residential, mixed-use residential, or an employment center.

---

<sup>1</sup> San Francisco Planning Department, Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Final Environmental Impact Report (PEIR), Planning Department Case No. 2004.0160E, State Clearinghouse No. 2005032048, certified August 7, 2008. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1893>. Accessed August 17, 2012.

The proposed project meets each of the above three criteria and thus, this checklist does not consider aesthetics or parking in determining the significance of project impacts under CEQA.<sup>2</sup> Project elevations are included in the project description, and an assessment of parking demand is included in the Transportation section for informational purposes.

(This space intentionally left blank.)

---

<sup>2</sup> San Francisco Planning Department. Transit-Oriented Infill Project Eligibility Checklist for 1450 15<sup>th</sup> Street, September 11, 2014. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 as part of Case File No. 2013.0124E.

Topics:	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
<b>1. LAND USE AND LAND USE PLANNING— Would the project:</b>				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land-use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial impact upon the existing character of the vicinity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that adoption of the Area Plans would result in an unavoidable significant impact on land use due to the cumulative loss of PDR. The proposed project would contribute to this impact by demolishing an existing building that has been occupied by PDR (industrial) uses in the past, and constructing a multi-family residential building in its place. Such demolition of PDR space and the related contribution to cumulative impacts, including that of the proposed project, were anticipated and analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. Therefore, the project would not contribute to any impact related to loss of PDR uses that was not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. Furthermore, the Citywide Planning and Neighborhood Planning Divisions of the Planning Department have determined that the proposed project is permitted in the UMU Zoning District and is consistent with the height, density, and land uses as specified in the Mission Subarea of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, maintaining the mixed character of the area by encouraging residential development.<sup>3,4</sup>

For these reasons, implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR related to land use and land use planning, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Topics:	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
<b>2. POPULATION AND HOUSING— Would the project:</b>				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<sup>3</sup> Varat, Adam, San Francisco Planning Department. Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning and Policy Analysis, Case No. 2013.0124E, 1450 15<sup>th</sup> Street. October 14, 2014. This document is on file and available for review as part of Case File No. 2013.0124E.

<sup>4</sup> Jeff Joslin, San Francisco Planning Department. Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Current Planning, Case No. 2013.0124E, 1450 15<sup>th</sup> Street. October 29, 2013. This document is on file and available for review as part of Case File No. 2013.0124E.

Topics:	Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site	Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR	Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information	No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or create demand for additional housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

One of the objectives of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans is to identify appropriate locations for housing in the City's industrially zoned land to meet the citywide demand for additional housing. The PEIR concluded that an increase in population in the Plan Areas is expected to occur as a secondary effect of the proposed rezoning and that any population increase would not, in itself, result in adverse physical effects, but would serve to advance key City policy objectives, such as providing housing in appropriate locations next to Downtown and other employment generators and furthering the City's Transit First policies. It was anticipated that the rezoning would result in an increase in both housing development and population in all of the Area Plan neighborhoods. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population and density would not result in significant adverse physical effects on the environment. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

The proposed project's residential use would be expected to add approximately 28 tenants to the site. These direct effects of the proposed project on population and housing are within the scope of the population growth anticipated under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans and evaluated in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts on population and housing that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

Topics:	Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site	Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR	Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information	No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR
<b>3. CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES—Would the project:</b>				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5, including those resources listed in Article 10 or Article 11 of the San Francisco Planning Code?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Historic Architectural Resources

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064.5(a)(1) and 15064.5(a)(2), historical resources are buildings or structures that are listed, or are eligible for listing, in the California Register of Historical Resources or are identified in a local register of historical resources, such as Articles 10 and 11 of the San Francisco Planning Code. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that future development facilitated through the changes in use districts and height limits under the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans could have substantial adverse changes on the significance of both individual historical resources and on historical districts within the Plan Areas. The PEIR determined that approximately 32 percent of the known or potential historical resources in the Plan Areas could potentially be affected under the preferred alternative. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR found this impact to be significant and unavoidable. This impact was addressed in a Statement of Overriding Considerations with findings and adopted as part of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans approval on January 19, 2009.

The proposed project would demolish the existing one-story, concrete industrial building constructed in 1925. The building was evaluated as part of the Inner Mission North Historic Resource Survey, which was adopted by the Historic Preservation Commission in May 2011. Based upon this survey, the existing building and lot were assigned a California Historic Resource Status Code (CHRSC) of "6Z," which defines the property as "found ineligible for [National Register], [California Register] or local designation through survey evaluation." Furthermore, the project site is not located in or near any historic districts. Therefore, the site is not considered to be a historic resource for the purposes of CEQA. As such, the proposed project would not result in the demolition or alteration of any historic resource. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to the significant historic resource impact identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, and no historic resource mitigation measures would apply to the proposed project.

For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts on historic architectural resources that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

### Archeological Resources

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that implementation of the Area Plan could result in significant impacts on archeological resources and identified three mitigation measures that would reduce these potential impacts to a less than significant level. Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure J-1 applies to properties for which a final archeological research design and treatment plan is on file at the Northwest Information Center and the Planning Department. Mitigation Measure J-2 applies to properties for which no archeological assessment report has been prepared or for which the archeological documentation is incomplete or inadequate to serve as an evaluation of potential effects on archeological resources under CEQA. Mitigation Measure J-3, which applies to properties in the Mission Dolores Archeological District, requires that a specific archeological testing program be conducted by a qualified archeological consultant with expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archeology.

The project site is one of the properties subject to Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure J-3. Mitigation Measure J-3 states any project resulting in soils disturbance in the Mission Dolores Archeological District shall be required to conduct a preliminary archeological sensitivity study prepared by a qualified archeological consultant having expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archeology. Based on the study, a determination shall be made if additional measures are needed to reduce potential effects of a project on archeological resources to a less-than-significant level. The Planning Department's archeologist conducted a Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR) of the project

site in conformance with the study requirements of Mitigation Measure J-2: the results are summarized below.<sup>5</sup>

The proposed project would require excavation and soil disturbance to a depth of approximately 13 feet below grade to install a mat slab foundation and basement parking garage. The project site is located in an area in which prehistoric and/or Spanish/Mexican archeological deposits may be present. Based on the PAR, it has been determined that the Planning Department's standard monitoring archeological mitigation measure would apply to the proposed project. The PAR and its monitoring requirements are consistent with Mitigation Measure J-3 from the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. With implementation of this project mitigation measure, impacts related to archeological resources would be less-than-significant. In accordance with the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR requirements, the project sponsor has agreed to implement Project Mitigation Measure 1, as discussed on pages 30-34.

For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts on archeological resources that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
<b>4. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION—</b>				
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels, obstructions to flight, or a change in location, that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<sup>5</sup> San Francisco Planning Department, *Preliminary Archeological Review: 1450 15<sup>th</sup> Street*. August 24, 2014. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2013.0124E.



The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR anticipated that growth resulting from the zoning changes would not result in significant impacts related to pedestrians, bicyclists, loading, emergency access, or construction. As the proposed project is within the development projected under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, there would be no additional impacts on pedestrians, bicyclists, loading, emergency access, or construction beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

However, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR anticipated that growth resulting from the zoning changes could result in significant impacts on traffic and transit ridership, and identified 11 transportation mitigation measures. Even with mitigation, however, it was anticipated that the significant adverse cumulative traffic impacts and the cumulative impacts on transit lines could not be fully mitigated. Thus, these impacts were found to be significant and unavoidable.

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan area, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the Community Plan Exemption Checklist topic 4c is not applicable.

### Trip Generation

The proposed project involves construction of a five-story, approximately 24,000 square-foot residential building with 23 dwelling units. Sixteen (16) car parking spaces and twelve (12) bicycle parking spaces are included as part of the 1450 15<sup>th</sup> Street project.

Trip generation of the proposed project was calculated using information in the *2002 Transportation Impacts Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review* (SF Guidelines) developed by the San Francisco Planning Department.<sup>6</sup> The proposed project would generate an estimated 230 person trips (inbound and outbound) on a weekday daily basis, consisting of 76 person trips by auto, 108 transit trips, 24 walk trips and 22 trips by other modes. During the p.m. peak hour, the proposed project would generate an estimated 12 vehicle trips (accounting for vehicle occupancy data for this Census Tract).

### Traffic

The proposed project's vehicle trips would travel through the intersections surrounding the project block. Intersection operating conditions are characterized by the concept of Level of Service (LOS), which ranges from A to F and provides a description of an intersection's performance based on traffic volumes, intersection capacity, and vehicle delays. LOS A represents free flow conditions, with little or no delay, while LOS F represents congested conditions, with extremely long delays; LOS D (moderately high delays) is considered the lowest acceptable level in San Francisco.

