Attachment A

California Environmental Quality Act Findings

PREAMBLE

In determining to approve the project described in Section I below (the "Project"), the San Francisco Planning Commission (the "Commission") makes and adopts the following findings of fact and decisions regarding the Project description and objectives, significant impacts, significant and unavoidable impacts, mitigation measures and alternatives, and a statement of overriding considerations, based on substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding and pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, California Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq. ("CEQA"), particularly Section 21081 and 21081.5, the Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, 14 California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq. ("CEQA Guidelines"), Section 15091 through 15093, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code ("Chapter 31"). The Commission adopts these findings in conjunction with the Approval Actions described in Section I(c), below, as required by CEQA.

These findings are organized as follows:

Section I provides a description of the proposed Potrero HOPE SF Master Plan project, the environmental review process for the Project, the City approval actions to be taken, and the location and custodian of the record.

Section II lists the Project's less-than-significant impacts that do not require mitigation.

Section III identifies potentially significant impacts that can be avoided or reduced to less-than-significant levels through mitigation and describes the disposition of the mitigation measures.

Section IV identifies significant project-specific or cumulative impacts that would not be eliminated or reduced to a less-than-significant level and describes any applicable mitigation measures as well as the disposition of the mitigation measures. The Final EIR/EIS identified mitigation measures to address certain of these impacts, but implementation of the mitigation measures will not reduce the impacts to a less than significant level.

Sections III and IV set forth findings as to the mitigation measures proposed in the Final EIR/EIS. (The Draft EIR/EIS and the Comments and Responses document together comprise the Final EIR/EIS, or "FEIR/FEIS"). Attachment B to the Planning Commission Motion contains the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP"), which provides a table setting forth each mitigation measure listed in the FEIR/FEIS that is required to reduce a significant adverse impact.

Section V identifies the Project Alternatives that were analyzed in the EIR/EIS and discusses the reasons for their rejection.

Section VI sets forth the Planning Commission's Statement of Overriding Considerations pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15093.

The MMRP for the mitigation measures that have been proposed for adoption is attached with these findings as **Attachment B** to this Motion. The MMRP is required by CEQA Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091. Attachment B provides a table setting forth each mitigation measure listed in the FEIR/FEIS that is required to reduce a significant adverse impact. Attachment B also specifies the agency responsible for implementation of each measure and establishes monitoring actions and a monitoring schedule. The full text of the mitigation measures is set forth in Attachment B.

These findings are based upon substantial evidence in the entire record before the Commission. The references set forth in these findings to certain pages or sections of the Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR/EIS" or "DEIR/DEIS") or the Comments and Responses document ("C&R") in the Final EIR/EIS are for ease of reference and are not intended to provide an exhaustive list of the evidence relied upon for these findings.

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

A. Project Description

The Project Sponsor proposes to demolish 620 existing public housing units and develop housing for a range of income levels for a total up to 1,080 net new units and 1,700 total units on the Project site.

The Project site is located in the southeastern area of the Potrero Hill neighborhood on the south slope of Potrero Hill. Specifically, the Project site is one and one-half blocks (or approximately 1,500 linear feet) west of Interstate 280 (I-280), four blocks (approximately 1,850 linear feet) east of U.S. Highway 101 (US 101), two blocks (approximately 950 linear feet) north of Cesar Chavez Street, and is bordered on the northwest by the Potrero Hill Recreation Center.

The Project site currently comprises two public housing developments in San Francisco: Potrero Terrace ("Terrace") and Potrero Annex ("Annex"). There are currently 38 residential buildings in the Terrace and 23 residential buildings in the Annex. In addition to the residential buildings, there is an administrative office in the Terrace at the northeast corner of 25th Street and Connecticut Street, and a Family Resource Center and child care center in the Annex.

The existing buildings are two to three stories or up to 24 to 34 feet in height. The Terrace residential buildings were constructed in 1941 and consist of one-, two-, and three-bedroom units, laundry facilities, and storage rooms. The Annex residential buildings were constructed in 1955 and consist of one-, two-, three-, four-, and five-bedroom units. The buildings at both sites are rectangular and are constructed of concrete block or wood-framed, with stucco covered exterior walls, built over a concrete foundation.

In addition to the Terrace and Annex properties, the proposed Project would include the development of a small parcel owned by the San Francisco Unified School District ("SFUSD") located on the southeast corner of 25th Street and Connecticut Street, sometimes referred to as "Block X." The SFUSD parcel is zoned P and is currently developed with a gated functioning basketball court, vacant land, and a paved area.

The proposed Project would replace all existing housing units, the Family Resource Center, and child care center; incorporate additional affordable housing and market-rate homes into the community; and add amenities such as open space, retail opportunities, and neighborhood services. Development is contemplated to occur in three non-overlapping phases, spanning from about 2016 to 2026 or longer, to minimize disruption to existing residents.

