



City and County of San Francisco
 San Francisco Public Works · Bureau of Street-Use and Mapping
 1155 Market Street, 3rd Floor · San Francisco, CA 94103
 sfpublicworks.org · tel 415-554-5810 · fax 415-554-6161



TENTATIVE MAP DECISION

Date: August 8, 2019

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

Project ID: 10102			
Project Type: 9 Units New Condominiums			
Address#	StreetName	Block	Lot
856	CAPP ST	3642	042
Tentative Map Referral			

Attention: Mr. Corey Teague.

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

(*In the course of review by City agencies, any discovered items of concern should be brought to the attention of Public Works for consideration.)

Sincerely,

ADRIAN VERHAGEN Digitally signed by ADRIAN VERHAGEN
 DN: cn=ADRIAN VERHAGEN, o, ou=DPW-BSM,
 email=adrian.verhagen@sfdpw.org, c=US
 Date: 2019.08.08 17:07:03 -07'00'

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 , CEQA Determination Date , 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 **Xinyu Liang** Digitally signed by Xinyu Liang
 Date: 2019.08.21 15:47:37 -07'00'

Date

Planner's Name
 for, Corey Teague, Zoning Administrator

NOTICE OF SPECIAL RESTRICTIONS UNDER THE PLANNING CODE

RECORDING REQUESTED BY

And When Recorded Mail To:

Name: Revival Properties, LLC

Address: 601 Van Ness Ave., #E3606

City: San Francisco

State: CA ZIP: 94102

CONFORMED COPY of document recorded

01/30/2019, 2019K727295

on _____ with document no. _____
This document has not been compared with the original
SAN FRANCISCO ASSESSOR-RECORDER

(Space Above This Line For Recorder's Use)

I (We) Revival Properties, LLC the owner(s) of that certain real property situated in the City and County of San Francisco, State of California more particularly described as follows: (or see attached sheet marked "Exhibit A" on which property is more fully described):

BEING ASSESSOR'S BLOCK: 3642; LOT: 042;

COMMONLY KNOWN AS: 856 CAPP STREET;

hereby give notice that there are special restrictions on the use of said property under the Planning Code.

Said Restrictions consist of conditions attached to **Variance Application No. 2017-000094VAR** authorized by the Zoning Administrator of the City and County of San Francisco on **January 25, 2019**, to **construct a four-story horizontal addition with a penthouse and roof decks that will extend into the required rear yard of the existing one-story, institutional building. The project also entails a change of use from institutional (vacant) to residential with nine dwelling units, and relocation and restoration of an existing one-story earthquake shack.**

The restrictions and conditions of which notice is hereby given are:

1. The authorization and rights vested by virtue of this decision letter shall be deemed void and cancelled if (1) a Site or Building Permit has not been issued within three years from the effective date of this decision; or (2) a Tentative Map has not been approved within three years from the effective date of this decision for Subdivision cases; or (3) neither a Site or Building Permit or Tentative Map is involved but another required City action has not been approved within three years from the effective date of this decision. However, this authorization may be extended by the Zoning Administrator when the issuance of a necessary Building Permit or approval of a Tentative Map or other City action is delayed by a City agency or by appeal of the issuance of such a permit or map or other City action.

NOTICE OF SPECIAL RESTRICTIONS UNDER THE PLANNING CODE

2. Any future physical expansion, even in the buildable area, shall be reviewed by the Zoning Administrator to determine if the expansion is compatible with existing neighborhood character and scale. If the Zoning Administrator determines that there would be a significant or extraordinary impact, the Zoning Administrator shall require either notice to adjacent and/or affected property owners or a new Variance application be sought and justified.
3. The proposed project must meet these conditions and all applicable City Codes. In case of conflict, the more restrictive controls apply.
4. Minor modifications as determined by the Zoning Administrator may be permitted.
5. The owner of the subject property shall record on the land records of the City and County of San Francisco the conditions attached to this Variance decision as a Notice of Special Restrictions in a form approved by the Zoning Administrator.
6. This Variance Decision and the recorded Notice of Special Restrictions shall be reproduced on the Index Sheet of the construction plans submitted with the Site or Building Permit Application for the Project. This Index Sheet of the construction plans shall reference the Variance Case Number.

