



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Certificate of Determination Community Plan Evaluation

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

Case No.: 2013.0538E
Project Address: 999 Folsom Street/301 6th Street
Zoning: MUR (Mixed Use-Residential)
SoMa Youth and Family Special Use District
85-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 3753/122
Lot Size: 16,389 square feet (0.38 acres)
Plan Area: Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan (East SoMa)
Project Sponsor: Jody Knight – Reuben, Junius & Rose LLP; (415) 567-9000
Staff Contact: Julie Moore, Julie.Moore@sfgov.org; (415) 575-8733

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project would demolish an approximately 1,500-square-foot (sf) former automotive station structure and surface parking lot and construct a new 8-story, 82-foot-tall, approximately 95,000-sf mixed-use building with frontages along Folsom Street, 6th Street, and Shipley Street. The proposed building would include 84 residential dwelling units (consisting of 34 two-bedroom, 49 one-bedroom, and one studio units) on floors 2 through 8. On the ground floor, the building would include 5,900 sf of commercial space in three tenant spaces with entries on each of the street frontages, an approximately 6,200-sf parking garage accessible from Shipley Street, a secure bicycle storage room and lockers, a residential lobby facing Folsom Street, a delivery entrance on 6th Street, and utility rooms.

(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.



Lisa Gibson
Environmental Review Officer

5/10/17

Date

cc: Jody Knight, Reuben, Junius & Rose, Project Sponsor; Supervisor Jane Kim, District 6; Ella Samonsky, Current Planning Division; Virna Byrd, M.D.F.; Exemption/Exclusion File

PROJECT DESCRIPTION (continued)

The proposed parking garage would include 37 vehicle parking spaces, of which 33 vehicles would be accommodated in triple stackers, two ADA accessible parking spaces, one car share space, and one additional space. The bicycle storage room and lockers would provide 85 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces; 16 Class 2 bicycle parking spaces would be located on the sidewalks in front of the project site on 6th and Folsom Streets. The project's open space consists of a second level rear yard and a roof deck of approximately 4,100 sf and 2,700 sf, respectively. Elevator, stair, and mechanical penthouses would extend up to 16-feet in height above the rooftop, as allowable by the Planning Code.

The project would remove two approximately 30-foot curb cuts on 6th Street and one 25-foot curb cut on Folsom Street. The existing curb cut on Shipley Street would be reduced from 32 to 10 feet, and would provide access to the parking garage. The project proposes additional design and streetscape improvements including recessing the ground floor from approximately four feet from the property line (effectively extending sidewalk space) on Shipley Street; recessing the ground floor approximately four feet from the property line at the commercial and delivery entries (a width of approximately 22 feet), and recessing the building up to seven feet for the residential lobby entry on Folsom Street, recessed planters, a strip of permeable pavers and seven new street trees along the edge of 6th Street, 16 Class 2 bicycle spaces in bicycle racks on 6th Street and Folsom Street, nine new street trees on Shipley and Folsom Streets, a yellow commercial loading zone adjacent to the delivery entry on 6th Street, and accessible curb ramps at the street corners. The commercial yellow zone on 6th Street would need to be designated by the SFMTA; therefore, the project sponsor would request that the SFMTA implement it.

PROJECT APPROVAL

The proposed project at 999 Folsom Street is subject to the following approvals:

Actions by the Planning Commission

- Approval of a Large Project Authorization from the Planning Commission is required per Planning Code Section 329 for the new construction of a building greater than 75 feet in height and greater than 25,000 gross square feet.

Actions by other City Departments

- Joint determination with the Planning Commission that the project would have no adverse shadow impact on Gene Friend Recreation Center or other parks subject to Section 295 of the Planning Code (*Recreation and Park Commission*)
- Approval of building permits for demolition and construction (*Department of Building Inspection*)
- Approval of a Site Mitigation Plan prior to the commencement of any excavation work (*Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Division*)
- Approval of the proposed curb modifications and on-street loading (*San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency*)
- Approval of street and sidewalk permits for any modifications to public streets, sidewalks, protected trees, street trees, or curb cuts (*San Francisco Public Works, Bureau of Street Use and Mapping*)

- Approval of any changes to sewer laterals. Approval of an erosion and sediment control plan prior to construction. Approval of project compliance with the Stormwater Design Guidelines (*San Francisco Public Utilities Commission*)

The Large Project Authorization approval by the Planning Commission is the Approval Action for the 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 999 Folsom Street/301 6th 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 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 999 Folsom Street/301 6th 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.^{2,3}

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

² San Francisco Planning Department. Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), Planning Department Case No. 2004.0160E, certified August 7, 2008. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1893>, accessed August 17, 2012.

