



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

REVISED Certificate of Determination Community Plan Evaluation

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Case No.: 2014-0376ENV
Project Address: 2918-2924 Mission Street
Zoning: Mission Neighborhood Commercial Transit (NCT) District
65-B/55-X, 65-B/55-X, and 65B/45-X Height and Bulk Districts
Block/Lot: 6529/002, 002A, 003
Lot Sizes: 2600, 2620, and 6433 sf; 11,653 sf total
Plan Area: Mission Subarea of the Eastern Neighborhoods
Project Sponsor: Mark Loper, Reuben, Junius & Rose, LLP
415-567-9000
Staff Contact: Julie Moore, 415-575-8733
Julie.Moore@sfgov.org

THIS COMMUNITY PLAN EVALUATION (CPE) SUPERSEDES THE CPE THAT WAS PUBLISHED ON AUGUST 30, 2017.

(Continued on next page.)

CEQA DETERMINATION

The project is eligible for streamlined environmental review per Section 15183 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines and California Public Resources Code Section 21083.3

DETERMINATION

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


for Lisa Gibson
Environmental Review Officer

September 20, 2018
Date

cc: Mark Loper, Reuben, Junius & Rose LLP, Project Sponsor; Supervisor Hillary Ronen, District 9; Linda Ajello Hoagland, Current Planning Division; Virna Byrd, M.D.F.; Exemption/Exclusion File

BACKGROUND

The Planning Department issued an Initial Study/Community Plan Evaluation (IS/CPE) for the 2918-2924 Mission Street Project (the “proposed project”) described below on August 30, 2017. The Planning Commission considered the project on December 15, 2017. On that date, the Planning Commission adopted the IS/CPE and approved the Conditional Use Authorization for the project and the Mission 2016 Interim Zoning Controls (Planning Commission Resolution No. 19865), which constituted the Approval Action under Chapter 31 of the Administrative Code. On January 2, 2018, J. Scott Weaver, Law Office of J. Scott Weaver, on behalf of the Calle 24 Latino Cultural District, filed an appeal of the CPE determination. The Board of Supervisors held a hearing on the appeal of the environmental determination on June 19, 2018. The Board upheld the appeal and reversed the determination by the Planning Department that the proposed project does not require additional environmental review. The Board found that there are environmental effects that are peculiar to the proposed project that were not analyzed as significant effects in the Eastern Neighborhoods Program Environmental Impact Report, and these effects are potentially significant off-site impacts. Specifically, the Board found the environmental analysis of the proposed project to be adequate in all respects except for the shadow analysis on the outdoor play areas of the Zaida T. Rodriguez early education school and directed the Planning Department to conduct further, more detailed, shadow analysis on these play areas to accurately assess the shadow impacts on these areas.¹

In response to this direction, the Planning Department has updated the IS/CPE to include additional analysis of the shadow effects of the proposed project on the Zaida T. Rodriguez early education school. The remainder of the IS/CPE has not changed, except for clarification of the list of required approvals by the Planning Commission and of the retail uses in the project description. This IS/CPE supersedes the August 30, 2017 IS/CPE for the proposed project.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project site consists of three lots on the west side of Mission Street between 25th Street and 26th Street; the southernmost lot extends from Mission Street to Osage Alley. The proposed project would demolish an approximately 5,200-square-foot (sf), one story, commercial building and adjacent 6,400-sf surface parking lot to construct an eight-story, 85-foot-tall, residential building with ground floor retail. As proposed, the project would require waivers, concessions, and/or incentives from Planning Code physical development limitations pursuant to California Government Code section 65915, commonly known as the state density bonus law, including for a building height 20 feet above the 65-foot height limit.