NOTICE OF SPECIAL RESTRICTIONS UNDER THE PLANNING CODE

The use of said property contrary to these special restrictions shall constitute a violation of the Planning Code, and no release, modification or elimination of these restrictions shall be valid unless notice thereof is recorded on the Land Records by the Zoning Administrator of the City and County of San Francisco; except that in the event that the zoning standards above are modified so as to be less restrictive and the uses therein restricted are thereby permitted and in conformity with the provisions of the Planning Code, this document would no longer be in effect and would be null and void.



(Signature)

John Stricklin, President

(Printed Name)

Dated: January 30, 2019 at San Francisco, California.
(Month, Day) (City)

(Signature)

(Printed Name)

Dated: _____, 20 at _____, California.
(Month, Day) (City)

(Signature)

(Printed Name)

Dated: _____, 20 at _____, California.
(Month, Day) (City)

Each signature must be acknowledged by a notary public before recordation; add Notary Public Certification(s) and Official Notarial Seal(s).

EXHIBIT "A"
Legal Description

For APN/Parcel ID(s): Lot 042, Block 3642

THE LAND REFERRED TO HEREIN BELOW IS SITUATED IN THE CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO, COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA AND IS DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

Beginning at a point on the Westerly line of Capp Street, distant thereon 170 feet Northerly from the Northerly line of Twenty-Fourth Street; running thence Northerly along said line of Capp Street 52 feet; thence at a right angle Westerly 122 feet and 6 inches; thence at a right angle Southerly 52 feet; thence at a right angle Easterly 122 feet and 6 inches to the point of beginning.

Being a portion of Mission Block No. 154.

CALIFORNIA ALL-PURPOSE ACKNOWLEDGMENT

CIVIL CODE § 1189

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 1-30-2019 before me, Shirley E. Busch, Notary Public,
Date Here Insert Name and Title of the Officer

personally appeared John Stricklin
Name(s) of Signer(s)

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.



Signature Shirley E. Busch
Signature of Notary Public

Place Notary Seal Above

OPTIONAL

Though this section is optional, completing this information can deter alteration of the document or fraudulent reattachment of this form to an unintended document.

Description of Attached Document

Title or Type of Document: _____ Document Date: _____

Number of Pages: _____ Signer(s) Other Than Named Above: _____

Capacity(ies) Claimed by Signer(s)

Signer's Name: _____

Corporate Officer — Title(s): _____

Partner — Limited General

Individual Attorney in Fact

Trustee Guardian or Conservator

Other: _____

Signer Is Representing: _____

Signer's Name: _____

Corporate Officer — Title(s): _____

Partner — Limited General

Individual Attorney in Fact

Trustee Guardian or Conservator

Other: _____

Signer Is Representing: _____



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Certificate of Determination COMMUNITY PLAN EVALUATION

Case No.: 2017-000094ENV
 Project Address: 856 Capp Street
 Zoning: RTO-M (Residential Transit Oriented-Mission) Use District
 Calle 24 Special Use District
 40-X Height and Bulk District
 Block/Lot: 3642/042
 Lot Size: 6,370 square feet
 Plan Area: Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan (Mission Plan Subarea)
 Project Sponsor: Tara Sullivan, Reuben, Junius & Rose, LLP (415) 567-9000
 Staff Contact: Jeanie Poling - (415) 575-9072, jeanie.poling@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 on the west side of Capp Street on the block surrounded by 23rd, Mission, 24th, and Capp streets in the Mission Plan subarea of the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area. The project site contains a one-story 3,659-square-foot vacant church building and a 222-square-foot detached accessory structure (earthquake shack) at the rear of the lot. The project sponsor proposes to construct a four-story horizontal rear addition to the main building, resulting in a 14,383-gross-square-foot building with nine residences (four one-bedroom units and five two-bedroom units) and no institutional use. The earthquake shack would be restored and relocated within the rear yard. No vehicle parking is proposed. The building height would measure 40 feet tall to the roof, and 50 feet to the top of a stair penthouse. The project would involve approximately 300 cubic yards of excavation to an approximate depth of 2 feet.


(Continued on next page.)