³ San Francisco Planning Department. San Francisco Planning Commission Motion 17659, August 7, 2008. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=1268>, accessed August 17, 2012.

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.⁴

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

As a result of the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning process, the project site has been rezoned from Residential Service Mixed Use District to MUR (Mixed Use Residential) District. The MUR District is intended to facilitate the development of high-density, mid-rise housing and encourages the expansion of retail, business service, and commercial uses. It is also intended to serve as a buffer between the higher density, predominantly commercial area of Yerba Buena Center to the east and the lower-scale, mixed use service/industrial and housing area west of 6th Street. The proposed project and its relation to PDR land supply and cumulative land use effects is discussed further in the Initial Study - Community Plan Evaluation (CPE) , under Land Use. The 999 Folsom Street/301 6th Street site, which is located in the East SoMa District of the Eastern Neighborhoods, was designated as a site with building potential up to 85 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 999 Folsom Street/301 6th 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

⁴ Table 2 Forecast Growth by Rezoning Option Chapter IV of the Eastern Neighborhoods Draft EIR shows projected net growth based on proposed rezoning scenarios. A baseline for existing conditions in the year 2000 was included to provide context for the scenario figures for parcels affected by the rezoning.

and described the impacts of the proposed 999 Folsom Street/301 6th Street project, and identified the mitigation measures applicable to the 999 Folsom Street/301 6th Street project. The proposed project is also consistent with the zoning controls and the provisions of the Planning Code applicable to the project site.^{5,6} Therefore, no further CEQA evaluation for the 999 Folsom Street/301 6th 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 at the southeast corner of Folsom Street and 6th Street in San Francisco's South of Market neighborhood. The rectangular project site has frontages along three streets, approximately 165 feet on 6th Street and 100 feet on both Folsom and Shipley Streets. The eastern side of the site abuts a three-story building. Folsom Street is a three-lane, one-way street, with a bicycle lane and parking on both sides of the street; an SFMTA bus shelter and stop is located adjacent to the site. Sixth Street is a busy thoroughfare with three lanes in each direction; and Shipley Street is a narrow one-way street. The project vicinity is an eclectic mix of uses and structures ranging from one-story industrial buildings to five-story residential developments. Recently approved and proposed projects within one block include the following:

- 345 6th Street, across Shipley Street from the project site – a 9-story mixed use building with 102 single resident occupancy dwelling units and 1,700 sf of commercial space;
- 363 6th Street, between Shipley and Clara Streets south of the project site – a 9-story mixed use building with 104 residential units and ground floor commercial space;
- 265 Shipley Street, east of the project site – a 5-story, 9 unit residential building;
- 980 Folsom Street, across Folsom Street from the project site – a 7-story, 85-foot tall, mixed use building with 34 residential dwelling units and ground floor retail

The Gene Friend Recreation Center is located diagonally across from the site at the northwest corner of the Folsom and 6th Street intersection approximately 250 feet from the site. The Victoria Manalo Draves Park is located on Folsom Street, between Columbia Square and Sherman Street, approximately 350 feet to the southwest of the project site. Bessie Carmichael Elementary School is located at 349 – 365 7th Street, south of the park and 650 feet to the southwest of the project site. The project site is also located within the Filipino Cultural Heritage District.

The project site is located within a quarter mile of several local transit lines including Muni lines 12-Pacific, 14-Mission, 19-Polk, 27-Bryant, 30-Stockton, 45-Union, 47-Van Ness, and 8-Bayshore.

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 999 Folsom Street/301 6th Street site project is in conformance with the height, use and density for the site

⁵ San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Evaluation Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning and Policy Analysis, 999 Folsom Street/301 Sixth Street, June 10, 2015.