The proposed project would generate an estimated 12 new p.m. peak hour vehicle trips that could travel through surrounding intersections. This amount of new p.m. peak hour vehicle trips would not substantially increase traffic volumes at nearby intersections, would not substantially increase average delay that would cause intersections that currently operate at acceptable LOS to deteriorate to unacceptable LOS, or would not substantially increase average delay at intersections that currently operate at unacceptable LOS.

The proposed project would not contribute considerably to LOS delay conditions as its contribution of an estimated 12 new p.m. peak-hour vehicle trips would not be a substantial proportion of the overall traffic volume or the new vehicle trips generated by Eastern Neighborhoods' Plan projects. The proposed

---

<sup>6</sup> San Francisco Planning Department, *Transportation Calculations for 1450 15<sup>th</sup> Street*, October 11, 2013. These calculations are available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2013.0124E.

project would also not contribute considerably to cumulative conditions and thus, the proposed project would not have any significant cumulative traffic impacts.

For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts on traffic that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

### Transit

The project site is located within a quarter mile of the BART 16<sup>th</sup> Street Mission station and several local transit routes including Muni lines 12, 14, 14L, 33, 49. The proposed project would be expected to generate 108 daily transit trips, including 19 during the p.m. peak hour. Given the wide availability of nearby transit, the addition of 19 p.m. peak hour transit trips would be accommodated by existing capacity. As such, the proposed project would not result in unacceptable levels of transit service or cause a substantial increase in delays or operating costs such that significant adverse impacts in transit service could result.

Each of the rezoning options in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts relating to increases in transit ridership on Muni lines, with the Preferred Project having significant impacts on seven lines. Of those lines, the project site is located within a quarter-mile of Muni lines 14 and 49. Mitigation measures proposed to address these impacts related to pursuing enhanced transit funding; conducting transit corridor and service improvements; and increasing transit accessibility, service information and storage/maintenance capabilities for Muni lines in the Eastern Neighborhoods. Even with mitigation, however, cumulative impacts on the above lines were found to be significant and unavoidable and a Statement of Overriding Considerations related to the significant and unavoidable cumulative transit impacts was adopted as part of the PEIR certification and project approval.

The proposed project would not contribute considerably to these conditions as its minor contribution of 19 p.m. peak hour transit trips would not be a substantial proportion of the overall additional transit volume generated by Eastern Neighborhood projects. The proposed project would also not contribute considerably to 2025 cumulative transit conditions and thus would not result in any significant cumulative transit impacts.

For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR related to transit and would not contribute considerably to cumulative transit impacts that were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

### Parking

Public Resources Code Section 21099(d), effective January 1, 2014, provides that, "aesthetics and parking impacts of a residential, mixed-use residential, or employment center project on an infill site located within a transit priority area shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment." Accordingly, aesthetics and parking are no longer to be considered in determining if a project has the potential to result in significant environmental effects for projects that meet all of the following three criteria:

- a) The project is in a transit priority area;
- b) The project is on an infill site; and
- c) The project is residential, mixed-use residential, or an employment center.

The proposed project meets each of the above three criteria and thus, this determination does not consider the adequacy of parking in determining the significance of project impacts under CEQA.<sup>7</sup> The Planning Department acknowledges that parking conditions may be of interest to the public and the decision makers. Therefore, the following parking demand analysis is provided for informational purposes only.

The parking demand for the new residential use associated with the proposed project was determined based on the methodology presented in the Transportation Guidelines. On an average weekday, the demand for parking would be for 35 spaces. The proposed project would provide 16 off-street spaces. Thus, as proposed, the project would have an unmet parking demand of an estimated 19 spaces. At this location, the unmet parking demand could be accommodated within existing on-street and off-street parking spaces within a reasonable distance of the project vicinity. Additionally, the project site is well served by public transit and bicycle facilities. Therefore, any unmet parking demand associated with the project would not materially affect the overall parking conditions in the project vicinity such that hazardous conditions or significant delays would be created.

Further, the proposed project is located in a UMU zoning district, and thus would not be required to provide any off-street parking spaces. It should be noted that the Planning Commission has the discretion to adjust the number of on-site parking spaces included in the proposed project, typically at the time that the project entitlements are sought. The Planning Commission may not support the parking ratio proposed. In some cases, particularly when the proposed project is in a transit rich area, the Planning Commission may not support the provision of any off-street parking spaces. This is, in part, owing to the fact that the parking spaces are not 'bundled' with the residential units. In other words, residents would have the option to rent or purchase a parking space, but one would not be automatically provided with the residential unit.

If the project were ultimately approved with no off-street parking spaces, the proposed project would have an unmet demand of 35 spaces. As mentioned above, the unmet parking demand could be accommodated within existing on-street and off-street parking spaces nearby and through alternative modes such as public transit and bicycle facilities. Given that the unmet demand could be met by existing facilities and given that the proposed project site is well-served by transit and bicycle facilities, a reduction in the number of off-street parking spaces associated with the proposed project, even if no off-street spaces are provided, would not result in significant delays or hazardous conditions.

Parking conditions are not static, as parking supply and demand varies from day to day, from day to night, from month to month, etc. Hence, the availability of parking spaces (or lack thereof) is not a permanent physical condition, but changes over time as people change their modes and patterns of travel. While parking conditions change over time, a substantial shortfall in parking caused by a project that creates hazardous conditions or significant delays to traffic, transit, bicycles or pedestrians could adversely affect the physical environment. Whether a shortfall in parking creates such conditions will depend on the magnitude of the shortfall and the ability of drivers to change travel patterns or switch to other travel modes. If a substantial shortfall in parking caused by a project creates hazardous conditions or significant delays in travel, such a condition could also result in secondary physical environmental impacts (e.g., air quality or noise impacts caused by congestion), depending on the project and its setting.

The absence of a ready supply of parking spaces, combined with available alternatives to auto travel (e.g., transit service, taxis, bicycles or travel by foot) and a relatively dense pattern of urban development,

---

<sup>7</sup> San Francisco Planning Department, Transit-Oriented Infill Project Eligibility Checklist for 1450 15<sup>th</sup> Street, September 11, 2014. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2013.0124E.

induces many drivers to seek and find alternative parking facilities, shift to other modes of travel, or change their overall travel habits. Any such resulting shifts to transit service or other modes (walking and biking), would be in keeping with the City's "Transit First" policy and numerous San Francisco General Plan Polices, including those in the Transportation Element. The City's Transit First Policy, established in the City's Charter Article 8A, Section 8A.115, provides that "parking policies for areas well served by public transit shall be designed to encourage travel by public transportation and alternative transportation."

The transportation analysis accounts for potential secondary effects, such as cars circling and looking for a parking space in areas of limited parking supply, by assuming that all drivers would attempt to find parking at or near the project site and then seek parking farther away if convenient parking is unavailable. The secondary effects of drivers searching for parking is typically offset by a reduction in vehicle trips due to others who are aware of constrained parking conditions in a given area, and thus choose to reach their destination by other modes (i.e. walking, biking, transit, taxi). If this occurs, any secondary environmental impacts that may result from a shortfall in parking in the vicinity of the proposed project would be minor, and the traffic assignments used in the transportation analysis, as well as in the associated air quality, noise and pedestrian safety analyses, would reasonably address potential secondary effects.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
<b>5. NOISE—Would the project:</b>				
a) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, in an area within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project located in the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Be substantially affected by existing noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified potential conflicts related to residences and other noise-sensitive uses in proximity to noisy uses such as PDR, retail, entertainment,

cultural/institutional/educational uses, and office uses. In addition, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR noted that implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans and Rezoning would incrementally increase traffic-generated noise on some streets in the Eastern Neighborhoods plan areas and result in construction noise impacts from pile driving and other construction activities. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR therefore identified six noise mitigation measures that would reduce noise impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures F-1 and F-2 relate to construction noise. Mitigation Measure F-1 addresses individual projects that include pile-driving, and Mitigation Measure F-2 addresses individual projects that include particularly noisy construction procedures (including pile-driving). Mitigation Measure F-1 does not apply because the proposed project would not involve pile-driving. However, the project could involve noisy construction activities. Therefore, Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure F-2 applies to the project and has been identified as Project Mitigation Measure 2. Compliance with this mitigation measure would result in less-than-significant construction noise impacts. The project sponsor has agreed to implement Project Mitigation Measure 2, as detailed on pages 30-34.

In addition, all construction activities for the proposed project (approximately 18 months) would be subject to and would comply with the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the San Francisco Police Code) (Noise Ordinance). Construction noise is regulated by the Noise Ordinance. The Noise Ordinance requires that construction work be conducted in the following manner: (1) noise levels of construction equipment, other than impact tools, must not exceed 80 dBA<sup>8</sup> ( $L_{dn}$ )<sup>9</sup> at a distance of 100 feet from the source (the equipment generating the noise); (2) impact tools must have intake and exhaust mufflers that are approved by the Director of the Department of Public Works (DPW) or the Director of the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) to best accomplish maximum noise reduction; and (3) if the noise from the construction work would exceed the ambient noise levels at the site property line by 5 dBA, the work must not be conducted between 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. unless the Director of DPW authorizes a special permit for conducting the work during that period.