CEQA DETERMINATION

The project is eligible for streamlined environmental review per section 15183 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines and CEQA section 21083.3.

DETERMINATION

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


 LISA GIBSON
 Environmental Review Officer

Date Jan 8, 2019

cc: Tara Sullivan, Project Sponsor
 Supervisor Hillary Ronen, District 9
 Natalia Kwiatkowska, Current Planning Division

Virna Byrd, M.D.F
 Exemption/Exclusion File

PROJECT DESCRIPTION (continued)

The residences would consist of four one-bedroom units and five two-bedroom units distributed on the four levels. Private open space would be provided in the form of private decks and patios and the rear yard. The proposed building would be supported by a mat slab foundation. An existing curb cut would be removed, and the project would include the planting of two street trees and three trees in the front setback of the project site. During the 13-month construction period, the project would involve approximately 300 cubic yards of excavation to a maximum depth of 2 feet. Construction equipment would include delivery vehicles and small hand-operated equipment required for standard wood frame construction. Project construction would not involve pile driving or the use of a crane.

PROJECT APPROVAL

The project at 856 Capp Street would require a building permit from the Department of Building Inspection for the proposed new construction on the project site. The project is subject to notification under Planning Code section 311 and requires a variance from rear yard (section 134) and dwelling unit exposure (section 140) requirements of the Planning Code. If discretionary review before the Planning Commission is requested, the discretionary review decision constitutes the *approval action* for the project. If no discretionary review is requested, the issuance of the building permit constitutes 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 EVALUATION OVERVIEW

CEQA section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines section 15183 provide that projects that are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan, or general plan policies for which an environmental impact report (EIR) was certified, shall not be subject to additional environmental review, except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. Section 15183 specifies that examination of environmental effects shall be limited to those effects that (a) are peculiar to the project or parcel on which the project would be located; (b) were not analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR on the zoning action, general plan or community plan with which the project is consistent; (c) are potentially significant off-site and cumulative impacts that were not discussed in the underlying EIR; or (d) are previously identified in the EIR, but which, as a result of substantial new information that was not known at the time that the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than that discussed in the underlying EIR. Section 15183(c) specifies that if an impact is not peculiar to the parcel or to the 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 856 Capp Street project described above, and incorporates by reference information contained in the programmatic EIR for the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans (PEIR)¹. Project-specific studies were prepared for the project to determine if the project would result in any significant environmental impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

¹ San Francisco Planning Department, *Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Final Environmental Impact Report (PEIR)*, August 7, 2008. Case No. 2004.0160E and State Clearinghouse No. 2005032048. Available at <http://sf-planning.org/area-plan-eirs>.

After several years of analysis, community outreach, and public review, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was adopted in December 2008. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was adopted in part to support housing development in some areas previously zoned to allow industrial uses, while preserving an adequate supply of space for existing and future PDR employment and businesses. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR also included changes to existing height and bulk districts in some areas, including the project site at 856 Capp Street.

The Planning Commission held public hearings to consider the various aspects of the proposed Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans and related Planning Code and Zoning Map amendments. On August 7, 2008, the Planning Commission certified the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR by Motion 17659 and adopted the Preferred Project for final recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.²

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

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR is a comprehensive programmatic document that presents an analysis of the environmental effects of implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, as well as the potential impacts under several proposed alternative scenarios. The Eastern Neighborhoods Draft EIR evaluated three rezoning alternatives, two community-proposed alternatives which focused largely on the Mission District, and a “No Project” alternative. The alternative selected, or the Preferred Project, represents a combination of Options B and C. The Planning Commission adopted the Preferred Project after fully considering the environmental effects of the Preferred Project and the various scenarios discussed in the PEIR. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR estimated that implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan could result in approximately 7,400 to 9,900 net dwelling units and 3,200,000 to 6,600,000 square feet of net non-residential space (excluding PDR loss) built in the plan area throughout the lifetime of the Plan (year 2025). The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR projected that this level of development would result in a total population increase of approximately 23,900 to 33,000 people throughout the lifetime of the plan.³

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 assessed 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 from RH-3 (Residential, House, Three-Family) to RTO-M (Residential Transit Oriented-Mission) District. The RTO-M Zoning District is well-served by transit, and has a mix of houses and apartment buildings within short

² Available at <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=1268>.