The proposed Project would increase the number of units on the site from 620 (14 of which are currently being used for non-residential purposes) to approximately 1,700, an increase of approximately 1,080 residential units. The final number of units is dependent on the unit mix. Of the new units, 606 would serve as replacement public housing dwelling units for those households currently occupying residential units the Terrace and Annex, on a one-for-one basis, that would remain affordable housing. Of the additional approximately 1,080 units, up to 42 percent (approximately 450 units) would be affordable housing while not less than 58 percent (approximately 630 units) would be market-rate housing. In total, up to approximately 63 percent of the proposed Project would be affordable housing while not less than the remaining 37 percent would be set aside as market-rate housing.

In addition to the development of housing units, up to 15,000 sf of ground-floor, neighborhood-serving retail or flex space would be developed along 24th Street between Arkansas Street and Missouri Street and at the corner of 25th Street and Connecticut Street. The proposed Project also includes the development of a 35,000 square foot Community Center, with daycare and preschool facilities, and open space, park and garden areas, and landscaping throughout the Project site.

There are approximately 1,055 off-street parking spaces proposed, primarily within underground or structured parking garages. Of the proposed parking spaces, 45 would be handicap accessible, and approximately 15 of these spaces would be designated for retail use and the Community Center and nine spaces would be designated as car-share spaces. The proposed Project would also provide approximately 600 unmetered on-street parking spaces. Dedicated bicycle facilities will be developed in various locations throughout the Project site. Bicycle parking would consist of secured spaces distributed within the residential buildings and the Community Center while the remaining spaces would be provided through on-street bicycle racks.

The proposed Project will incorporate existing and reconfigured roadways, with extensions of the streets out through the length of the Project site, eliminating awkward blocks, street configurations, and dead ends that currently exist. The proposed Project would upgrade and resize water, wastewater, drainage, gas and electric, and other utility infrastructure within the site as necessary. All onsite utilities would be undergrounded as a part of the proposed Project.

The Project site is zoned RM-2 and P (Public).Under Section 206.2 of the *Planning Code*, RM-2 is defined as Residential, Mixed-Use—Moderate Density. The Project site is within a 40-X Height and Bulk District, which sets building height limits at 40 feet, with no bulk restriction. The proposed density of the Project could be approved through a Height and Map Amendment to change the height and bulk designations for portions of the site that are proposed above 40 feet. In addition, the Proposed Project would require a Special Use District ("SUD") to allow the transfer of densities across newly created lots and to allow more retail uses, and a rezoning of the former SFUSD "Block X" site from P to a RM-2 District.

The proposed Project is within the Showplace Square/Potrero Area Plan, which is a part of the greater Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, approved in January 2009. The Showplace Square/Potrero Area Plan

identifies the proposed Project site as an area that will be redeveloped under the San Francisco Housing for People Everywhere (HOPE) SF Program. The HOPE SF, a partnership between the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development ("MOHCD") and the San Francisco Housing Authority ("SFHA"), proposes to redevelop the Potrero Terrace and Annex housing developments as a part of its program to revitalize distressed public housing developments in San Francisco.

B. Project Objectives

The Project Sponsor has developed the following objectives for the proposed Project:

- Implement the City's HOPE SF Initiative and the Showplace Square/Potrero Area Plan.
- Create an economically integrated neighborhood with new public housing units, affordable rental apartments, and market rate for sale and/or rental homes.
- Establish physical and social connections between the Project site and the larger Potrero Hill neighborhood.
- Provide employment opportunities for current public housing residents.
- Provide community facilities, including space for on-site services and programs.
- Create a comprehensive services plan to address gaps in services and facilitate access to existing programs and resources.
- Build a new 24th Street neighborhood center with a community center, senior housing, and a park.
- Provide dramatically enhanced infrastructure, including upgrading and resizing water, wastewater, drainage, gas and electric, and other utility infrastructure within the site as necessary.
- Provide an increased roadway, bicycle and transit network, as well as increased pedestrian access, across the entire Project site to enhance safety and convenience.
- Develop as much housing as possible and feasible in buildings that would range from three to six stories tall.
- Provide space for community-serving retail stores.
- Create a financially feasible plan for redevelopment within the constraint of limited availability of public subsidies.
- Incorporate green and healthy development principles that include green construction and healthy buildings, a walkable neighborhood, stormwater management, and that meets the requirements for Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design-Neighborhood Development ("LEED-ND").

C. Project Approvals

The Project requires the following Planning Commission approvals and/or actions:

- Certification of the Final EIR/EIS, and adoption of CEQA Findings and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

- The Planning Commission finds that that acquisition by the City of Parcel X and the other approvals set forth below are consistent with the San Francisco General Plan

- Approval of the Potrero HOPE SF Design Standards and Guidelines

- Approval of "Major Modifications" to the Potrero HOPE SF Design Standards and Guidelines on a project-by-project basis if requested for subsequent phases of development, an application and approval process established in the Special Use District ("SUD")

- Recommendation to the Board of Supervisors for approval of height and bulk map amendments

- Recommendation to the Board of Supervisors of a SUD that will establish development controls largely through referencing the DCDG, and new procedures for reviewing and approving both buildings and community improvements (e.g., infrastructure)