DBI is responsible for enforcing the Noise Ordinance for private construction projects during normal business hours (8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.). The Police Department is responsible for enforcing the Noise Ordinance during all other hours. Nonetheless, during the construction period for the proposed project of approximately 18 months, occupants of the nearby properties could be disturbed by construction noise. Times may occur when noise could interfere with indoor activities in nearby residences and other businesses near the project site and may be considered an annoyance by occupants of nearby properties. The increase in noise in the project area during project construction would not be considered a significant impact of the proposed project, because the construction noise would be temporary, intermittent, and restricted in occurrence and level, as the contractor would be required to comply with the Noise Ordinance.

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures F-3 and F-4 require that a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements be conducted for new development that includes noise-sensitive uses located along streets with noise levels above 60 dBA ( $L_{dn}$ ). As the project is located in an area where traffic-related noise exceeds 60 dBA ( $L_{dn}$ ) and involves construction of a residential building (a noise-sensitive

<sup>8</sup> The dBA, or A-weighted decibel, refers to a scale of noise measurement that approximates the range of sensitivity of the human ear to sounds of different frequencies. On this scale, the normal range of human hearing extends from about 0 dBA to about 140 dBA. A 10-dBA increase in the level of a continuous noise represents a perceived doubling of loudness.

<sup>9</sup> The  $L_{dn}$  is the  $L_{eq}$ , or Energy Equivalent Level, of the A-weighted noise level over a 24-hour period with a 10 dB penalty applied to noise levels between 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. The  $L_{eq}$  is the level of a steady noise which would have the same energy as the fluctuating noise level integrated over the time period of interest.

use), Mitigation Measures F-3 and F-4 apply to the project. Accordingly, the project sponsor has conducted an environmental noise study demonstrating that the proposed project can feasibly attain acceptable interior noise levels consistent with Title 24.<sup>10</sup> This environmental noise study satisfies Mitigation Measures F-3 and F-4.

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure F-5 addresses impacts related to individual projects that include new noise-generating uses that would be expected to generate noise levels in excess of ambient noise in the proposed project site vicinity. The project does not include such noise-generating uses, thus Mitigation Measure F-5 is not applicable to the project.

Mitigation Measure F-6 addresses impacts from existing ambient noise levels on open space required under the Planning Code for new development that includes noise sensitive uses. As previously discussed, the project is located in an area where traffic-related noise levels exceed 60 dBA (L<sub>dn</sub>). The project includes approximately 1,794 square feet of open space located on the second floor at the rear of the building. Therefore, Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure F-6 applies the project, and has been identified as Project Mitigation Measure 3, as detailed on page 33. Compliance with this mitigation measure would result in less-than-significant noise impacts on noise-sensitive receptors.

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan area, within two miles of a public airport, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, topics 12e and f from the CPE Checklist are not applicable.

For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant noise impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
<b>6. AIR QUALITY—Would the project:</b>				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal, state, or regional ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<sup>10</sup> Charles M. Salter Associates, Inc., Architectural Acoustic Consultants. 1450 15<sup>th</sup> Street San Francisco, CA Environmental Noise Study. Acoustical Analysis. September 9, 2013. This report is available for review as part of Case No. 2013.0124E.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified potentially significant air quality impacts resulting from construction activities and impacts to sensitive land uses<sup>11</sup> as a result of exposure to elevated levels of diesel particulate matter (DPM) and other toxic air contaminants (TACs). The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified four mitigation measures that would reduce these air quality impacts to less-than-significant levels. All other air quality impacts were found to be less than significant.

#### Construction Dust Control

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-1 Construction Air Quality requires individual projects involving construction activities to include dust control measures and to maintain and operate construction equipment so as to minimize exhaust emissions of particulates and other pollutants. The San Francisco Board of Supervisors subsequently approved a series of amendments to the San Francisco Building and Health Codes, generally referred to as the Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 176-08, effective July 30, 2008). The intent of the Construction Dust Control Ordinance is to reduce the quantity of fugitive dust generated during site preparation, demolition, and construction work in order to protect the health of the general public and of on-site workers, minimize public nuisance complaints, and to avoid orders to stop work by DBI. Project-related construction activities would result in construction dust, primarily from ground-disturbing activities. In compliance with the Construction Dust Control Ordinance, the project sponsor and contractor responsible for construction activities at the project site would be required to control construction dust on the site through a combination of watering disturbed areas, covering stockpiled materials, street and sidewalk sweeping and other measures.

The regulations and procedures set forth by the San Francisco Dust Control Ordinance would ensure that construction dust impacts would not be significant. These requirements supersede the dust control provisions of PEIR Mitigation Measure G-1. Therefore, the portion of PEIR Mitigation Measure G-1 Construction Air Quality that addresses dust control is not applicable to the proposed project.

#### Health Risk

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-1 addresses air quality impacts during construction, Mitigation Measure G-2 addresses the siting of sensitive land uses near sources of TACs and PEIR Mitigation Measures G-3 and G-4 address proposed uses that would emit DPM and other TACs.

Subsequent to certification of the PEIR, San Francisco (in partnership with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)) inventoried and assessed air pollution and exposures from mobile, stationary, and area sources within San Francisco and identified portions of the City that result in additional health risks for affected populations ("Air Pollutant Exposure Zone"). The Air Pollutant Exposure Zone was identified based on two health based criteria:

- (1) Areas where the excess cancer risk from all sources is greater than 100; or
- (2) Areas where  $PM_{2.5}$ <sup>12</sup> concentrations from all sources (including ambient concentrations) are greater than  $10\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ .<sup>13</sup>

<sup>11</sup> The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) considers sensitive receptors as: children, adults or seniors occupying or residing in: 1) residential dwellings, including apartments, houses, condominiums, 2) schools, colleges, and universities, 3) daycares, 4) hospitals, and 5) senior care facilities. BAAQMD, Recommended Methods for Screening and Modeling Local Risks and Hazards, May 2011, page 12.

<sup>12</sup>  $PM_{2.5}$  is defined as particulate matter less than 2.5 micrometers in diameter, often called "fine" particles.

<sup>13</sup> A microgram per cubic meter ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ) is a derived System International measurement unit of density—measuring volume in cubic meters—used to estimate weight or mass in micrograms.

The project site is not located within an identified Air Pollutant Exposure Zone. Therefore, the ambient health risk to sensitive receptors<sup>14</sup> from air pollutants is not considered substantial and the remainder of Mitigation Measure G-1 that requires the minimization of construction exhaust emissions is not applicable to the proposed project.

The proposed project would include development of residential uses and is considered a sensitive land use for purposes of air quality evaluation. As discussed above, the ambient health risk to sensitive receptors from air pollutants is not considered substantial and Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-2 Air Quality for Sensitive Land Uses is not applicable to the proposed project. Furthermore, the proposed residential land uses are not uses that would emit substantial levels of DPM or other TACs and Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measures G-3 and G-4 are similarly not applicable.

**Criteria Air Pollutants**

While the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that at a program-level the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans would not result in significant regional air quality impacts, the PEIR states that “Individual development projects undertaken in the future pursuant to the new zoning and area plans would be subject to a significance determination based on the BAAQMD’s quantitative thresholds for individual projects.”<sup>15</sup> The BAAQMD’s *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* (Air Quality Guidelines) provide screening criteria<sup>16</sup> for determining whether a project’s criteria air pollutant emissions would violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. Pursuant to the Air Quality Guidelines, projects that meet the screening criteria do not have a significant impact related to criteria air pollutants. For projects that do not meet the screening criteria, a detailed air quality assessment is required to further evaluate whether project-related criteria air pollutant emissions would exceed BAAQMD significance thresholds. Criteria air pollutant emissions during construction and operation of the proposed project would meet the Air Quality Guidelines screening criteria. Therefore, the project would not have a significant impact related to criteria air pollutants, and a detailed air quality assessment is not required.

For the above reasons, none of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR air quality mitigation measures are applicable to the proposed project and the project would not result in significant air quality impacts that were not identified in the PEIR.

<u>Topics:</u>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
<b>7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS—Would the project:</b>				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<sup>14</sup> The BAAQMD considers sensitive receptors as: children, adults or seniors occupying or residing in: 1) Residential dwellings, including apartments, houses, condominiums, 2) schools, colleges, and universities, 3) daycares, 4) hospitals, and 5) senior care facilities. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), Recommended Methods for Screening and Modeling Local Risks and Hazards, May 2011, page 12.

<sup>15</sup> San Francisco Planning Department, Eastern Neighborhood’s Rezoning and Area Plans Final Environmental Impact Report. See page 346. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=4003>. Accessed June 4, 2014.

<sup>16</sup> Bay Area Air Quality Management District, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, updated May 2011. See pp. 3-2 to 3-3.