⁶ San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Evaluation Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning and Policy Analysis, 999 Folsom Street/301 Sixth Street, June 10, 2015.

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 999 Folsom Street/301 6th Street site 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 contribute considerably to the identified land use impacts related to PDR loss because redevelopment of the project site for residential and commercial uses could occur without the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning, nor would the project affect historic architectural resources as the subject building is not a historic resource nor is it a contributor to a historic district. The project would contribute to the significant and unavoidable impacts related to transit ridership on Muni lines in the vicinity and shadow impacts on nearby parks and 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.

Table 1 – Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
F. Noise		
F-1: Construction Noise (Pile Driving)	Applicable: temporary construction noise if pile driving cannot be avoided	The project sponsor has agreed to implement noise attenuation measures if pile driving is required for construction
F-2: Construction Noise	Applicable: temporary construction noise from use of heavy equipment	The project sponsor has agreed to develop and implement a set of noise attenuation measures during construction.
F-3: Interior Noise Levels	Not Applicable: CEQA generally no longer requires the consideration of the effects of existing environmental conditions on a proposed project's future users or residents.	N/A
F-4: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses	Not Applicable: CEQA generally no longer requires consideration of the effects of existing environmental conditions on a proposed project's future users or	N/A

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
	residents.	
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 generally no longer requires consideration of the effects of existing environmental conditions on a proposed project's future users or residents if the project would not exacerbate those environmental conditions.	N/A
G. Air Quality		
G-1: Construction Air Quality	Applicable: the project site is located within an identified Air Pollutant Exposure Zone. Project construction could exacerbate poor air quality.	The project sponsor has agreed to develop and implement a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan to reduce construction emissions.
G-2: Air Quality for Sensitive Land Uses	Not Applicable: The requirements of this measure are met by compliance with Health Code Article 38.	N/A
G-3: Siting of Uses that Emit DPM	Not Applicable: the proposed residential and commercial 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 residential and commercial uses are not expected to emit substantial levels of other TACs.	N/A
J. Archeological Resources		
J-1: Properties with Previous Studies	Not Applicable: No Previous Studies have been performed on the project site.	N/A
J-2: Properties with no Previous Studies	Applicable: Preliminary Archeological Review by the Planning Department indicates the potential to adversely affect	The project sponsor has agreed to implement archeological testing mitigation measure.

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
	archeological resources.	
J-3: Mission Dolores Archeological District	Not Applicable: Not within 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: the project would demolish a building structure	The project sponsor has agreed to dispose of demolition debris in accordance with applicable regulations.
E. Transportation		
E-1: Traffic Signal Installation	Not Applicable: automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis	N/A
E-2: Intelligent Traffic Management	Not Applicable: automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis	N/A
E-3: Enhanced Funding	Not Applicable: automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis	N/A
E-4: Intelligent Traffic Management	Not Applicable: automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis	N/A
E-5: Enhanced Transit Funding	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A
E-6: Transit Corridor Improvements	Not Applicable: plan level	N/A

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
	mitigation by SFMTA	
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 April 10, 2015 to adjacent occupants and owners of properties within 300 feet of the project site, SoMA neighborhood groups, and the city-wide distribution list. Overall, environmental concerns 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 individuals submitted comments on a variety of topics including: effects on light, air and space on neighboring properties; the height of the building relative to buildings in the project vicinity; shadow impacts on Gene Friend Recreation Center, including after the potential future redesign of the recreation center, and on Victoria Manalo Draves Park; additional traffic, noise and air pollution; gentrification of the East SoMa area; and altered traffic patterns, pedestrian and bicyclist hazards due to distractions (GPS and cell phones) not analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods EIR.