³ Table 2 Forecast Growth by Rezoning Option Chapter IV of the Eastern Neighborhoods Draft EIR shows projected net growth based on proposed rezoning scenarios. A baseline for existing conditions in the year 2000 was included to provide context for the scenario figures for parcels affected by the rezoning.

walking distance of transit and neighborhood commercial areas. While some one- and two-family structures are present, the character of the district is primarily of structures with three or more units of a range of sizes and types suitable for a variety of households. The overall residential density is regulated by the permitted and required height, bulk, setbacks, and open space of each parcel, along with residential design guidelines. Because of the high availability of transit service and the proximity of retail and services within walking distance, it is common that not every dwelling unit has a parking space and overall off-street residential parking is limited. Open space is provided on site in the form of rear yards, decks, balconies, roof-decks, and courtyards, and is augmented by nearby public parks, plazas, and enhanced streetscapes. The 856 Capp Street project site allows residential use to a height of 40 feet.

Individual projects that could occur in the future under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans will undergo project-level environmental evaluation to determine if they would result in further impacts specific to the development proposal, the site, and the time of development and to assess whether additional environmental review would be required. This determination concludes that the project at 856 Capp Street is consistent with and was encompassed within the analysis in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, including the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR development projections. This determination also finds that the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR adequately anticipated and described the impacts of the proposed 856 Capp Street project and finds that two mitigation measures from the PEIR are applicable to the 856 Capp Street project. The project is also consistent with the zoning controls and the provisions of the Planning Code applicable to the project site.⁴ Therefore, no further CEQA evaluation for the 856 Capp Street project is required. In sum, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and this certificate of determination and accompanying project-specific initial study comprise the full and complete CEQA evaluation necessary for the project.

PROJECT SETTING

The project site is located on the west side of Capp Street on the block surrounded by 23rd, Mission, 24th, and Capp streets in the Mission District. The project site is currently occupied by a one-story 1,944-square-foot church building at the front of the lot, a 1,494-square-foot building attached to the church building, and a 222-square-foot detached accessory structure (earthquake shack) at the rear of the lot. A 9-foot-wide curb cut exists in front of the south side of the property and leads to the driveway that leads to the rear of the parcel.

The project block along both sides of Capp Street contains two- to four-story residential buildings. Commercial uses exist along 24th and 23rd streets, and an entrance to the 24th Street BART station exists within the project block.

The project site is well served by public transit. Within one half-mile of the project site are seven Muni transit lines that operate at a frequency of at least every 15 minutes during the a.m. and p.m. peak periods: 12-Folsom/Pacific, 14-Mission, 14R-Mission Rapid, 14X-Mission Express, 27-Bryant, 48-Quintara/24thStreet, and 49-Van Ness/Mission). Six of those seven Muni lines (and the 24th Street BART station) stop at Mission and 24th Streets, a 400-foot walk from the project site.

⁴ San Francisco Planning Department, *Community Plan Evaluation Eligibility Determination, Current Planning Analysis, 856 Capp Street*, November 26, 2018.

Zoning districts in the vicinity of the project site are RTO-M (Residential Transit Oriented-House, Mission), the Mission Street NCT (Neighborhood Commercial Transit), and the 24th-Mission Street NCT.

POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR included analyses of the following environmental topics: 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 856 Capp 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 856 Capp Street project. As a result, the 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 856 Capp Street project would not remove any existing PDR uses, and the current zoning does not allow PDR uses. Therefore, the project would not contribute to any impact related to loss of PDR uses that was identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. Two existing buildings on the site are historical resources but the project would not demolish or materially alter those physical characteristics of the resources that convey their historical significance; therefore, the project would not contribute to the significant historic resource impact identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. Transit ridership generated by the project, which entails approximately eight p.m. peak hour transit trips, would not considerably contribute to the transit impacts identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. The project would not cast shadow on a park or other public open spaces. Therefore, the 856 Capp Street project would not result in any new or substantially more severe impacts than were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