Topics:	Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site	Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR	Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information	No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR assessed the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions that could result from rezoning of the Mission Plan Area under the three rezoning options. The Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning Options A, B, and C are anticipated to result in GHG emissions on the order of 4.2, 4.3 and 4.5 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>E<sup>17</sup> per service population,<sup>18</sup> respectively. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR concluded that the resulting GHG emissions from the three options analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans would be less than significant. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

Regulations outlined in San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* (GHG Reduction Strategy) have proven effective as San Francisco's GHG emissions have measurably reduced when compared to 1990 emissions levels, demonstrating that the City has met and exceeded EO S-3-05, AB 32, and the Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan GHG reduction goals for the year 2020. The proposed project was determined to be consistent with San Francisco's GHG Reduction Strategy. Other existing regulations, such as those implemented through AB 32, will continue to reduce a proposed project's contribution to climate change. Therefore, the proposed project's GHG emissions would not conflict with state, regional, and local GHG reduction plans and regulations, and thus the proposed project's contribution to GHG emissions would not be cumulatively considerable, nor would the project generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that would have a significant impact on the environment.

As the proposed project is within the development projected under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, there would be no additional impacts on GHG emissions beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

Topics:	Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site	Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR	Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information	No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR
<b>8. WIND AND SHADOW—Would the project:</b>				
a) Alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Wind**

Based upon experience of the Planning Department in reviewing wind analyses and expert opinion on other projects, it is generally (but not always) the case that projects under 80 feet in height do not have the

<sup>17</sup> CO<sub>2</sub>E, defined as equivalent Carbon Dioxide, is a quantity that describes other greenhouse gases in terms of the amount of Carbon Dioxide that would have an equal global warming potential.

<sup>18</sup> Memorandum from Jessica Range to Environmental Planning staff, Greenhouse Gas Analyses for Community Plan Exemptions in Eastern Neighborhoods, April 20, 2010. This memorandum provides an overview of the GHG analysis conducted for the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and provides an analysis of the emissions using a service population (equivalent of total number of residents and employees) metric.

potential to generate significant wind impacts. Although the proposed 50-foot-tall building would be taller than the immediately adjacent buildings, it would be similar in height to existing buildings in the surrounding area. For the above reasons, the proposed project is not anticipated to cause significant impacts related to wind that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

**Shadow**

Planning Code Section 295 generally prohibits new structures above 40 feet in height that would cast additional shadows on open space that is under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission between one hour after sunrise and one hour before sunset, at any time of the year, unless that shadow would not result in a significant adverse effect on the use of the open space. Under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, sites surrounding parks could be redeveloped with taller buildings without triggering Section 295 of the Planning Code because certain parks are not subject to Section 295 of the Planning Code (i.e., under jurisdiction of departments other than the Recreation and Parks Department or privately owned). The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR could not conclude if the rezoning and community plans would result in less-than-significant shadow impacts because the feasibility of complete mitigation for potential new shadow impacts of unknown proposed proposals could not be determined at that time. Therefore, the PEIR determined shadow impacts to be significant and unavoidable. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

The proposed project would construct a 50-foot-tall building; therefore, the Planning Department prepared a preliminary shadow fan analysis a shadow analysis to determine whether the project would have the potential to cast new shadow on nearby parks.<sup>19</sup> Based on information provided by the applicant, the shadow fan diagram prepared by the Planning Department indicates the project shadow would not reach nearby parks or open space.

The proposed project would shade portions of nearby streets, sidewalks, landscaped areas and private property at times within the project vicinity. Shadows upon streets sidewalks, and landscaping would not exceed levels commonly expected in urban areas and would be considered a less-than-significant effect under CEQA. Although occupants of nearby property may regard the increase in shadow as undesirable, the limited increase in shading of private properties as a result of the proposed project would not be considered a significant impact under CEQA.

For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to shadow that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<u>Topics:</u>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
<b>9. RECREATION—Would the project:</b>				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<sup>19</sup> San Francisco Planning Department, Shadow Fan Analysis, 1450 15<sup>th</sup> Street: 53-foot-high building, June 16, 2014. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2013.0124E.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Physically degrade existing recreational resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR concluded that implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans would not result in substantial or accelerated deterioration of existing recreational resources or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that may have an adverse effect on the environment. No mitigation measures related to recreational resources were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

As the proposed project would not degrade recreational facilities and is within the development projected under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, there would be no additional impacts on recreation beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
<b>10. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS—Would the project:</b>				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supply available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or require new or expanded water supply resources or entitlements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that would serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population would not result in a significant impact to the provision of water, wastewater collection and treatment, and solid waste collection and disposal. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

As the proposed project is within the development projected under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, there would be no additional impacts on utilities and service systems beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
<b>11. PUBLIC SERVICES—Would the project:</b>				
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any public services such as fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population would not result in a significant impact to public services, including fire protection, police protection, and public schools. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

As the proposed project is within the development projected under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, there would be no additional impacts on public services beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
<b>12. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES—Would the project:</b>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

As discussed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area is in a developed urban environment that does not provide native natural habitat for any rare or endangered plant or animal species. There are no riparian corridors, estuaries, marshes, or wetlands in the Plan Area that could be affected by the development anticipated under the Area Plan. In addition, development envisioned under the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan would not substantially interfere with the movement of any resident or migratory wildlife species. For these reasons, the PEIR concluded that implementation of the Area Plan would not result in significant impacts on biological resources, and no mitigation measures were identified.

As the proposed project is within the development projected under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, there would be no additional impacts on biological resources beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
<b>13. GEOLOGY AND SOILS—Would the project:</b>				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Topics:	Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site	Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR	Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information	No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Change substantially the topography or any unique geologic or physical features of the site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR concluded that implementation of the Plan would indirectly increase the population that would be subject to an earthquake, including seismically induced ground-shaking, liquefaction, and landslides. The PEIR also noted that new development is generally safer than comparable older development due to improvements in building codes and construction techniques. Compliance with applicable codes and recommendations made in project-specific geotechnical analyses would not eliminate earthquake risks, but would reduce them to an acceptable level, given the seismically active characteristics of the Bay Area. Thus, the PEIR concluded that implementation of the Plan would not result in significant impacts with regard to geology, and no mitigation measures were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

The proposed project would involve excavation to a depth of approximately 13 feet in an area of liquefaction potential—designated as a Seismic Hazards Study Zone (SHSZ) by the California Division of Mines and Geology. For any development proposal in an area of liquefaction potential, the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) will, in its review of the building permit application, require the project sponsor to prepare a geotechnical report. As such, a geotechnical report was prepared for the project.<sup>20</sup> The project sponsor will be required to adhere to the recommendations contained in the report.

The project is required to conform to the San Francisco Building Code, which ensures the safety of all new construction in the City. DBI will review the project-specific geotechnical report during its review of the building permit for the project. In addition, DBI may require additional site specific soils report(s) through the building permit application process, as needed. The DBI requirement for a geotechnical report and review of the building permit application pursuant to DBI's implementation of the Building Code would ensure that the proposed project would have no significant impacts related to soils, seismic or other geological hazards.

In light of the above, the proposed project would not result in a significant effect related to seismic and geologic hazards. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to

<sup>20</sup> P. Whitehead and Associates Consulting Engineers. *Geotechnical Report, 1450 15<sup>th</sup> Street, Block 3549 Lot 064, San Francisco, CA.* August 17, 2012. This report is available for review as part of Case No. 2013.0124E.

geology and soils that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
<b>14. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY—Would the project:</b>				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other authoritative flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population would not result in a significant impact on hydrology and water quality, including the combined sewer system and the potential for combined sewer outflows. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

The existing lot is entirely covered by impervious surfaces and the proposed buildings and patio areas would fully occupy the project site. As a result, the proposed project would not result in an increase in

the amount of impervious surface area on the site, which in turn would increase the amount of runoff and drainage. In accordance with the Stormwater Management Ordinance (Ordinance No. 83-10), the proposed project would be subject to and would comply with the Stormwater Design Guidelines, incorporating Low Impact Design (LID) approaches and stormwater management systems into the project. Therefore, the proposed project would not increase runoff and drainage.

Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts related to hydrology and water quality that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
<b>15. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS—</b> Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR noted that implementation of any of the proposed project’s rezoning options would encourage construction of new development within the project area. The PEIR found that there is a high potential to encounter hazardous materials during construction activities in many parts of the project area because of the presence of 1906 earthquake fill, previous and current land uses associated with the use of hazardous materials, and known or suspected hazardous materials cleanup cases.



However, the PEIR found that existing regulations for facility closure, Under Storage Tank (UST) closure, and investigation and cleanup of soil and groundwater would ensure implementation of measures to protect workers and the community from exposure to hazardous materials during construction.