Comments on environmental topics are addressed in the Initial Study – Community Plan Evaluation topics of land use, wind, shadow, noise, air quality, transportation and circulation. As discussed, the proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts associated with land use, wind, shadow, noise, air quality, transportation and circulation beyond those identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.⁷

With regard to the one comment that the Eastern Neighborhood Area Plan EIR was based on data regarding residents and an economic base that is out of date and that the East SoMa has changed dramatically so that the low income and working class residents are being pushed out of the area by

⁷ San Francisco Planning Department, Initial Study – Community Plan Evaluation, Case No. 2013.0538E, 999 Folsom Street/301 6th Street. This document is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, in Case File No. 2013.0538E.

higher income residents, CEQA generally does not require the analysis of social or economic impacts. While there could potentially be an impact to property values or rents in the area, such an occurrence would be a socioeconomic impact, which is beyond the scope of CEQA. As stated in CEQA Guidelines Section 15131(a), “[e]conomic 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. Construction of the proposed project at 999 Folsom Street/301 6th Street would not create an economic change that would lead to the physical deterioration of the surrounding neighborhood.

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. CEQA Guidelines Sec 15162(c) establishes that once a project, in this case the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, is approved:

“[T]he lead agency’s role in that approval is completed unless further discretionary approval on that project is required. Information appearing after an approval does not require reopening of that approval.” [Emphasis added.]

That is, unless and until the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans themselves are amended or revised, the reopening of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR is neither warranted nor required under CEQA. Impacts to the environment that might result with implementation of the project were analyzed in the CPE Initial Study Checklist according to the project’s potential impacts upon the specific setting for each environmental topic, clearly stated significance criteria, and substantial evidence in the form of topic-specific analyses. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15130, the CPE Initial Study Checklist also includes analysis of the proposed project’s potential cumulative impacts for each environmental topic. The CPE Initial Study Checklist prepared for the project evaluates its potential project-specific environmental effects and incorporates by reference information contained in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. Project-specific analysis was prepared for the project to determine if it would result in any significant environmental impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

The CPE Initial Study Checklist determined that the proposed project would not have a significant impact that was not previously identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR for all CEQA Guidelines Appendix G environmental topics. The commenter has not provided any evidence that the environmental effects of the project have not been adequately covered by the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

CONCLUSION

As summarized above and further discussed in the project-specific initial study⁸:

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

⁸ Ibid.

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.

**Attachment A:
 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)**

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
---	--	-----------------	---	------------------------------

MITIGATION MEASURES FROM THE EASTERN NEIGHBORHOODS AREA PLAN EIR

<p>Project Mitigation Measure 1 – Archeological Testing</p> <p>Based on a reasonable presumption that archeological resources may be present within the project site, the following measures shall be undertaken to avoid any potentially significant adverse effect from the proposed project on buried or submerged historical resources. The project sponsor shall retain the services of a qualified archeological consultant having expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archeology. The archeological consultant shall undertake an archeological testing program as specified herein. In addition, the consultant shall be available to conduct an archeological monitoring and/or data recovery program if required pursuant to this measure. The archeological consultant’s work shall be conducted in accordance with this measure at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer (ERO). All plans and reports prepared by the consultant as specified herein shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment, and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Archeological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction of the project for up to a maximum of four weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of construction can be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce to a less than significant level potential effects on a significant archeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Sect. 15064.5 (a)(c).</p>	<p>Project sponsor/ archeological consultant at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer (ERO).</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of site permits</p>	<p>Project sponsor to retain a qualified archeological consultant who shall report to the ERO.</p> <p>Qualified archeological consultant will scope archeological testing program with ERO.</p>	<p>Archeological consultant shall be retained prior to issuing of site permit. Archeological consultant has approved scope by the ERO for the archeological testing program</p> <p>Archeological consultant retained. Date: _____</p> <p>Archeological consultant received approval for archeological testing program scope: _____</p> <p>Date: _____</p>
---	--	--	---	---

Attachment A: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
determines that the archeological resource is of greater interpretive than research significance and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible.				resource be adversely affected? Y N Additional mitigation to be undertaken by project sponsor? Y N
<p><i>Archeological Monitoring Program.</i> If the ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant determines that an archeological monitoring program (AMP) shall be implemented the archeological monitoring program shall minimally include the following provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the AMP reasonably prior to any project-related soils disturbing activities commencing. The ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant shall determine what project activities shall be archeologically monitored. In most cases, any soils- disturbing activities, such as demolition, foundation removal, excavation, grading, utilities installation, foundation work, driving of piles (foundation, shoring, etc.), site remediation, etc., shall require archeological monitoring because of the risk these activities pose to potential archaeological resources and to their depositional context; The archeological consultant shall advise all project contractors to 	Project sponsor/ archeological consultant/ archeological monitor/ contractor(s), at the direction of the ERO.	ERO & archeological consultant shall meet prior to commencement of soil-disturbing activity. If the ERO determines that an Archeological Monitoring Program is necessary, monitor throughout all soil-disturbing activities.	Project sponsor/ archeological consultant/ archeological monitor/ contractor(s) shall implement the AMP, if required by the ERO.	AMP required? Y N Date: _____ Date AMP submitted to the ERO: _____ Date AMP approved by the ERO: _____ _____