The proposed 67,300-sf building would include 75 dwelling units (18 studio, 27 one-bedroom, and 30 two-bedroom). Retail spaces, totaling about 6,700 sf, would front Mission Street on either side of the building lobby. A 44-foot-long white loading zone would be provided in front of the lobby and the existing parking lot curb cut would be replaced with sidewalk. A bicycle storage room with 76 class 1 bicycle spaces would be accessed through the lobby area and from Osage Alley. Six street trees and seven

¹ Board of Supervisors, Motion No. M18-094, Findings Reversing the Community Plan Evaluation – 2918-2924 Mission Street, July 10, 2018. This and other documents pertaining to the CPE appeal in Board of Supervisors File No. 180718 are available at <https://sfgov.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=3306976&GUID=573556D0-4ACA-4E05-A3BE-0E0EC81CF040&Options=ID|Text|&Search=180019>

bicycle racks (14 class 2 bicycle parking spaces) would be installed on Mission Street.² Open space would be provided by common terraces on the second floor and rooftop of approximately 1,050 sf and 5,750 sf, respectively, and approximately 1,100 sf of private decks. The proposed building would include an elevator and stair penthouse approximately 9 feet in height above the 85-foot-tall roof.

PROJECT APPROVAL

The project requires a conditional use authorization per Planning Code section 121.1, 121.7, and 303 for development of large lots in Neighborhood Commercial districts and a lot merger resulting in a lot frontage exceeding 100 feet in the Mission NCT District. Planning Commission approval of the conditional use authorization would constitute the approval action for the proposed project. The approval action date establishes the start of the 30-day appeal period for this CEQA determination pursuant to section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

COMMUNITY PLAN EVALUATION OVERVIEW

California Public Resources Code section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines section 15183 provide that projects that are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an environmental impact report (EIR) was certified, shall not be subject to additional environmental review except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. Section 15183 specifies that examination of environmental effects shall be limited to those effects that: a) are peculiar to the project or parcel on which the project would be located; b) were not analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR on the zoning action, general plan or community plan with which the project is consistent; c) are potentially significant off-site and cumulative impacts that were not discussed in the underlying EIR; or d) are previously identified in the EIR, but which, as a result of substantial new information that was not known at the time that the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than that discussed in the underlying EIR. Section 15183(c) specifies that if an impact is not peculiar to the parcel or to the proposed project, then an EIR need not be prepared for the project solely on the basis of that impact.

This determination evaluates the potential project-specific environmental effects of the 2918-2924 Mission Street project described above, and incorporates by reference information contained in the Programmatic EIR for the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans (PEIR)³. 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

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

³ Planning Department Case No. 2004.0160E and State Clearinghouse No. 2005032048

and businesses. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR also included changes to existing height and bulk districts in some areas, including the project site at 2918 – 2924 Mission 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.^{4,5}

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.⁶

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 NC-T (Neighborhood Commercial - Transit) District. The NC-T District is intended to promote high-density housing and a flexible mix of smaller neighborhood-serving retail and commercial uses. Restrictions on the size of non-residential uses would prohibit the development of large scale retail and office uses, and most PDR uses. The proposed project and its relation to PDR land supply and cumulative land use effects is discussed further in the community plan evaluation (CPE) initial study, under Land Use. The 2918 –

⁴ San Francisco Planning Department. Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), Planning Department Case No. 2004.0160E, certified August 7, 2008. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1893>, accessed August 17, 2012.

⁵ 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.

⁶ 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.

2924 Mission Street site, which is located in the Mission District of the Eastern Neighborhoods, was designated as a site with building up to 45 to 65 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 2918–2924 Mission 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 2918–2924 Mission Street project, and identified the mitigation measures applicable to the 2918–2924 Mission Street project. The proposed project is also consistent with the zoning controls and the provisions of the Planning Code applicable to the project site.^{7,8} Therefore, no further CEQA evaluation for the 2918–2924 Mission Street project is required. In sum, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and this certificate of determination and accompanying project-specific initial study comprise the full and complete CEQA evaluation necessary for the proposed project.