### **Hazardous Building Materials**

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that future development in the Plan Area may involve demolition or renovation of existing structures containing hazardous building materials. Some building materials commonly used in older buildings could present a public health risk if disturbed during an accident or during demolition or renovation of an existing building. Hazardous building materials addressed in the PEIR include asbestos, electrical equipment such as transformers and fluorescent light ballasts that contain PCBs or di (2 ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP), fluorescent lights containing mercury vapors, and lead-based paints. Asbestos and lead based paint may also present a health risk to existing building occupants if they are in a deteriorated condition. If removed during demolition of a building, these materials would also require special disposal procedures. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified a significant impact associated with hazardous building materials including PCBs, DEHP, and mercury and determined that that Mitigation Measure L-1: Hazardous Building Materials, would reduce effects to a less-than-significant level. Because the proposed development includes demolition of an existing building, Mitigation Measure L-1 would apply to the proposed project, and has been identified as Project Mitigation Measure 4 as detailed on page 34.

### **Soil and Groundwater Contamination**

The proposed project would excavate over 50 cubic yards of soil on a site that is located on the Maher Map.<sup>21</sup> Therefore, the project is subject to Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance, which is administered and overseen by the Department of Public Health (DPH). The Maher Ordinance requires the project sponsor to retain the services of a qualified professional to prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) that meets the requirements of Health Code Section 22.A.6.

The Phase I ESA would determine the potential for site contamination and level of exposure risk associated with the project. Based on that information, the project sponsor may be required to conduct soil and/or groundwater sampling and analysis. Where such analysis reveals the presence of hazardous substances in excess of state or federal standards, the project sponsor is required to submit a site mitigation plan (SMP) to the DPH or other appropriate state or federal agency(ies), and to remediate any site contamination in accordance with an approved SMP prior to the issuance of any building permit.

In compliance with the Maher Ordinance, the project sponsor has submitted a Maher Application to DPH and a Phase I ESA has been prepared to assess the potential for site contamination.<sup>22</sup> The Phase I found no evidence of the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products that indicate an existing release, a past release, or a material threat of a release into structures on the property or into the ground, ground water, or surface water. The Phase I did not find any physical or documentary evidence of any use, storage or disposal of any chemicals, hazardous materials, reportable substances, underground storage tanks, or hazardous waste at the site. No Recognized Environmental Concerns are associated with the property and none were identified in the nearby areas.

<sup>21</sup> The Maher Map identifies sites that are known or suspected to contain contaminated soil and/or groundwater. Available online at: [http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/publications\\_reports/library\\_of\\_cartography/Maher%20Map.pdf](http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/publications_reports/library_of_cartography/Maher%20Map.pdf). Accessed October 14, 2014.

<sup>22</sup> John Carver Consulting. *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment at 1450 15<sup>th</sup> Street San Francisco, CA*. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. February 3, 2004. This report is available for review as part of Case No. 2013.0124E.

Pursuant to compliance with Article 22A of the Health Code, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR related to hazardous soil and/or groundwater. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts related to hazardous materials that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to hazards or hazardous materials that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
<b>16. MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES—</b> Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Encourage activities which result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use these in a wasteful manner?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the Area Plan would facilitate the construction of both new residential units and commercial buildings. Development of these uses would not result in use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy in a wasteful manner or in the context of energy use throughout the City and region. The energy demand for individual buildings would be typical for such projects and would meet, or exceed, current state and local codes and standards concerning energy consumption, including Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations enforced by DBI. The Plan Area does not include any natural resources routinely extracted and the rezoning does not result in any natural resource extraction programs. Therefore, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR concluded that implementation of the Area Plan would not result in a significant impact on mineral and energy resources. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

As the proposed project is within the development projected under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, there would be no additional impacts on mineral and energy resources beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<u>Topics:</u>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
<b>17. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:—Would the project:</b>				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that no agricultural resources exist in the Area Plan; therefore the rezoning and community plans would have no effect on agricultural resources. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR did not analyze the effects on forest resources.

As the proposed project is within the development projected under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, there would be no additional impacts on agriculture and forest resources beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

**MITIGATION MEASURES**

**Project Mitigation Measure 1 – Archeological Monitoring (Mitigation Measure J-3 of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR)**

Based on the reasonable potential 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 monitoring program. 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)(c).

*Consultation with Descendant Communities:* On discovery of an archeological site<sup>23</sup> associated with descendant Native Americans or the Overseas Chinese an appropriate representative<sup>24</sup> 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 consult with 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 monitoring program (AMP).* 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 project archeologist 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 potential risk these activities pose to 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 archaeological 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 the 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 crews and heavy 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 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, after making a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archeological deposit, present the findings of this assessment to the ERO.

<sup>23</sup> By the term "archeological site" is intended here to minimally include any archeological deposit, feature, burial, or evidence of burial.

<sup>24</sup> 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.

If the ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant 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) An archeological 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.

If an archeological data recovery program is required by the ERO, the archeological data recovery program shall be conducted in accord with an archeological data recovery plan (ADRP). The project archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the ADRP. The archeological consultant shall prepare a draft ADRP that shall be submitted to the ERO for review and approval. 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.
- *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 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 make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of, with appropriate dignity, human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects (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.

*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 provided in a separate removable insert within the draft final report.

Copies of the Draft FARR shall be sent to the ERO for review and approval. Once approved by the ERO copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one (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 or interpretive value, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.

#### **Project Mitigation Measure 2 – Construction Noise (Mitigation Measure F-2 of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR)**

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:

- 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.
- 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 – Open Space in Noisy Environments (Mitigation Measure F-6 of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR)**

To minimize effects on development in noisy areas, for new development including noise-sensitive uses, the Planning Department shall, through its building permit review process, in conjunction with noise analysis required pursuant to Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure 4, require that open space required under the Planning Code for such uses be protected, to the maximum feasible extent, from existing ambient noise levels that could prove annoying or disruptive to users of the open space.

Implementation of this measure could involve, among other things, site design that uses the building itself to shield on-site open space from the greatest noise sources, construction of noise barriers between noise sources and open space, and appropriate use of both common and private open space in multi-family dwellings, and implementation would also be undertaken consistent with other principles of urban design.

**Project Mitigation Measure 4 – Hazardous Building Materials Abatement (Mitigation Measure L-1 of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR)**

The City shall condition future development approvals to require that the subsequent project sponsors ensure that any equipment containing polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) or mercury, 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 tube fixtures, which could contain mercury, are similarly removed intact 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.

EXHIBIT C: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM				
Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<b>MITIGATION MEASURES</b>				
<p><u><b>Project Mitigation Measure 1 – Archeological Monitoring (Mitigation Measure I-3 of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR)</b></u></p> <p>Based on the reasonable potential 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 monitoring program. 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</p>	Project sponsor.	Prior to issuance of any permit for soil-disturbing activities and during construction.	Project Sponsor; ERO; archeologist.	Considered complete upon ERO's approval of FARR.



**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
-----------------------------	---	------------------------	---	------------------------

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)(c).

*Consultation with Descendant Communities:* On discovery of an archeological site<sup>1</sup> associated with descendant Native Americans or the Overseas Chinese an appropriate representative<sup>2</sup> 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 consult with 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 monitoring program (AMP).* 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

<sup>1</sup> By the term "archeological site" is intended here to minimally include any archeological deposit, feature, burial, or evidence of burial.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p>disturbing activities commencing. The ERO in consultation with the project archeologist 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 potential risk these activities pose to archaeological resources and to their depositional context;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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;</li> <li>▪ The archaeological 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 the archeological consultant, determined that project construction activities could have no effects on significant archeological deposits;</li> <li>▪ The archeological monitor shall record and be authorized to collect soil samples and artifactual/ecofactual material as warranted for analysis;</li> <li>▪ If an intact archeological deposit is encountered, all soils disturbing activities in the vicinity of the</li> </ul>				

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
-----------------------------	---	------------------------	---	------------------------

deposit shall cease. The archeological monitor shall be empowered to temporarily redirect demolition/excavation/pile driving/construction crews and heavy 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 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, after making a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archeological deposit, present the findings of this assessment to the ERO.

If the ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant 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) An archeological data recovery program

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
-----------------------------	---	------------------------	---	------------------------

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.

If an archeological data recovery program is required by the ERO, the archeological data recovery program shall be conducted in accord with an archeological data recovery plan (ADRP). The project archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the ADRP. The archeological consultant shall prepare a draft ADRP that shall be submitted to the ERO for review and approval. 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

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
-----------------------------	---	------------------------	---	------------------------

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.
- *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

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
-----------------------------	---	------------------------	---	------------------------

Federal Laws, including immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the Coroner's determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (Pub. Res. Code Sec. 5097.98). The archeological consultant, project sponsor, ERO, and MLD shall make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of, with appropriate dignity, human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects (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.

*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 provided in a separate removable insert within the draft final report.

Copies of the Draft FARR shall be sent to the ERO for review and approval. Once approved by the ERO copies of

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
-----------------------------	---	------------------------	---	------------------------

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 or interpretive value, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.