- Recommendation to the Board of Supervisors for an amendment to the Planning Code to allow a rezoning of a portion of the Project site from P to a RM-2 District

The Project requires the following Planning Director approvals and/or actions:

- Final approval of "Community Improvements" (or "Development Phase") application for infrastructure and other community improvements after coordinating input from other Agencies, an application and approval process established in the SUD

- Approval of "Design Review" application, for the construction of each individual building to assure compliance with DCDG, the Planning Code, and General Plan, an application and approval process established in the SUD

- Approval of "Minor Modifications" to the Potrero HOPE SF Design Standards and Guidelines on a project-by-project basis if requested for subsequent phases of development

The Project requires the following Board of Supervisors approvals and/or actions:

- Approval of a SUD with recommendation from the Planning Commission

- Approval of zoning map amendments for a portion of the site from P to an RM-2 District and to map the SUD with recommendation from the Planning Commission

- Affirm certification of EIR, if appealed

- Approval of height and bulk map amendments with recommendation from the Planning Commission

- Approval of a Development Agreement with master developer after recommendation from Planning Commission

The Project requires the following Housing Authority approvals and/or actions:

- Approval of HUD's Disposition and Demolition Agreement
- Approval of a Master Development Agreement with master developer
- Approval of Disposition and Development Agreements with master developer for each phase of development
- Approval of ground leases for developers of affordable rental housing sites

Actions by Other City Departments and State Agencies

- Demolition , grading and building permits (Department of Building Inspection)
- Relocation of bus stops and location of curb cuts, curbside loading zones and on-street parking spaces (San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency)
- Approval of Subdivision Map and Condominium Maps; approval for changes, acceptance of, or vacations of public rights-of-way; and tree removal and replacement permits (San Francisco Department of Public Works)

D. Environmental Review

On November 10, 2010, the Planning Department, in compliance with CEQA and its CEQA procedures, issued a Notice of Preparation ("NOP") to prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Report. Individuals and agencies that received these notices included: all occupants of the Potrero Terrace and Annex housing developments; owners of properties within 300 feet of the Project site; owners and tenants of properties adjacent to the Project site; other potentially interested parties, including various regional and state agencies; and neighborhood organizations.

On November 22, 2010, a scoping meeting was held. The scoping meeting provided the public and affected governmental agencies with an opportunity to present their environmental concerns regarding the proposed Project.

On May 2, 2012, HUD issued a notice of intent (NOI) to prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement to inform agencies and the general public that a joint EIR/EIS was being prepared and invited comments on the scope and content of the document. The NOI provided contact information for City staff responsible for the NOI, and stated that a public scoping meeting would be held no less than 15 days following publication of the NOI.

On May 17, 2012, a scoping meeting was held. The scoping meeting provided the public and affected governmental agencies with an opportunity to present their environmental concerns regarding the proposed Project.

On November 5, 2014, the Department published the Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement (hereinafter "DEIR/DEIS"). The DEIR/DEIS was made available for a

60-day public review period, beginning on November 7, 2014, to solicit public comment from agencies and individuals on the adequacy and accuracy of the DEIR/DEIS.

A Notice of Availability ("NOA") of the DEIR/DEIS was posted on the websites of the Department and the MOHCD, as well as in the Federal Register, on November 7, 2014.

The NOA was distributed to applicable local and State agencies, interested parties, owners and occupants of properties within 300 feet of the Project site, individuals likely to be interested in the potential impacts of the Proposed Project, commenters on the NOP and NOI, and those individuals who requested a copy of the DEIR/DEIS.

Copies of the Draft EIR/EIS were also available for public review during normal business hours at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA; the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission, First Floor, San Francisco, CA 94105; and the MOHCD offices at 1 South Van Ness Avenue 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103.

Notice of Completion was filed with the State Secretary of Resources via the State Clearinghouse on November 7, 2014.

The Commission held a duly advertised public hearing on the DEIR/DEIS on December 11, 2014, at which opportunity for public comment was given, and public comment was received on the DEIR/DEIS. The period for commenting on the EIR/EIS ended on January 7, 2015.

The Department prepared responses to comments on environmental issues received during the 60-day public review period for the DEIR/DEIS, prepared revisions to the text of the DEIR/DEIS in response to comments received or based on additional information that became available during the public review period, and corrected errors in the DEIR/DEIS. This material was presented in a Responses to Comments document, published on October 8, 2015, distributed to the Commission and all parties who commented on the DEIR/DEIS, and made available to others upon request at the Department.

A Final Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement (hereinafter "FEIR/FEIS") has been prepared by the Department, consisting of the DEIR/DEIS, any consultations and comments received during the review process, any additional information that became available, and the Responses to Comments document, all as required by law.

Project EIR/EIS files have been made available for review by the Commission and the public. These files are available for public review at the Department at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, and are part of the record before the Commission.