**Attachment A:
 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)**

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>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;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The archeological monitor(s) shall be present on the project site according to a schedule agreed upon by the archeological consultant and the ERO until the ERO has, in consultation with project archeological consultant, determined that project construction activities could have no effects on significant archeological deposits; • The archeological monitor shall record and be authorized to collect soil samples and artifactual/ecofactual material as warranted for analysis; • If an intact archeological deposit is encountered, all soils-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit shall cease. The archeological monitor shall be empowered to temporarily redirect demolition/ excavation/pile driving/construction activities and equipment until the deposit is evaluated. If in the case of pile driving activity (foundation, shoring, etc.), the archeological monitor has cause to believe that the pile driving activity may affect an archeological resource, the pile driving activity shall be terminated until an appropriate evaluation of the resource has been made in consultation with the ERO. The archeological consultant shall immediately notify the ERO of the encountered archeological deposit. The archeological consultant shall make a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archeological deposit, and present the findings of this assessment to the ERO. 				<p>Date AMP implementation complete: _____</p> <p>Date written report regarding findings of the AMP received: _____</p>

**Attachment A:
 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)**

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>Whether or not significant archeological resources are encountered, the archeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings of the monitoring program to the ERO.</p>				
<p><i>Archeological Data Recovery Program.</i> The archeological data recovery program shall be conducted in accord with an archeological data recovery plan (ADRP). The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the ADRP prior to preparation of a draft ADRP. The archeological consultant shall submit a draft ADRP to the ERO. The ADRP shall identify how the proposed data recovery program will preserve the significant information the archeological resource is expected to contain. That is, the ADRP will identify what scientific/historical research questions are applicable to the expected resource, what data classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions. Data recovery, in general, should be limited to the portions of the historical property that could be adversely affected by the proposed project. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be applied to portions of the archeological resources if nondestructive methods are practical.</p> <p>The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Field Methods and Procedures.</i> Descriptions of proposed field strategies, procedures, and operations. • <i>Cataloguing and Laboratory Analysis.</i> Description of selected cataloguing system and artifact analysis procedures. • <i>Discard and Deaccession Policy.</i> Description of and rationale for field and post-field discard and deaccession policies. 	<p>Archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO</p>	<p>If there is a determination that an ADRP program is required</p>	<p>Project sponsor/ archeological consultant/ archeological monitor/ contractor(s) shall prepare an ADRP if required by the ERO.</p>	<p>ADRP required? Y N Date: _____ Date of scoping meeting for ARDP: _____ Date Draft ARDP submitted to the ERO: _____ Date ARDP approved by the ERO: _____ Date ARDP implement-</p>

**Attachment A:
 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)**

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Interpretive Program.</i> Consideration of an on-site/off-site public interpretive program during the course of the archeological data recovery program. <i>Security Measures.</i> Recommended security measures to protect the archeological resource from vandalism, looting, and non-intentionally damaging activities. <i>Final Report.</i> Description of proposed report format and distribution of results. <p><i>Curation.</i> Description of the procedures and recommendations for the curation of any recovered data having potential research value, identification of appropriate curation facilities, and a summary of the accession policies of the curation facilities.</p>				ation complete: _____ _____
<p><i>Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects.</i> The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and Federal laws. This shall include immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the Coroner’s determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (Pub. Res. Code Sec. 5097.98). The archeological consultant, project sponsor, ERO, and MLD shall have up to but not beyond six days after the discovery to make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects with appropriate dignity (CEQA Guidelines. Sec. 15064.5(d)). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal,</p>	Project sponsor / archeological consultant in consultation with the San Francisco Coroner, NAHC, and MDL.	In the event human remains and/or funerary objects are found.	Project sponsor/ archeological consultant to monitor (throughout all soil disturbing activities) for human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects and, if found, contact the San Francisco Coroner/ NAHC/ MDL	Human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects found? Y N Date: _____ Persons contacted: Date: _____ Persons