<u>Project Mitigation Measure 2 – Construction Noise (Mitigation Measure F-2 of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR)</u>	Project sponsor, contractor(s).	During construction period.	Project sponsor to provide monthly noise reports during construction.	Considered complete upon final monthly report.
---	---------------------------------	-----------------------------	---	--

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

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p>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"> <li>• Erect temporary plywood noise barriers around a construction site, particularly where a site adjoins noise-sensitive uses.</li> <li>• Utilize noise control blankets on a building structure as the building is erected to reduce noise emission from the site.</li> <li>• Evaluate the feasibility of noise control at the receivers by temporarily improving the noise reduction capability of adjacent buildings housing sensitive uses.</li> <li>• Monitor the effectiveness of noise attenuation measures by taking noise measurements.</li> <li>• Post signs on-site pertaining to permitted construction days and hours and complaint procedures and who to notify in the event of a problem, with telephone numbers listed.</li> </ul>	Project sponsor, contractor(s).	Prior to entitlement/building permit approval.	Planning Department.	Considered completed upon approval of project plans by the Planning
To minimize effects on development in noisy areas, for new				



**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p>development including noise-sensitive uses, the Planning Department shall, through its building permit review process, in conjunction with noise analysis required pursuant to Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure 4, require that open space required under the Planning Code for such uses be protected, to the maximum feasible extent, from existing ambient noise levels that could prove annoying or disruptive to users of the open space. Implementation of this measure could involve, among other things, site design that uses the building itself to shield on-site open space from the greatest noise sources, construction of noise barriers between noise sources and open space, and appropriate use of both common and private open space in multi-family dwellings, and implementation would also be undertaken consistent with other principles of urban design.</p>				Department.
<p><u>Project Mitigation Measure 4 - Hazardous Building Materials Abatement (Mitigation Measure L-1 of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR)</u> The City shall condition future development approvals to require that the subsequent project sponsors ensure that any equipment containing polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) or mercury, 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</p>	Project sponsor	Prior to any demolition or construction activities.	Project sponsor; Planning Department.	Prior to any demolition or construction activities.

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
-----------------------------	---	------------------------	---	------------------------

fluorescent light tube fixtures, which could contain mercury, are similarly removed intact 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.



---

**CERTIFICATE OF REDEMPTIONS OFFICER  
SHOWING TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS PAID.**

I, **David Augustine, Tax Collector of the City and County San Francisco, State of California**, do hereby certify, pursuant to the provisions of California Government Code Section 66492 et. seq., that according to the records of my office, there are no liens against the subdivision designated on the map entitled:

**Block No. 3549 Lot No. 064**

**Address: 1450 15Th St**

for unpaid City & County property taxes or special assessments collected as taxes, except taxes or assessments not yet payable.

**David Augustine, Tax Collector**

The above certificate pertains to taxes and special assessments collected as taxes for the period prior to this current tax year.

**Dated this 17th day of August. This certificate is valid for the earlier of 60 days from this date or December 31, 2017. If this certificate is no longer valid please contact the Office of Treasurer and Tax Collector to obtain another certificate.**



---

**CERTIFICATE SHOWING TAXES A LIEN, BUT NOT YET DUE**

I, David Augustine, Tax Collector of the City and County San Francisco, State of California, do hereby certify, pursuant to the provisions of California Government Code Section 66492 et. seq., that the subdivision designated on the map entitled is subject to the following City & County property taxes and Special Assessments which are a lien on the property but which taxes are not yet due:

**Block No.            3549            Lot No. 064**

**Address:            1450 15Th St**

**Estimated probable assessed value of property within the proposed Subdivision/Parcel**

**Map:                    \$6,127,896**

**Established or estimated tax rate:                    1.2000%**

**Estimated taxes liened but not yet due:                    \$73,535.00**

**Amount of Assessments not yet due:                    \$353.00**

**These estimated taxes and special assessments have been paid.**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David Augustine".

**David Augustine, Tax Collector**

**Dated this 17th day of August. This certificate is valid for the earlier of 60 days from this date or December 31, 2017. If this certificate is no longer valid please contact the Office of Treasurer and Tax Collector to obtain another certificate.**

**OWNER'S STATEMENT:**

"WE HEREBY STATE THAT WE ARE ALL THE OWNERS OF AND HOLDERS OF SECURITY INTEREST OR HAVE SOME RIGHT, TITLE, OR INTEREST IN AND TO THE REAL PROPERTY INCLUDED WITHIN THE SUBDIVISION SHOWN UPON THIS MAP; THAT WE ARE THE ONLY PERSONS WHOSE CONSENT IS NECESSARY TO PASS A CLEAR TITLE TO SAID REAL PROPERTY; THAT WE HEREBY CONSENT TO MAKING AND RECORDING OF SAID MAP AS SHOWN WITHIN THE DISTINCTIVE BORDERLINE; THAT SAID MAP CONSTITUTES AND CONSISTS OF A SURVEY MAP SHOWING MONUMENTATION ON THE GROUND WITHIN THE MEANING OF PARAGRAPHS 4190 AND 4285 OF THE CIVIL CODE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA; AND THAT WE HEREBY CONSENT TO THE MAKING AND RECORDING OF SAID MAP PURSUANT TO DIVISION 4, PART 5, CHAPTER 3, ARTICLE 4 OF THE CIVIL CODE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA."

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, WE, THE UNDERSIGNED, HAVE CAUSED THIS STATEMENT TO BE EXECUTED.

**OWNERS:**

10 SOUTH SHORE, LLC, A FLORIDA LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY

Denis McMahon  
DENIS McMAHON, 10 SOUTH SHORE, LLC, MANAGING MEMBER

**BENEFICIARY:**

BANK OF THE WEST, A CALIFORNIA BANKING CORPORATION

BY: Cris Galvez TITLE: Vice President

Cris Galvez  
PRINT NAME

**OWNER'S ACKNOWLEDGMENT:**

A NOTARY PUBLIC OR OTHER OFFICER COMPLETING THIS CERTIFICATE VERIFIES ONLY THE IDENTITY OF THE INDIVIDUAL WHO SIGNED THE DOCUMENT TO WHICH THIS CERTIFICATE IS ATTACHED, AND NOT THE TRUTHFULNESS, ACCURACY, OR VALIDITY OF THAT DOCUMENT.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA )  
COUNTY OF San Francisco )  
ON August 9, 2020 BEFORE ME, Esteban Delatorre NOTARY PUBLIC  
(INSERT NAME)

PERSONALLY APPEARED: Denis McMahon  
WHO PROVED TO ME ON THE BASIS OF SATISFACTORY EVIDENCE TO BE THE PERSON(S) WHOSE NAME(S) IS/ARE SUBSCRIBED TO THE WITHIN INSTRUMENT AND ACKNOWLEDGED TO ME THAT HE/SHE/THEY EXECUTED THE SAME IN HIS/HER/THEIR AUTHORIZED CAPACITY(IES), AND THAT BY HIS/HER/THEIR SIGNATURE(S) ON THE INSTRUMENT THE PERSON(S) OR THE ENTITY UPON BEHALF OF WHICH THE PERSON(S) ACTED, EXECUTED THE INSTRUMENT.

I CERTIFY UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA THAT THE FOREGOING PARAGRAPH IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

WITNESS MY HAND AND OFFICIAL SEAL.

Esteban Delatorre ESTEBAN DELATORRE  
SIGNATURE PRINTED NAME

11/4/2020 2170541  
COMMISSION EXPIRES: COMMISSION # OF NOTARY:

San Francisco  
PRINCIPAL COUNTY OF BUSINESS:

**RECORDER'S STATEMENT:**

FILED THIS \_\_\_\_\_ DAY OF \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_, AT \_\_\_\_\_ M.  
IN BOOK \_\_\_\_\_ OF CONDOMINIUM MAPS, AT PAGE(S) \_\_\_\_\_ AT THE REQUEST OF  
FREDERICK T. SEHER.

SIGNED \_\_\_\_\_  
COUNTY RECORDER

**BENEFICIARY ACKNOWLEDGMENT:**

A NOTARY PUBLIC OR OTHER OFFICER COMPLETING THIS CERTIFICATE VERIFIES ONLY THE IDENTITY OF THE INDIVIDUAL WHO SIGNED THE DOCUMENT TO WHICH THIS CERTIFICATE IS ATTACHED, AND NOT THE TRUTHFULNESS, ACCURACY, OR VALIDITY OF THAT DOCUMENT.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA )  
COUNTY OF Contra Costa )  
ON August 11, 2020 BEFORE ME, Kameika Elisha Moore NOTARY PUBLIC  
(INSERT NAME)

PERSONALLY APPEARED: Cris Galvez  
WHO PROVED TO ME ON THE BASIS OF SATISFACTORY EVIDENCE TO BE THE PERSON(S) WHOSE NAME(S) IS/ARE SUBSCRIBED TO THE WITHIN INSTRUMENT AND ACKNOWLEDGED TO ME THAT HE/SHE/THEY EXECUTED THE SAME IN HIS/HER/THEIR AUTHORIZED CAPACITY(IES), AND THAT BY HIS/HER/THEIR SIGNATURE(S) ON THE INSTRUMENT THE PERSON(S) OR THE ENTITY UPON BEHALF OF WHICH THE PERSON(S) ACTED, EXECUTED THE INSTRUMENT.