On December 10, 2015, the Commission reviewed and considered the FEIR/FEIS and found that the contents of said report and the procedures through which the FEIR/FEIS was prepared, publicized, and reviewed comply with the provisions of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. The FEIR/FEIS was certified by the Commission on December 10, 2015 by adoption of its Motion No. 19530.

E. Content and Location of Record

The record upon which all findings and determinations related to the adoption of the proposed project are based include the following:

- The FEIR/FEIS, and all documents referenced in or relied upon by the FEIR/FEIS;
- All information (including written evidence and testimony) provided by City staff to the Planning Commission relating to the FEIR/FEIS, the proposed approvals and entitlements, the Project, and the alternatives set forth in the FEIR/FEIS;
- All information (including written evidence and testimony) presented to the Planning Commission by the environmental consultant and subconsultants who prepared the FEIR/FEIS, or incorporated into reports presented to the Planning Commission;
- All information (including written evidence and testimony) presented to the City from other public agencies relating to the project or the FEIR/FEIS;
- All applications, letters, testimony, and presentations presented to the City by the Project Sponsor and its consultants in connection with the project;
- All information (including written evidence and testimony) presented at any public hearing or workshop related to the project and the EIR/EIS;
- The MMRP; and,
- All other documents comprising the record pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21167.6(e).

The public hearing transcripts and audio files, a copy of all letters regarding the FEIR/FEIS received during the public review period, the administrative record, and background documentation for the FEIR/FEIS are located at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, 4th Floor, San Francisco. The Planning Department, Jonas P. Ionin, is the custodian of these documents and materials.

F. Findings about Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The following Sections II, III and IV set forth the Commission's findings about the FEIR/FEIS's determinations regarding significant environmental impacts and the mitigation measures proposed to address them. These findings provide the written analysis and conclusions of the Commission regarding the environmental impacts of the Project and the mitigation measures included as part of the FEIR/FEIS and adopted by the Commission as part of the Project. To avoid duplication and redundancy, and because the Commission agrees with, and hereby adopts, the conclusions in the FEIR/FEIS, these findings will not repeat the analysis and conclusions in the FEIR/FEIS but instead incorporate them by reference and rely upon them as substantial evidence supporting these findings.

In making these findings, the Commission has considered the opinions of staff and experts, other agencies, and members of the public. The Commission finds that (i) the determination of significance thresholds is a judgment decision within the discretion of the City and County of San Francisco; (ii) the

significance thresholds used in the FEIR/FEIS are supported by substantial evidence in the record, including the expert opinion of the FEIR/FEIS preparers and City staff; and (iii) the significance thresholds used in the FEIR/FEIS provide reasonable and appropriate means of assessing the significance of the adverse environmental effects of the Project. Thus, although, as a legal matter, the Commission is not bound by the significance determinations in the FEIR/FEIS (see Public Resources Code, Section 21082.2, subdivision (e)), the Commission finds them persuasive and hereby adopts them as its own.

These findings do not attempt to describe the full analysis of each environmental impact contained in the FEIR/FEIS. Instead, a full explanation of these environmental findings and conclusions can be found in the FEIR/FEIS, and these findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in the FEIR/FEIS supporting the determination regarding the project impact and mitigation measures designed to address those impacts. In making these findings, the Commission ratifies, adopts and incorporates in these findings the determinations and conclusions of the FEIR/FEIS relating to environmental impacts and mitigation measures, except to the extent any such determinations and conclusions are specifically and expressly modified by these findings.

As set forth below, the Commission adopts and incorporates all of the mitigation measures set forth in the Project FEIR/FEIS, which are set forth in the attached MMRP, to reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project. The Commission intends to adopt the mitigation measures proposed in the FEIR/FEIS. Accordingly, in the event a mitigation measure recommended in the FEIR/FEIS has inadvertently been omitted in these findings or the MMRP, such mitigation measure is hereby adopted and incorporated in the findings below by reference. In addition, in the event the language describing a mitigation measure set forth in these findings or the MMRP fails to accurately reflect the mitigation measures in the FEIR/FEIS due to a clerical error, the language of the policies and implementation measures as set forth in the FEIR/FEIS shall control. The impact numbers and mitigation measure numbers used in these findings reflect the information contained in the FEIR/FEIS.

In Sections II, III and IV below, the same findings are made for a category of environmental impacts and mitigation measures. Rather than repeat the identical finding to address each and every significant effect and mitigation measure, the initial finding obviates the need for such repetition because in no instance is the Commission rejecting the conclusions of the FEIR/FEIS or the mitigation measures recommended in the FEIR/FEIS for the Project.

These findings are based upon substantial evidence in the entire record before the Planning Commission. The references set forth in these findings to certain pages or sections of the EIR/EIS or responses to comments in the Final EIR/EIS are for ease of reference and are not intended to provide an exhaustive list of the evidence relied upon for these findings.

II. LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

The Final EIR/EIS found that implementation of the Project would result in less-than-significant impacts in the following environmental topic areas: Land Use and Land Use Planning; Aesthetics; Population and Housing; Greenhouse Gas Emissions; Wind and Shadow; Recreation; Utilities and Service Systems; Public Services; Hydrology and Water Quality; Mineral and Energy Resources; and Agriculture and Forest Resources.