**Attachment A:
 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)**

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>recordation, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects. Nothing in existing State regulations or in this mitigation measure compels the project sponsor and the ERO to accept recommendations of an MLD. The archeological consultant shall retain possession of any Native American human remains and associated or unassociated burial objects until completion of any scientific analyses of the human remains or objects as specified in the treatment agreement if such as agreement has been made or, otherwise, as determined by the archeological consultant and the ERO.</p>				<p>contacted: Date: _____ Persons contacted: Date: _____ Persons contacted: Date: _____</p>
<p><i>Final Archeological Resources Report.</i> The archeological consultant shall submit a Draft Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archeological resource and describes the archeological and historical research methods employed in the archeological testing/monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the final report.</p> <p>Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one (1) copy and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Major Environmental Analysis division of the Planning Department shall receive 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 in or the high interpretive value of the resource, the ERO may require a</p>	<p>Project sponsor/ archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO.</p>	<p>After completion of the archeological data recovery, inventorying, analysis and interpretation.</p>	<p>Project sponsor/ archeological consultant</p>	<p>Following completion of soil disturbing activities. Considered complete upon distribution of final FARR.</p> <p>Date Draft FARR submitted to ERO: _____</p> <p>Date FARR approved by ERO: _____</p>

Attachment A: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.				Date of distribution of Final FARR: _____ Date of submittal of Final FARR to information center: _____
<p>Project Mitigation Measure 2 – Construction Noise - Pile Driving (Mitigation Measure F-1 of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR)</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 are 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 sponsor shall also require that contractors schedule pile-driving activities for times of the day that would minimize disturbance to neighbors.</p>	Project sponsor and construction contractor(s).	Prior to and during construction.	Project sponsor, contractor(s), shall provide Department of Building Inspection and the Planning Department with monthly reports during construction period.	Considered complete upon receipt of final monitoring report at completion of construction.
<p>Project Mitigation Measure 3 – Construction Noise (Mitigation Measure F-2 of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR)</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</p>	Project sponsor and construction contractor(s).	Prior to and during construction.	Project sponsor, contractor(s), shall provide Department of Building Inspection and the Planning	Considered complete upon receipt of final monitoring report at

Attachment A: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>submitted to the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) to ensure that maximum feasible noise attenuation will be achieved. These attenuation measures shall include as many of the following control strategies as feasible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Erect temporary plywood noise barriers around a construction site, particularly where a site adjoins noise-sensitive uses; • Utilize noise control blankets on a building structure as the building is erected to reduce noise emission from the site; • Evaluate the feasibility of noise control at the receivers by temporarily improving the noise reduction capability of adjacent buildings housing sensitive uses; • Monitor the effectiveness of noise attenuation measures by taking noise measurements; and • Post signs on-site pertaining to permitted construction days and hours and complaint procedures and who to notify in the event of a problem, with telephone numbers listed. 			Department with monthly reports during construction period.	completion of construction.
<p>Project Mitigation Measure 4 – Construction Air Quality (Mitigation Measure G-1 of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR)</p> <p>The project sponsor or the project sponsor’s contractor shall comply with the following.</p> <p><i>A. Engine Requirements.</i></p> <p>1. All off-road equipment greater than 25 hp and operating for more than 20 total hours over the entire duration of construction activities shall have engines that meet or exceed either U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) or California Air Resources Board (ARB) Tier 3 off-road emission standards, and have been retrofitted</p>	Project sponsor; project contractor(s)	Prior to construction activities requiring the use of off-road equipment	Submit certification statement	Project sponsor/ contractor(s) and the ERO