PROJECT SETTING

The project site is located on a block bounded by Mission Street to the east, Osage Alley to the west, 25th Street to the north and 26th Street to the south. The project area along Mission Street is primarily zoned Mission NC-T and characterized by two and three story buildings with ground floor retail. West of the site in the Residential Transit Oriented-Mission (RTO-M) zoning between Osage Alley and Orange Alley, the uses are predominantly residential buildings, two to four stories in height; with a seven-story apartment building at the northwest corner of Osage Alley and 25th Street. Buildings immediately adjacent to the project site are the Zaida T. Rodriguez Early Education School to the south and to the west across Osage Alley, Chase Bank to the north at the corner of Mission and 25th Street, and a mix of two and three story buildings used for a variety of uses including automobile repair, retail stores, residences, restaurants, and the Instituto Familiar de la Raza across Mission Street to the east. The western boundary of the Calle 24 Latino Cultural District is located along the eastern side of Mission Street; the boundary of the Calle 24 Special Use District is situated generally one block further east on Lilac Street.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) 24th Street station is located one block north of the project site, as are several MUNI bus lines including the 14-Mission, 14R-Mission Rapid, 48-Quintary/24th Street, 49-Van Ness/Mission and the 67-Bernal Heights. Access to U.S. 101 is less than one mile southeast of the site via Cesar Chavez Street.

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;

⁷ San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Evaluation Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning and Policy Analysis, 2918-2924 Mission Street, April 19, 2017. This document (and all other documents cited in this report, unless otherwise noted), is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2014.0376ENV.

⁸ San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Evaluation Eligibility Determination, Current Planning Analysis, 2918-2924 Mission Street, June 1, 2017.

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 2918-2924 Mission 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 2918-2924 Mission 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 displace an existing PDR use and, therefore, would not contribute to the significant and unavoidable land use impact. The proposed project would not impact a CEQA historical resource and would therefore not contribute to the significant and unavoidable historic architectural resources impact. The proposed project would not generate cumulatively considerable new transit trips and would therefore not contribute to the significant and unavoidable transportation impacts. The proposed project would not cast new shadow that would negatively affect the use and enjoyment of a recreational resource, and therefore would not contribute to the significant and unavoidable shadow impacts described in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. Shadow from the project would not substantially affect the use of the Zaida T. Rodriguez schoolyards, and would not exceed levels commonly experienced or expected in a dense urban environment.

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

Table 1 – Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
F. Noise		
F-1: Construction Noise (Pile Driving)	Applicable	The project sponsor has agreed to predrill piles where feasible and to use noise shielding devices.
F-2: Construction Noise	Applicable: temporary construction noise from use of heavy equipment	The project sponsor has agreed to develop and implement a set of noise attenuation measures during construction.
F-3: Interior Noise Levels	Not Applicable: CEQA no longer requires consideration of the effects of the existing environment on a proposed project’s future users or residents where that project would not exacerbate existing	N/A

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
	noise levels.	
F-4: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses	Not Applicable: CEQA no longer requires consideration of the effects of the existing environment on a proposed project's future users or residents where that project would not exacerbate existing noise levels.	N/A
F-5: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses	Not Applicable: the project does not include any noise-generating uses	N/A
F-6: Open Space in Noisy Environments	Not Applicable: CEQA no longer requires consideration of the effects of the existing environment on a proposed project's future users or residents where that project would not exacerbate existing noise levels.	N/A
G. Air Quality		
G-1: Construction Air Quality	Not Applicable: these requirements have been superseded by the San Francisco Dust Control Ordinance	The proposed project would be required to comply with the San Francisco Dust Control Ordinance and Article 22A
G-2: Air Quality for Sensitive Land Uses	Not Applicable: superseded by Article 38 requirements	N/A
G-3: Siting of Uses that Emit DPM	Not Applicable: the proposed residential and retail uses are not expected to emit substantial levels of DPM.	N/A
G-4: Siting of Uses that Emit other TACs	Not Applicable: the proposed project would not include a backup diesel generator or other sources of TACs	N/A
J. Archeological Resources		
J-1: Properties with Previous Studies	Not Applicable: no archeological studies are on file	N/A