Note: On September 27, 2013, Governor Brown signed Senate Bill (SB) 743, which became effective on January 1, 2014. Among other provisions, SB 743 added Section 21099 to the Public Resources Code ("PRC") and eliminated the analysis of aesthetics and parking impacts for certain urban infill projects under CEQA. The proposed Project meets the definition of a mixed-use residential project on an infill site within a transit priority area as specified by Section 21099. Accordingly, this document does not provide CEQA conclusions regarding aesthetics and parking, which can no longer be considered in determining the significance of the proposed Project's physical environmental effects under CEQA. Implementation of SB 743 was subsequent to the publication of the NOP, which had indicated that the EIR would include a discussion of aesthetics- and parking-related impacts of the Proposed Project. However, since the proposed Project is subject to NEPA, comments submitted on the NOI relating to aesthetics and parking impacts are addressed in Sections 5.3, *Visual Quality/Aesthetics* and 5.7, *Transportation and Circulation*, of the FEIR/FEIS and NEPA conclusions are provided.

III. FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS THAT CAN BE AVOIDED OR REDUCED TO A LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT LEVEL THROUGH MITIGATION AND THE DISPOSITION OF THE MITIGATION MEASURES

CEQA requires agencies to adopt mitigation measures that would avoid or substantially lessen a project's identified significant impacts or potential significant impacts if such measures are feasible. The findings in this section concern 19 potential impacts and their related mitigation measures proposed in the FEIR/FEIS. These mitigation measures are included in the MMRP. A copy of the MMRP is included as Attachment B to the Planning Commission Motion adopting these findings. The FEIR/FEIS found that three mitigation measures would be required for this Project to reduce to a less than significant level cultural and paleontological resources impacts; three mitigation measures would be required for this Project to reduce to a less than significant level transportation and circulation impacts; two mitigation measures would be required for this Project to reduce to a less than significant level noise impacts; one mitigation measure would be required for this Project to reduce to a less than significant level air quality impacts; two mitigation measures would be required for this Project to reduce to a less than significant level biological resources impacts; six mitigation measures would be required for this Project to reduce to a less than significant level geology and soils impacts; and four mitigation measures would be required for this Project to reduce to a less than significant level hazards and hazardous materials impacts.

The Project Sponsor has agreed to implement the following mitigation measures to address the potential cultural and paleontological resources, transportation and circulation, noise, air quality, biological resources, geology and soils, and hazards and hazardous materials impacts identified in the FEIR/FEIS. As authorized by CEQA Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, 15092, and 15093, based on substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding, the Planning Commission finds that, unless otherwise stated, the Project will be required to incorporate mitigation measures identified in the FEIR/FEIS into the Project to mitigate or to avoid significant or potentially significant environmental impacts. Except as otherwise noted, these mitigation measures will reduce or avoid the potentially significant impacts described in the Final EIR/EIS, and the Commission finds that these mitigation measures are feasible to implement and are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City and County of San Francisco to implement or enforce.

Additionally, the required mitigation measures are fully enforceable and will be enforced through conditions of approval in any building permits issued for the Project by the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection. With the required mitigation measures, these Project impacts would be avoided or

reduced to a less-than-significant level. The Planning Commission finds that the mitigation measures presented in the MMRP are feasible and shall be adopted as conditions of Project approval.

The following mitigation measures would be required to reduce cultural and paleontological resources impacts, transportation and circulation impacts, noise impacts, air quality impacts, biological resources impacts, geology and soils impacts, and hazards and hazardous materials impacts identified in the FEIR/FEIS to a less-than-significant level:

Project Mitigation Measure M-CP-2a: Archeological Resource Discovery

Impact CP-2: Effects on Archaeological Resources. The proposed Project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064; therefore, consultation with an archaeological consultant who will conduct an archaeological testing program and, if necessary, conduct an archaeological monitoring and/or data recovery program, is required to avoid any potential adverse effect from the proposed Project on accidentally buried or submerged archaeological resources and to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Impact CP-4: Effects on Human Remains. The proposed Project could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries; therefore, consultation with an archaeological consultant who will conduct an archaeological testing program and, if necessary, conduct an archaeological monitoring and/or data recovery program and assist with notification of appropriate authorities and agencies and development of an agreement for the treatment of, with appropriate dignity, human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects, is required to prevent the accidental disturbance of human remains and to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Impact C-CP-2: Cumulative Effects on Archaeological Resources. The proposed Project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, could result in a significant cumulative impact related to archaeological resources; therefore, consultation with an archaeological consultant who will conduct an archaeological testing program and, if necessary, conduct an archaeological monitoring and/or data recovery program, is required to reduce this cumulative impact to a less than significant level.