**Attachment A:
 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)**

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>with an ARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy. Equipment with engines meeting Tier 4 Interim or Tier 4 Final off-road emission standards automatically meet this requirement.</p> <p>2. Where access to alternative sources of power are available, portable diesel engines shall be prohibited.</p> <p>3. Diesel engines, whether for off-road or on-road equipment, shall not be left idling for more than two minutes, at any location, except as provided in exceptions to the applicable state regulations regarding idling for off-road and on-road equipment (e.g., traffic conditions, safe operating conditions). The Contractor shall post legible and visible signs in English, Spanish, and Chinese, in designated queuing areas and at the construction site to remind operators of the two minute idling limit.</p> <p>4. The Contractor shall instruct construction workers and equipment operators on the maintenance and tuning of construction equipment, and require that such workers and operators properly maintain and tune equipment in accordance with manufacturer specifications.</p> <p>B. <i>Waivers.</i></p> <p>1. The Planning Department’s Environmental Review Officer or designee (ERO) may waive the alternative source of power requirement of Subsection (A)(2) if an alternative source of power is limited or infeasible at the project site. If the ERO grants the waiver, the Contractor must submit documentation that the equipment used for onsite power generation meets the requirements of Subsection (A)(1).</p> <p>2. The ERO may waive the equipment requirements of Subsection</p>				

**Attachment A:
 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)**

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed												
<p>(A)(1) if: a particular piece of off-road equipment with an ARB Level 3 VDECS is technically not feasible; the equipment would not produce desired emissions reduction due to expected operating modes; installation of the equipment would create a safety hazard or impaired visibility for the operator; or, there is a compelling emergency need to use off-road equipment that is not retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 VDECS. If the ERO grants the waiver, the Contractor must use the next cleanest piece of off-road equipment, according to Table below. If seeking an exception to (A)(1), the project sponsor shall be required to demonstrate that resulting construction emissions would not exceed significance thresholds for construction.</p> <p>Table – Off-Road Equipment Compliance Step-down Schedule</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="178 902 963 1117"> <thead> <tr> <th>Compliance Alternative</th> <th>Engine Emission Standard</th> <th>Emissions Control</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Tier 3</td> <td>ARB Level 2 VDECS</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Tier 3</td> <td>ARB Level 1 VDECS</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Tier 3</td> <td>Alternative Fuel*</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>How to use the table: If the ERO determines that the equipment requirements cannot be met, then the project sponsor would need to meet Compliance Alternative 1. If the ERO determines that the Contractor cannot supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 1, then the Contractor must meet Compliance Alternative 2. If the ERO determines that the Contractor cannot supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 2, then the Contractor must meet Compliance Alternative 3. ** Alternative fuels are not a VDECS.</p>	Compliance Alternative	Engine Emission Standard	Emissions Control	1	Tier 3	ARB Level 2 VDECS	2	Tier 3	ARB Level 1 VDECS	3	Tier 3	Alternative Fuel*				
Compliance Alternative	Engine Emission Standard	Emissions Control														
1	Tier 3	ARB Level 2 VDECS														
2	Tier 3	ARB Level 1 VDECS														
3	Tier 3	Alternative Fuel*														
<p>C. <i>Construction Emissions Minimization Plan.</i> Before starting on-site construction activities, the Contractor shall submit a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan (Plan) to the ERO for review and approval. The Plan shall state, in reasonable detail, how the Contractor will meet the requirements of Section A.</p>	Project sponsor/contractor(s)	Prior to issuance of a permit specified in Section 106A.3.2.6 of the Francisco Building Code	Prepare and submit a Plan	Project sponsor/contractor(s) and the ERO												