I CERTIFY UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA THAT THE FOREGOING PARAGRAPH IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

WITNESS MY HAND AND OFFICIAL SEAL.

Kameika Elisha Moore Kameika Elisha Moore  
SIGNATURE PRINTED NAME

08/30/2020 2158691  
COMMISSION EXPIRES: COMMISSION # OF NOTARY:

Contra Costa  
PRINCIPAL COUNTY OF BUSINESS:

**SURVEYOR'S STATEMENT:**

THIS MAP WAS PREPARED BY ME, OR UNDER MY DIRECTION AND IS BASED UPON A FIELD SURVEY IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE SUBDIVISION MAP ACT AND LOCAL ORDINANCE AT THE REQUEST OF DENIS McMAHON ON DECEMBER 10, 2015. I HEREBY STATE THAT THIS PARCEL MAP SUBSTANTIALLY CONFORMS TO THE APPROVED OR CONDITIONALLY APPROVED TENTATIVE MAP, IF ANY.

I FURTHER STATE THAT ALL THE MONUMENTS ARE OF THE CHARACTER AND OCCUPY THE POSITIONS INDICATED AND THAT THE MONUMENTS ARE SUFFICIENT TO ENABLE THE SURVEY TO BE RETRACED.



Frederick T. Seher  
FREDERICK T. SEHER, P.L.S.  
LICENSE NO. 8216

DATE: 08-23-17

**CITY AND COUNTY SURVEYOR'S STATEMENT:**

I HEREBY STATE THAT I HAVE EXAMINED THIS MAP; THAT THE SUBDIVISION AS SHOWN IS SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME AS IT APPEARED ON THE TENTATIVE MAP, IF ANY, AND ANY APPROVED ALTERATION THEREOF; THAT ALL PROVISIONS OF THE CALIFORNIA SUBDIVISION MAP ACT AND ANY LOCAL ORDINANCE APPLICABLE AT THE TIME OF THE APPROVAL OF THE TENTATIVE MAP, IF ANY, HAVE BEEN COMPLIED WITH; AND THAT I AM SATISFIED THIS MAP IS TECHNICALLY CORRECT.

ACTING CITY AND COUNTY SURVEYOR  
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BY: James M. Ryan  
JAMES M. RYAN, L.S. 8630

DATE: 9-6-17



**FINAL MAP NO. 9025**  
**A 23 UNIT RESIDENTIAL**  
**CONDOMINIUM PROJECT**

BEING A SUBDIVISION OF THAT CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY AS DESCRIBED IN THAT CERTAIN DEED FILED FOR RECORD ON OCTOBER 03, 2012, DOCUMENT NUMBER 2012-J615427-00 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS, ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE RECORDER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA.

ALSO BEING A PART OF MISSION BLOCK 32

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

CALIFORNIA  
AUGUST, 2017



Frederick T. Seher & Associates, Inc.  
PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYORS  
841 LOMBARD STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94133  
PHONE (415) 921-7690 FAX (415)

1175

**TAX STATEMENT:**

I, ANGELA CALVILLO, CLERK OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DO HEREBY STATE THAT THE SUBDIVIDER HAS FILED A STATEMENT FROM THE TREASURER AND TAX COLLECTOR OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, SHOWING THAT ACCORDING TO THE RECORDS OF HIS OR HER OFFICE THERE ARE NO LIENS AGAINST THIS SUBDIVISION OR ANY PART THEREOF FOR UNPAID STATE, COUNTY, MUNICIPAL OR LOCAL TAXES, OR SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS COLLECTED AS TAXES.

DATED ..... DAY OF ....., 20.....

CLERK OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

**CLERK'S STATEMENT:**

I, ANGELA CALVILLO, CLERK OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, HEREBY STATE THAT SAID BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BY

ITS MOTION NO. .... ADOPTED ....., 20..... APPROVED THIS MAP ENTITLED, "FINAL MAP NO. 9025".

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I HAVE HEREUNTO SUBSCRIBED MY HAND AND CAUSED THE SEAL OF THE OFFICE TO BE AFFIXED.

BY: ..... DATE: .....  
CLERK OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

**APPROVALS:**

THIS MAP IS APPROVED THIS 1<sup>ST</sup> DAY OF September, 2017

BY ORDER NO. 186325

BY: ..... DATE: .....

MOHAMMED NURJI  
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS AND ADVISORY AGENCY  
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

**APPROVED AS TO FORM:**

DENNIS J. HERRERA, CITY ATTORNEY

BY:  .....

DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY  
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' APPROVAL:**

ON ....., 20....., THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA APPROVED AND PASSED MOTION NO.

....., A COPY OF WHICH IS ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE BOARD

OF SUPERVISORS IN FILE NO. ....

**GENERAL NOTES:**

A) THIS MAP IS THE SURVEY MAP PORTION OF A CONDOMINIUM PLAN AS DESCRIBED IN CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE SECTIONS 4120 AND 4295. THIS CONDOMINIUM PROJECT IS LIMITED TO A MAXIMUM NUMBER OF TWENTY-THREE (23) DWELLING UNITS.

B) ALL INGRESS(ES), EGRESS(ES), PATH(S) OF TRAVEL, FIRE/EMERGENCY EXIT(S) AND EXITING COMPONENTS, EXIT PATHWAY(S) AND PASSAGEWAY(S), STAIRWAY(S), CORRIDOR(S), ELEVATOR(S), AND COMMON USE ACCESSIBLE FEATURE(S) AND FACILITIES SUCH AS RESTROOMS THAT THE BUILDING CODE REQUIRES FOR COMMON USE SHALL BE HELD IN COMMON UNDIVIDED INTEREST.

C) UNLESS SPECIFIED OTHERWISE IN THE GOVERNING DOCUMENTS OF A CONDOMINIUM HOMEOWNERS' ASSOCIATION, INCLUDING ITS CONDITIONS, COVENANTS, AND RESTRICTIONS, THE HOMEOWNERS' ASSOCIATION SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE, IN PERPETUITY, FOR THE MAINTENANCE, REPAIR, AND REPLACEMENT OF:

(i) ALL GENERAL USE COMMON AREA IMPROVEMENTS; AND  
(ii) ALL FRONTING SIDEWALKS, ALL PERMITTED OR UNPERMITTED PRIVATE ENCROACHMENTS AND PRIVATELY MAINTAINED STREET TREES FRONTING THE PROPERTY, AND ANY OTHER OBLIGATION IMPOSED ON PROPERTY OWNERS FRONTING A PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY PURSUANT TO THE PUBLIC WORKS CODE OR OTHER APPLICABLE MUNICIPAL CODES.

D) IN THE EVENT THE AREAS IDENTIFIED IN (C)(i) ARE NOT PROPERLY MAINTAINED, REPAIRED, AND REPLACED ACCORDING TO THE CITY REQUIREMENTS, EACH HOMEOWNER SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE TO THE EXTENT OF HIS/HER PROPORTIONATE OBLIGATION TO THE HOMEOWNERS' ASSOCIATION FOR THE MAINTENANCE, REPAIR, AND REPLACEMENT OF THOSE AREAS. FAILURE TO UNDERTAKE SUCH MAINTENANCE, REPAIR, AND REPLACEMENT MAY RESULT IN CITY ENFORCEMENT AND ABATEMENT ACTIONS AGAINST THE HOMEOWNERS' ASSOCIATION AND/OR THE INDIVIDUAL HOMEOWNERS, WHICH MAY INCLUDE, BUT NOT BE LIMITED TO IMPOSITION OF A LIEN AGAINST THE HOMEOWNER'S PROPERTY.

E) APPROVAL OF THIS MAP SHALL NOT BE DEEMED APPROVAL OF THE DESIGN, LOCATION, SIZE, DENSITY OR USE OF ANY STRUCTURE(S) OR ANCILLARY AREAS OF THE PROPERTY ASSOCIATED WITH STRUCTURES, NEW OR EXISTING, WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN REVIEWED OR APPROVED BY APPROPRIATE CITY AGENCIES NOR SHALL SUCH APPROVAL CONSTITUTE A WAIVER OF THE SUBDIVIDER'S OBLIGATION TO ABATE ANY OUTSTANDING MUNICIPAL CODE VIOLATIONS. ANY STRUCTURES CONSTRUCTED SUBSEQUENT TO APPROVAL OF THIS FINAL MAP SHALL COMPLY WITH ALL RELEVANT MUNICIPAL CODES, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO THE PLANNING, HOUSING AND BUILDING CODES, IN EFFECT AT THE TIME OF ANY APPLICATION FOR REQUIRED PERMITS.