Impact C-CP-4: Cumulative Effects on Human Remains. The proposed Project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, could result in a significant cumulative impact related to human remains resources; therefore, consultation with an archaeological consultant who will conduct an archaeological testing program and, if necessary, conduct an archaeological monitoring and/or data recovery program and assist with notification of appropriate authorities and agencies and development of an agreement for the treatment of, with appropriate dignity, human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects, is required to prevent the accidental disturbance of human remains and to reduce this cumulative impact to a less than significant level.

Project Mitigation Measure M-CP-2b: Archeological Monitoring Program

Impact CP-2: Effects on Archaeological Resources. The proposed Project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064; therefore, an Archaeological Monitoring Program ("AMP"), if determined to be necessary, is required to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Impact C-CP-2: Cumulative Effects on Archaeological Resources. The proposed Project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, could result in a significant cumulative impact related to archaeological resources; therefore, an Archaeological Monitoring Program ("AMP"), if determined to be necessary, is required to reduce this cumulative impact to a less than significant level.

Project Mitigation Measure M-CP-3a: Discovery of Paleontological Resources

Impact CP-3: Effects on Paleontological Resources. The proposed Project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; therefore, retention of a qualified paleontological consultant having expertise in California paleontology to design and implement a monitoring and mitigation program is required to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Impact C-CP-3: Cumulative Effects on Paleontological Resources. The proposed Project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, could result in a significant cumulative impact related to paleontological resources; therefore, retention of a qualified paleontological consultant having expertise in California paleontology to design and implement a monitoring and mitigation program is required to reduce this cumulative impact to a less than significant level.

Project Mitigation Measure M-TR-14: Construction Traffic Control Plan

Impact TR-14(a): Construction Effects on Circulation. The proposed Project would involve extensive construction over several years that could result in the following temporary conditions: street closures and detours, rerouting of Muni lines and bus stops, and sidewalk closures; therefore, implementation of a Construction Transportation Control Plan ("TCP") for each construction phase is required to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Project Mitigation Measure M-TR-16: Design of Bulb-Outs and Driveways

Impact TR-16(a): Effects on Site Access and On-Site Circulation. The newly constructed roadway network associated with the proposed Project would effectively connect the local roadway system, but could impact internal circulation; therefore, incorporation of bulb-out and driveway design from the Better Streets Plan, Planning Department, and SFMTA is required to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Project Mitigation Measure C-M-TR-1b: 25th Street/Indiana Street/Northbound I-280 On-Ramp Eastbound Approach Turn Lane Modification or Traffic Signal

Impact C-TR-1(b): 2030 Cumulative Impacts. the proposed Project would result in significant traffic impacts at Intersection #4 (25th Street/Indiana Street/NB I-280 On-Ramp); therefore, restriping of the eastbound approach to convert the existing left-through lane to a through lane with a new 75-foot left-turn pocket is required to reduce this cumulative impact to a less than significant level.

Project Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a: Submit a Construction Noise Plan to Reduce Construction Noise

Impact NO-1: Exposure of Persons to or Generation of Noise Levels in Excess of Standards. The proposed Project could result in excess construction noise; therefore, submission of a Construction Noise Plan for

review and approval prior to the issuance of the demolition permit is required to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Impact NO-4: Substantial Temporary Increase in Ambient Noise Levels. The proposed Project could cause a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels during construction; therefore, submission of a Construction Noise Plan for review and approval prior to the issuance of the demolition permit is required to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Project Mitigation Measure M-NO-1b: Implement a Construction Noise Plan to Reduce Construction Noise

Impact NO-1: Exposure of Persons to or Generation of Noise Levels in Excess of Standards. The proposed Project could result in excess construction noise; therefore, implementation of a Construction Noise Plan during demolition and construction of the proposed Project is required to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Project Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4: Construction Emissions Minimization

Impact AQ-4: Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations. The proposed Project could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; therefore, submission of a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan for review and approval prior to the issuance of a construction permit is required to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Project Mitigation Measure M-BI-4a: Bird Nest Pre-Construction Survey

Impact BI-4: Effects on Wildlife Movement. The proposed Project could interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites; therefore, retention of a qualified biologist to conduct preconstruction breeding-season surveys is required to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Project Mitigation Measure M-BI-4b: Bird Nest Buffer Zone

Impact BI-4: Effects on Wildlife Movement. The proposed Project could interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites; therefore, a delay in construction in the vicinity of active bird nest sites located on or adjacent to the Project site during the breeding season, while the nest is occupied with adults and/or young, is required to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Project Mitigation Measure M-GE-1: Landslide Hazard Mitigation

Impact GE-1: Seismic Effects. The proposed Project could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, seismic ground-shaking, liquefaction, or lateral spreading; therefore, implementation of measures to reduce potential landslide hazards is required to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Project Mitigation Measure M-GE-2a: Preventative Erosion Control Measures

Impact GE-2: Erosion Effects. The proposed Project is susceptible to substantial erosion; therefore, implementation of preventative erosion control measures is required to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Project Mitigation Measure M-GE-2b: Cut Slopes and Engineered Fill