**Attachment A:
 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)**

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Plan shall include estimates of the construction timeline by phase, with a description of each piece of off-road equipment required for every construction phase. The description may include, but is not limited to: equipment type, equipment manufacturer, equipment identification number, engine model year, engine certification (Tier rating), horsepower, engine serial number, and expected fuel usage and hours of operation. For VDECS installed, the description may include: technology type, serial number, make, model, manufacturer, ARB verification number level, and installation date and hour meter reading on installation date. For off-road equipment using alternative fuels, the description shall also specify the type of alternative fuel being used. 2. The ERO shall ensure that all applicable requirements of the Plan have been incorporated into the contract specifications. The Plan shall include a certification statement that the Contractor agrees to comply fully with the Plan. 3. The Contractor shall make the Plan available to the public for review on-site during working hours. The Contractor shall post at the construction site a legible and visible sign summarizing the Plan. The sign shall also state that the public may ask to inspect the Plan for the project at any time during working hours and shall explain how to request to inspect the Plan. The Contractor shall post at least one copy of the sign in a visible location on each side of the construction site facing a public right-of-way. 				
<p><i>D. Monitoring.</i> After start of Construction Activities, the Contractor shall submit quarterly reports to the ERO documenting compliance with the Plan. After completion of construction activities and prior to receiving a final certificate of occupancy, the project sponsor shall submit to the ERO a final report summarizing construction activities, including the start and end dates and duration of each construction phase, and the specific information required in the Plan.</p>	Project sponsor/ contractor(s)	Quarterly	Submit quarterly reports	Project sponsor/ contractor(s) and the ERO

**Attachment A:
 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)**

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>Project Mitigation Measure 5 – Hazardous Building Materials (Mitigation Measure L-1 of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR)</p> <p>The project sponsor shall ensure that any existing equipment containing PCBs or DEPH, such as fluorescent light ballasts (that may be present within the existing buildings on the project site), are removed and properly disposed of according to applicable federal, state, and local laws prior to the start of renovation, and that any fluorescent light tubes, which could contain mercury, are similarly removed and properly disposed of. Any other hazardous materials identified, either before or during work, shall be abated according to applicable federal, state, and local laws.</p>	<p>Project sponsor and construction contractor(s).</p>	<p>Prior to and during construction activities.</p>	<p>Project Sponsor/ construction contractor(s).</p>	<p>Considered complete upon completion of demolition and proper abatement activities.</p>
IMPROVEMENT MEASURES				
<p>Project Improvement Measure 1 – Queue Abatement Methods</p> <p>It shall be the responsibility of the owner/operator of any off-street parking facility with more than 20 parking spaces (excluding loading and car-share spaces) to ensure that recurring vehicle queues do not occur on the public right-of-way. A vehicle queue is defined as one or more vehicles (destined to the parking facility) blocking any portion of any public street, alley or sidewalk for a consecutive period of three minutes or longer on a daily or weekly basis.</p> <p>If a recurring queue occurs, the owner/operator of the parking facility shall employ abatement methods as needed to abate the queue. Appropriate abatement methods will vary depending on the characteristics and causes of the recurring queue, as well as the characteristics of the parking facility, the street(s) to which the facility connects, and the associated land uses (if applicable).</p>	<p>Owner/operator of the project’s off-street parking facility.</p>	<p>Upon operation of the off-street parking facility.</p>	<p>Owner/operator; Planning Department.</p>	<p>Ongoing during operation.</p>

**Attachment A:
 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)**

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>Suggested abatement methods include but are not limited to the following: redesign of facility to improve vehicle circulation and/or on-site queue capacity; employment of parking attendants; installation of LOT FULL signs with active management by parking attendants; use of valet parking or other space-efficient parking techniques; use of off-site parking facilities or shared parking with nearby uses; use of parking occupancy sensors and signage directing drivers to available spaces; travel demand management strategies such as additional bicycle parking, customer shuttles, delivery services; and/or parking demand management strategies such as parking time limits, paid parking, time-of-day parking surcharge, or validated parking.</p> <p>If the Planning Director, or his or her designee, suspects that a recurring queue is present, the Department shall notify the property owner in writing. Upon request, the owner/operator shall hire a qualified transportation consultant to evaluate the conditions at the site for no less than seven days. The consultant shall prepare a monitoring report to be submitted to the Department for review. If the Department determines that a recurring queue does exist, the facility owner/operator shall have 90 days from the date of the written determination to abate the queue.</p>				
<p>Project Improvement Measure 2 – Warning Signal for Outbound Vehicle Exits</p> <p>Install an automatic, audible and visible warning signal to alert pedestrians and inbound vehicles of outbound vehicles exiting the project garage.</p>	<p>Owner/operator of the project’s off-street parking facility.</p>	<p>Upon operation of the off-street parking facility.</p>	<p>Owner/operator; Planning Department.</p>	<p>Ongoing during operation.</p>