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
	for this site	
J-2: Properties with no Previous Studies	Applicable: the project would require excavation.	The project sponsor has agreed to implement measures for the accidental discovery of archeological resources
J-3: Mission Dolores Archeological District	Not Applicable: the project is not located in the Mission Dolores Archeological District	N/A
K. Historical Resources		
K-1: Interim Procedures for Permit Review in the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area	Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation completed by Planning Department	N/A
K-2: Amendments to Article 10 of the Planning Code Pertaining to Vertical Additions in the South End Historic District (East SoMa)	Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation completed by Planning Commission	N/A
K-3: Amendments to Article 10 of the Planning Code Pertaining to Alterations and Infill Development in the Dogpatch Historic District (Central Waterfront)	Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation completed by Planning Commission	N/A
L. Hazardous Materials		
L-1: Hazardous Building Materials	Applicable: project includes demolition of an existing structure	Project sponsor has agreed to implement measures for handling and disposal of hazardous building materials
E. Transportation		
E-1: Traffic Signal Installation	Not Applicable: automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis	N/A
E-2: Intelligent Traffic Management	Not Applicable: automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis	N/A
E-3: Enhanced Funding	Not Applicable: automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis	N/A
E-4: Intelligent Traffic Management	Not Applicable: automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis	N/A

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
	analysis	
E-5: Enhanced Transit Funding	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A
E-6: Transit Corridor Improvements	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A
E-7: Transit Accessibility	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A
E-8: Muni Storage and Maintenance	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A
E-9: Rider Improvements	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A
E-10: Transit Enhancement	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A
E-11: Transportation Demand Management	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A

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

PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT

A "Notification of Project Receiving Environmental Review" was mailed on September 30, 2016 to adjacent occupants and owners of properties within 300 feet of the project site. Comments were received from 19 individuals or entities. Overall, environmental 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. Commenters expressed concern regarding noise and air quality during construction, hazardous materials in soil, shading on the childcare center's play yards and nearby properties, pedestrian safety on Osage Alley, lack of sufficient parking, and the scale of the project relative to the neighborhood buildings. Additional comments noted the need for more affordable housing and expressed concerns regarding displacement and gentrification in the vicinity, impacts on the Calle 24 Latino Cultural District, and cumulative air quality and greenhouse gas effects from additional traffic in the vicinity. As shown in the project-specific initial study, 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.

CEQA generally does not require the analysis of social or economic impacts. As stated in CEQA Guidelines section 15131(a), "economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not

be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes.” In general, analysis of the potential adverse physical impacts resulting from economic activities has been concerned with the question of whether an economic change would lead to physical deterioration in a community. The construction of 2918-2924 Mission Street would not create an economic change that would lead to the physical deterioration of the surrounding neighborhood.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR included an extensive analysis of the socioeconomic effects of the area plans and rezoning generally concluding that: (1) the rezoning would have secondary socioeconomic effects, (2) these effects would be more severe without the rezoning, and (3) these socioeconomic effects would not in turn lead to significant physical environmental impacts. The PEIR identifies improvement measures to address less than significant effects of potential displacement of some neighborhood-serving uses. Thus, the concerns about the socioeconomic effects of development under the area plans and rezoning are not new and were not overlooked by the plan-level EIR.

The Planning Department worked with ALH Urban & Regional Economics to prepare analyses of retail supply and demand, commercial and residential displacement, as well as a review of the relevant academic literature to evaluate whether gentrification and displacement of existing residents or businesses in the Mission can be attributed to market-rate residential and mixed-use development under the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning and area plans. Neither these analyses nor the literature establishes empirical evidence supporting the position that market-rate development under the rezoning and area plans is responsible for residential or commercial displacement.