Impact GE-2: Erosion Effects. The proposed Project is susceptible to substantial erosion; therefore, removal of existing fill and loose surface soil and replacement as engineered fill prior to construction is required to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Project Mitigation Measure M-GE-2c: Erosion Control Measures in Response to Heavy Rains

Impact GE-2: Erosion Effects. The proposed Project is susceptible to substantial erosion; therefore, provision of a positive gradient away from the slopes during heavy rains is required to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Project Mitigation Measure M-GE-3: Unstable Soils and Slopes

Impact GE-3: Effects on Unstable Geologic Units. The proposed Project could be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the Proposed Project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse; therefore, preparation of estimates and corrective procedures to address settlement of deep fills, remedial grading, and incorporations of recommendations from geotechnical investigations, among other things, are required to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Project Mitigation Measure M-GE-4: Expansive Soils

Impact GE-4: Effects from Expansive Soils. The proposed Project would be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, and could create substantial risks to life or property; therefore, corrective grading to reduce the impacts from soil swell, if necessary, is required to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Project Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2.1: Voluntary Remedial Action Program ("VRAP") Applications and Work Plans

Impact HZ-2: Effects Related to Release of Hazardous Material. The proposed Project could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment; therefore, submission of a VRAP application, including a Sampling and Analysis Report ("SAR") work plan, is required to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Impact HZ-3: Effects of Hazardous Materials on Schools. The proposed Project could emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; therefore, submission of a VRAP application, including a SAR work plan, is required to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Project Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2.2: Site Mitigation Plan ("SMP")

Impact HZ-2: Effects Related to Release of Hazardous Material. The proposed Project could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment; therefore, implementation of a SMP is required to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Impact HZ-3: Effects of Hazardous Materials on Schools. The proposed Project could emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; therefore, implementation of a SMP is required to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Project Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2.3: Dust Control Plan and Worker Health and Safety Plan

Impact HZ-2: Effects Related to Release of Hazardous Material. The proposed Project could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment; therefore, submission of a Dust Control Plan and Worker Health and Safety Plan, prior to construction field work for any phase, is required to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Impact HZ-3: Effects of Hazardous Materials on Schools. The proposed Project could emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; therefore, submission of a Dust Control Plan and Worker Health and Safety Plan, prior to construction field work for any phase, is required to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Project Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2.4: Underground Storage Tanks ("UST")

Impact HZ-2: Effects Related to Release of Hazardous Material. The proposed Project could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment; therefore, notification by construction contractor to owner/project applicant of any encountered UST is required to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Impact HZ-3: Effects of Hazardous Materials on Schools. The proposed Project could emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; therefore, notification by construction contractor to owner/project applicant of any encountered UST is required to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

IV. SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS THAT CANNOT BE AVOIDED OR REDUCED TO A LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

Based on substantial evidence in the whole record of these proceedings, the Planning Commission finds that there are significant project-specific and cumulative impacts that would not be eliminated or reduced to an insignificant level by the mitigation measures listed in the MMRP. The FEIR/FEIS identifies four significant and unavoidable impacts on transportation and circulation; one significant and unavoidable impact on noise; and two significant and unavoidable impacts on air quality.

The Planning Commission further finds based on the analysis contained within the FEIR/FEIS, other considerations in the record, and the significance criteria identified in the FEIR/FEIS, that feasible mitigation measures are not available to reduce the significant Project impacts to less-than-significant levels, and thus those impacts remain significant and unavoidable. The Commission also finds that, although measures were considered in the FEIR/FEIS that could reduce some significant impacts, certain measures, as described in this Section IV below, are infeasible for reasons set forth below, and therefore those impacts remain significant and unavoidable or potentially significant and unavoidable.

Thus, the following significant impacts on the environment, as reflected in the FEIR/FEIS, are unavoidable. But, as more fully explained in Section VI, below, under Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(3) and (b), and CEQA Guidelines 15091(a)(3), 15092(b)(2)(B), and 15093, the Planning Commission finds that these impacts are acceptable for the legal, environmental, economic, social, technological and other benefits of the Project. This finding is supported by substantial evidence in the record of this proceeding.

The FEIR/FEIS identifies the following impacts on transportation and circulation, for which no feasible mitigation measures were identified to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels:

Impact TR-4(a): The proposed Project would increase ridership on the 10 Townsend Muni line, which would result in an exceedance of Muni's 85 percent capacity utilization threshold. No feasible mitigation measures were identified after consideration of several potential mitigation measures, though one mitigation measure is included in the MMRP. The proposed Project would add 52 additional riders to the outbound 10 Townsend line (about 17 riders per bus during the peak hour) and 27 additional riders to the inbound 10 Townsend line (about 9 riders per bus during the peak hour). This would constitute nearly an additional standard busload of transit trips in the outbound direction and half a busload of transit trips in the inbound direction, substantially more than the threshold of a five percent contribution that is typically considered significant. The proposed Project related-transit trips would worsen the capacity utilization of the 10 Townsend at its Major Load Point ("MLP") from 98 percent to 113 percent in the inbound direction and from 90 percent to 118 percent in the outbound direction, which would be a deterioration of capacity utilization. The operations of the 10 Townsend Muni line can only be improved by increasing its capacity, which requires providing more buses serving this route. A fair-share funding agreement with SFMTA could help offset the Proposed Project's contribution, and is incorporated as a mitigation measure in the MMRP (Mitigation Measure M-TR-4). However, because the ability of SFMTA to provide the additional service on this line to accommodate the Proposed Project is uncertain, the effectiveness of fair-share mitigation is unknown. Therefore, no feasible mitigation measures were found to reduce the proposed Project's significant impact on the 10 Townsend Muni line to less-than-significant levels, rendering Impact TR-4(a) significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