F) BAY WINDOWS, FIRE ESCAPES AND OTHER ENCROACHMENTS (IF ANY SHOWN HEREON, THAT EXIST, OR THAT MAY BE CONSTRUCTED) ONTO OR OVER 15TH STREET AND SHOTWELL STREET ARE PERMITTED THROUGH AND ARE SUBJECT TO THE RESTRICTIONS SET FORTH IN THE BUILDING CODE AND PLANNING CODE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO. THIS MAP DOES NOT CONVEY ANY OWNERSHIP INTEREST IN SUCH ENCROACHMENT AREAS TO THE CONDOMINIUM UNIT OWNER(S).

G) SIGNIFICANT ENCROACHMENTS, TO THE EXTENT THEY WERE VISIBLE AND OBSERVED, ARE NOTED HEREON. HOWEVER, IT IS ACKNOWLEDGED THAT OTHER ENCROACHMENTS FROM ADJOINING PROPERTIES MAY EXIST OR BE CONSTRUCTED. IT SHALL BE THE RESPONSIBILITY SOLELY OF THE PROPERTY OWNERS INVOLVED TO RESOLVE ANY ISSUES THAT MAY ARISE FROM ANY ENCROACHMENTS WHETHER DEPICTED HEREON OR NOT. THIS MAP DOES NOT PURPORT TO CONVEY ANY OWNERSHIP INTEREST IN AN ENCROACHMENT AREA TO ANY PROPERTY OWNER.

**NOTES:**

THE PROPERTY SHOWN HEREIN IS SUBJECT TO THE TERMS AND PROVISIONS AS DESCRIBED IN THE FOLLOWING RECORDED DOCUMENTS:

"PARTY WALL AGREEMENT"  
RECORDED ON AUGUST 10, 1954  
REEL 6428 AT IMAGE 420 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS

"NOTICE OF SPECIAL RESTRICTIONS UNDER THE PLANNING CODE"  
RECORDED ON DECEMBER 19, 2014  
DOC. 2014-J995312-00

"NOTICE OF SPECIAL RESTRICTIONS UNDER THE PLANNING CODE"  
RECORDED ON DECEMBER 19, 2014  
DOC. 2014-J995311-00

1176

**FINAL MAP NO. 9025  
A 23 UNIT RESIDENTIAL  
CONDOMINIUM PROJECT**

BEING A SUBDIVISION OF THAT CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY AS DESCRIBED IN THAT CERTAIN DEED FILED FOR RECORD ON OCTOBER 03, 2012, DOCUMENT NUMBER 2012-J515427-00 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS, ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE RECORDER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA.



ALSO BEING A PART OF MISSION BLOCK 32

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

CALIFORNIA  
AUGUST, 2017



**Frederick T. Seher & Associates, Inc.**  
PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYORS  
841 LOMBARD STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94133  
PHONE (415) 921-7890 FAX (415) 921-7855



**LEGEND:**

- ( ) INDICATES RECORD DATA IN DISCREPANCY WITH MEASURED, PER REFERENCE
- CITY MONUMENT SEARCHED FOR, NOT FOUND (S.F.N.F.)
- BRASS NAIL & TAG (3/4") L.S. 6216 RESET IN CURB PER ⑥
- L "L" CUT, ORIGIN UNKNOWN
- MN ##### MONUMENT IDENTIFICATION PER CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO DATABASE



**MAP AND DEED REFERENCES:**

- ① GRANT DEED RECORDED OCTOBER 03, 2012, DOCUMENT NUMBER 2012-J515427-00, ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE RECORDER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.
- ② MONUMENT MAPS NO. 261 AND 282, ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY SURVEYOR.
- ③ UNDATED BLOCK DIAGRAM OF MISSION BLOCK NO. 32, FILED AS "3549A" IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY SURVEYOR.
- ④ CORNER RECORD, DOCUMENT NUMBER AB 3549 LOT 043, FOR MONUMENT AT SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SOUTH VAN NESS AVENUE AND 14TH STREET, ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY SURVEYOR.
- ⑤ \*PARCEL MAP 2766\* RECORDED MARCH 28, 2007, IN BOOK 89 OF CONDOMINIUM MAPS, PAGES 151-152, ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE RECORDER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

**BOUNDARY NOTES:**

1. ALL ANGLES ARE 90° UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED; MONUMENT LINES ARE AS SHOWN.
2. ALL DISTANCES SHOWN HEREON ARE MEASURED UNLESS SHOWN OTHERWISE.
3. ALL DISTANCES ARE MEASURED IN FEET AND DECIMALS THEREOF.

**BASIS OF SURVEY:**

BLOCK LINES OF BLOCK 3549 WERE ESTABLISHED PARALLEL AND PERPENDICULAR TO THE CITY MONUMENT LINE IDENTIFIED AS BASIS OF SURVEY LINE.

**FINAL MAP NO. 9025**  
**A 23 UNIT RESIDENTIAL**  
**CONDOMINIUM PROJECT**

BEING A SUBDIVISION OF THAT CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY AS DESCRIBED IN THAT CERTAIN DEED FILED FOR RECORD ON OCTOBER 03, 2012, DOCUMENT NUMBER 2012-J515427-00 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS, ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE RECORDER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA.

ALSO BEING A PART OF MISSION BLOCK 32

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
 SCALE AS NOTED

CALIFORNIA  
 AUGUST, 2017



**Frederick T. Seher & Associates, Inc.**  
 PROFESSIONAL LAND SURV  
 841 LOMBARD STREET, SAN FR  
 PHONE (415) 921-7690 FAX (415) 921-7690

4 94133

SHEET THREE OF FOUR SHEETS

1177



**LEGEND:**

- SET BRASS NAIL & TAG (3/4") L.S. 6216 IN CURB
- ( ) INDICATES RECORD DATA IN DISCREPANCY WITH MEASURED, PER REFERENCE
- N/F NOW OR FORMERLY
- L " CUT, ORIGIN UNKNOWN

**NOTE:**


DISTANCES FROM BUILDING CORNERS TO PROPERTY LINE WERE MEASURED 5.0' UP FROM GROUND (OR AS NOTED). BUILDING TRIMS ARE EXCLUDED FROM THESE DISTANCES.

**LINETYPES:**



- RIGHT OF WAY (R.O.W.)
- PROPERTY LINE
- ADJOINING LOT LINE

**MAP AND DEED REFERENCES:**

- ① GRANT DEED RECORDED OCTOBER 03, 2012, DOCUMENT NUMBER 2012-J515427-00, ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE RECORDER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.
- ② MONUMENT MAPS NO. 281 AND 282, ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY SURVEYOR.
- ③ UNDATED BLOCK DIAGRAM OF MISSION BLOCK NO. 32, FILED AS "3519A" IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY SURVEYOR.
- ④ CORNER RECORD, DOCUMENT NUMBER AB 3549 LOT 043, FOR MONUMENT AT SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SOUTH VAN NESS AVENUE AND 14TH STREET, ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY SURVEYOR.
- ⑤ "PARCEL MAP 2766" RECORDED MARCH 28, 2007, IN BOOK 89 OF CONDOMINIUM MAPS, PAGES 151-152, ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE RECORDER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.
- ⑥ DEED RECORDED MAY 22, 2007, DOCUMENT NUMBER 2007-1389127-00, ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE RECORDER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.
- ⑦ DEED RECORDED MAY 11, 1949, BOOK 5183, PAGE 410 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS, ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE RECORDER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.
- ⑧ DEED RECORDED AUGUST 10, 1954, BOOK 6428, PAGE 419 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS, ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE RECORDER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.
- ⑨ "PARTY WALL AGREEMENT" RECORDED AUGUST 10, 1954, BOOK 6428, PAGE 420 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS, ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE RECORDER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.
- ⑩ GRANT DEED RECORDED JANUARY 12, 1959, BOOK 7443, PAGE 547 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS, ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE RECORDER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.



**DETAIL 1**



**DETAIL 2**  
NOT TO SCALE  
(DETAILS NEAR PROPERTY LINE  
EXAGGERATED FOR CLARITY)

**FINAL MAP NO. 9025**  
**A 23 UNIT RESIDENTIAL CONDOMINIUM PROJECT**

BEING A SUBDIVISION OF THAT CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY AS DESCRIBED IN THAT CERTAIN DEED FILED FOR RECORD ON OCTOBER 03, 2012, DOCUMENT NUMBER 2012-J515427-00 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS, ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE RECORDER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA.

ALSO BEING A PART OF MISSION BLOCK 32

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
SCALE AS NOTED

CALIFORNIA  
AUGUST, 2017



**Frederick T. Seher & Associates, Inc.**  
PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYORS  
941 LOMBARD STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94133  
PHONE (415) 921-7690 FAX (415) 921-7655