The department also conducted additional analysis to evaluate whether the proposed project would cause or contribute to significant impacts on the physical environment related to population growth, such as transportation, air quality, and greenhouse gas emissions, beyond those identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. This analysis, like that previously provided in the community plan evaluations prepared for the project, is based on current data and modelling and uses the Planning Department’s latest environmental impact analysis standards and methodologies. This analysis shows that cumulative impacts on traffic congestion are the same or slightly less severe than anticipated in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. In addition, current data provided by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (“SFMTA”) show that transit capacity on most lines serving the Eastern Neighborhoods is better than previously anticipated. This is due largely to SFMTA’s implementation of a number of major transportation system improvements that were assumed to be infeasible at the time that the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was certified. Thus, there is no evidence that transportation and related air quality, greenhouse gas, and other impacts in the Eastern Neighborhoods plan areas are substantially more severe than the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR disclosed.

CONCLUSION

As summarized above and further discussed in the CPE Checklist⁹:

1. The proposed project is consistent with the development density established for the project site in the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans;

⁹ The CPE Checklist is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, in Case File No. 2014.0376ENV.

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

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

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
2918-2924 Mission Street (Case No. 2014.0376ENV)

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM					
Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Mitigation Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
MITIGATION MEASURES AGREED TO BY PROJECT SPONSOR					
CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES					
<p><u>Project Mitigation Measure 1 – Accidental Discovery (Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure J-2)</u></p> <p>The following mitigation measure is required to avoid any potential adverse effect from the proposed project on accidentally discovered buried or submerged historical resources as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a) and (c). The project sponsor shall distribute the Planning Department archeological resource “ALERT” sheet to the project prime contractor; to any project subcontractor (including demolition, excavation, grading, foundation, pile driving, etc. firms); or utilities firm involved in soils disturbing activities within the project site. Prior to any soils disturbing activities being undertaken each contractor is responsible for ensuring that the “ALERT” sheet is circulated to all field personnel including, machine operators, field crew, pile drivers, supervisory personnel, etc. The project sponsor shall provide the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) with a signed affidavit from the responsible parties (prime contractor, subcontractor(s), and utilities firm) to the ERO confirming that all field personnel have received copies of the Alert Sheet.</p>	Project sponsor	Prior to any soil disturbing activities	Distribute Planning Department Archeological Resource “ALERT” sheet to Prime Contractor, sub-contractors and utilities firms	Project sponsor, archaeologist and Environmental Review Officer (ERO)	Submit signed affidavit of distribution to ERO
Should any indication of an archeological resource be encountered during any soils disturbing activity of the project, the project Head Foreman and/or project sponsor shall immediately notify the ERO and shall immediately suspend any soils disturbing activities in the vicinity of the discovery until the ERO has determined what additional measures should be undertaken.	Head Foreman and/or project sponsor	Accidental discovery	Suspend any soils disturbing activity	Notify ERO of accidental discovery	ERO to determine additional measures
If the ERO determines that an archeological resource may be present within the project site, the project sponsor shall retain the services of an archaeological consultant from the pool of qualified archaeological consultants maintained by the Planning Department archaeologist. The archeological consultant shall advise the ERO as to whether the discovery is an archeological resource, retains sufficient integrity, and is of potential scientific/historical/cultural significance. If an archeological resource is present, the	Project Sponsor	In case of accidental discovery	If ERO determines an archeological resource may be present, services of a qualified		Considered complete upon implementation of any measures