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

Table 1 – Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
F. Noise		
F-1: Construction Noise (Pile Driving)	Not applicable: pile driving not required.	Not applicable
F-2: Construction Noise	Not applicable: no heavy construction equipment would be used.	Not applicable
F-3: Interior Noise Levels	Not applicable: the regulations and procedures set forth by Title 24 would ensure that existing ambient noise levels would not adversely affect the proposed residential uses on the project site.	Not applicable
F-4: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses	Not applicable: the regulations and procedures set forth by Title 24 would ensure that existing ambient noise levels would not adversely affect the proposed residential uses on the project site.	Not applicable
F-5: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses	Not applicable: the project would not include noise-generating uses.	Not applicable
F-6: Open Space in Noisy Environments	Not applicable: CEQA no longer requires the consideration of the effects of the existing environmental conditions on a proposed project's future users if the project would not exacerbate those environmental conditions.	Not applicable
G. Air Quality		
G-1: Construction Air Quality	Not applicable: the project site is not located within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone and the requirements of the Dust Control Ordinance supersede the dust control provisions of PEIR Mitigation Measure G-1.	Not applicable
G-2: Air Quality for Sensitive Land Uses	Not applicable: superseded by applicable Article 38 requirements.	Not applicable
G-3: Siting of Uses that Emit Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM)	Not applicable: the project would not include uses that would emit substantial levels of DPM.	Not applicable

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
G-4: Siting of Uses that Emit other Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs)	Not applicable: the project would not include uses that would emit substantial levels of other TACs.	Not applicable
J. Archeological Resources		
J-1: Properties with Previous Studies	Not applicable: the project site does not have any previous archaeological studies on record.	Not applicable
J-2: Properties with no Previous Studies	Applicable: soil disturbing activities proposed.	The Planning Department has conducted preliminary archeological review. The project sponsor has agreed to implement an archeological accidental discovery mitigation measure (see Project Mitigation Measure 1).
J-3: Mission Dolores Archeological District	Not applicable: the project site is not located within the Mission Dolores Archeological District.	Not applicable
K. Historical Resources		
K-1: Interim Procedures for Permit Review in the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area	Not applicable: plan-level mitigation completed by the Planning Department.	Not applicable
K-2: Amendments to Article 10 of the Planning Code Pertaining to Vertical Additions in the South End Historic District (East SoMa)	Not applicable: plan-level mitigation completed by the Planning Commission.	Not applicable

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
K-3: Amendments to Article 10 of the Planning Code Pertaining to Alterations and Infill Development in the Dogpatch Historic District (Central Waterfront)	Not applicable: plan-level mitigation completed by the Planning Commission.	Not applicable
L. Hazardous Materials		
L-1: Hazardous Building Materials	Applicable: the project would demolish a portion of a structure.	The project has agreed to implement this mitigation measure (see Project Mitigation Measure 2).
E. Transportation		
E-1: Traffic Signal Installation	Not applicable: automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis.	Not applicable
E-2: Intelligent Traffic Management	Not applicable: automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis.	Not applicable
E-3: Enhanced Funding	Not applicable: automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis.	Not applicable
E-4: Intelligent Traffic Management	Not applicable: automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis.	Not applicable
E-5: Enhanced Transit Funding	Not applicable: plan level mitigation by San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority (SFMTA).	Not applicable
E-6: Transit Corridor Improvements	Not applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA.	Not applicable
E-7: Transit Accessibility	Not applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA.	Not applicable
E-8: Muni Storage and Maintenance	Not applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA.	Not applicable
E-9: Rider Improvements	Not applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA.	Not applicable
E-10: Transit Enhancement	Not applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA.	Not applicable

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
E-11: Transportation Demand Management	Not applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA, and in compliance with a portion of this mitigation measure, the City adopted a comprehensive Transportation Demand Management Program for most new development citywide.	Not applicable

PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT

A “Notification of Project Receiving Environmental Review” was mailed on November 1, 2017 to adjacent occupants, owners of properties within 300 feet of the project site and interested parties. No public comments were received in response to the notification.

CONCLUSION

As summarized above and further discussed in the project-specific initial study⁵:

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

Therefore, no further environmental review shall be required for the project pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.

⁵ The initial study is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, in Case File No. 2015-000094ENV.

This page intentionally left blank