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Mitigation Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p>archeological consultant shall identify and evaluate the archeological resource. The archeological consultant shall make a recommendation as to what action, if any, is warranted. Based on this information, the ERO may require, if warranted, specific additional measures to be implemented by the project sponsor.</p>	Archeological consultant		<p>archeological consultant to be retained. Identify and evaluate archeological resources</p>	<p>Make recommendation to the ERO</p>	<p>requested by ERO</p>
<p>Measures might include: preservation in situ of the archeological resource; an archaeological monitoring program; or an archeological testing program. If an archeological monitoring program or archeological testing program is required, it shall be consistent with the Environmental Planning (EP) division guidelines for such programs. The ERO may also require that the project sponsor immediately implement a site security program if the archeological resource is at risk from vandalism, looting, or other damaging actions.</p>	Project Sponsor	<p>After determination by the ERO of appropriate action to be implemented following evaluation of accidental discovery.</p>	<p>Implementation of Archeological measure required by ERO</p>		<p>Considered complete upon implementation of any measures requested by ERO</p>
<p>The project archeological consultant shall submit a Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archeological resource and describing the archeological and historical research methods employed in the archeological monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the final report.</p>	Project Sponsor	<p>Following completion of any required archeological field program.</p>	<p>Submittal of Draft/Final FARR to ERO</p>		
<p>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 copy, one unbound copy and one unlocked, searchable PDF copy on CD three copies 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.</p>	Project Sponsor		<p>Distribution of Final FARR.</p>		

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Mitigation Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
NOISE					
<p><u>Project Mitigation Measure 2 – Pile Driving Noise (Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure F-1).</u></p> <p>The project sponsor shall ensure that piles be pre-drilled wherever feasible to reduce construction-related noise and vibration. No impact pile drivers shall be used unless absolutely necessary. Contractors would be required to use pile-driving equipment with state-of-the-art noise shielding and muffling devices. To reduce noise and vibration impacts, sonic or vibratory sheetpile drivers, rather than impact drivers, shall be used wherever sheetpiles are needed. The project sponsor shall also require that contractors schedule pile-driving activity for times of the day that would minimize disturbance to neighbors.</p>	Project sponsor; project contractor(s)	During construction period	Prepare and submit monthly report during construction.	San Francisco Planning Department and the Department of Building Inspection	Considered complete on submittal of final monthly report.
<p><u>Project Mitigation Measure 3 – Construction Noise (Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure F-2).</u></p> <p>The project sponsor shall develop a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant. Prior to commencing construction, a plan for such measures shall be submitted to the Department of Building Inspection to ensure that maximum feasible noise attenuation will be achieved. These attenuation measures shall include as many of the following control strategies as feasible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Erect temporary plywood noise barriers around a construction site, particularly where a site adjoins noise-sensitive uses; • Utilize noise control blankets on a building structure as the building is erected to reduce noise emission from the site; • Evaluate the feasibility of noise control at the receivers by temporarily improving the noise reduction capability of adjacent buildings housing sensitive uses; • Monitor the effectiveness of noise attenuation measures by taking noise 	Project sponsor; project contractor(s)	Prior to construction activities During construction period	Prepare and submit a Noise Control Plan Prepare and submit monthly noise reports.	San Francisco Planning Department and the Department of Building Inspection	Considered complete on submittal of final monthly report.

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Mitigation Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
measurements; and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 					

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

The project sponsor shall ensure that any existing equipment containing polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) or di (2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (DEPH), such as fluorescent light ballasts (that may be present within the existing buildings on the project site), are removed and properly disposed of according to applicable federal, state, and local laws prior to the start of renovation, and that any fluorescent light tubes, which could contain mercury, are similarly removed and properly disposed of. Any other hazardous materials identified, either before or during work, shall be abated according to applicable federal, state, and local laws.

Planning Department and Department of Public Health (DPH)	Prior to approval of project	Comply with applicable laws during removal and disposal of any equipment containing PCBs or DEPH and document this process	Planning Department, in consultation with DPH; where Site Mitigation Plan is required, Project Sponsor or contractor shall submit a monitoring report to DPH, with a copy to Planning Department and DBI, at end of construction	Considered complete upon receipt of final monitoring report at completion of construction
---	------------------------------	--	--	---