Impact C-TR-1(b): The proposed Project would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to delay exceedances at four intersections: #3 – Pennsylvania Avenue/SB I-280 Off-Ramp, #4 – 25th Street/Indiana Street/NB I-280 On-Ramp, #12 – Cesar Chavez Street/Vermont Street and #13 – Cesar Chavez Street/US 101 Off-Ramp. No feasible mitigation measures were identified for Intersections #3, 12 or 13 after consideration of several potential mitigation measures, though one mitigation measure is included in the MMRP. A feasible mitigation measure was identified for Intersection #4 that would reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

With respect to Intersection #3, the proposed Project would increase traffic along the westbound left-turning movement by about 160 vehicle trips (18 percent); this would alter the worst approach and result in an increase in traffic of the westbound left-turning critical movement at the Pennsylvania Avenue/Southbound I-280 Off-Ramp intersection by more than five percent. Capacity improvements such as providing an additional left-turning lane on the Southbound I-280 Off-Ramp to improve the operating conditions of this approach and intersection was considered, but would require providing an additional through lane along Southbound Pennsylvania Avenue, from either reducing sidewalk widths or encroaching into the neighboring property. Therefore, adding an additional southbound left-turn lane, although considered, was not recommended as mitigation. Mitigation Measure C-M-TR-1a, which would consist of signalizing this intersection, was identified and included in the MMRP to potentially reduce this impact. Installation of a traffic signal at this location would improve the operating conditions of this intersection from LOS F (approximately 50 seconds of delay per vehicle for the westbound approach) to LOS B (approximately 17 seconds of delay per vehicle). However, due to the uncertainty of implementation of Mitigation Measure C-M-TR-1a, the feasibility of the recommended mitigation measure is unknown. Therefore, no feasible mitigation measures were found to reduce the proposed Project's significant impact at Intersection #3 to less-than-significant levels, rendering this cumulative impact significant and unavoidable.

With respect to Intersection #4, the proposed Project would increase traffic at the eastbound approach of the 25th Street/Indiana Street/Northbound I-280 On-Ramp intersection and would deteriorate from LOS C (about 22 seconds of delay) under 2030 Cumulative No Project Conditions to LOS E (about 38 seconds of delay) under 2030 Cumulative Plus Project Conditions. In addition, traffic added by the proposed Project would cause Caltrans signal warrant to be met at this intersection under 2030 Cumulative Plus Project Conditions. Implementation of Mitigation Measure C-M-TR-1b would improve the intersection operations to LOS C (approximately 24 seconds of delay per vehicle in the northbound direction). Therefore, with Mitigation Measure C-M-TR-1b, the traffic impact at this intersection would be reduced to less than significant for the proposed Project.

With respect to Intersection #12, the proposed Project would increase traffic along the southbound approach of this intersection by about 33 vehicles (11 percent), altering the worst approach and resulting in an increase in traffic of the southbound approach at the Cesar Chavez Street/Vermont Street intersection by more than five percent. During the PM peak hour of 2030 Cumulative Conditions, the southbound approach of this intersection would operate with an average vehicle delay greater than 1,000 seconds. This is primarily due to the lack of sufficient gaps between vehicles travelling along Cesar Chavez Street (2,319 vph) for the southbound left-turning vehicles (148 vph) to perform the maneuver. Capacity improvements at this intersection would not help improve gaps between traffic travelling along Cesar Chavez Street. As such, capacity improvements alone, although considered, was not recommended to improve operations at this intersection. Similarly, restricting southbound left turns from Vermont Street to Cesar Chavez Street was considered for mitigation. This improvement would reduce the delay of the southbound approach from greater than 1,000 seconds per vehicle (LOS F) to approximately 45 seconds per vehicle (LOS E). However, elimination of left turns would force vehicles turning left to use Cesar Chavez Street/Connecticut Street intersection to travel along eastbound Cesar Chavez Street. This would worsen operations at the Cesar Chavez Street/Connecticut Street intersection from LOS D to LOS F. Therefore, this improvement was not recommended as a feasible mitigation measure either. Mitigation Measure C-M-TR-1c, which would consist of signalizing this intersection, was identified and included in the MMRP to potentially reduce this impact. However, due to the uncertainty of implementation of Mitigation Measure C-M-TR-1a, including the fact the SFMTA has no plans to

signalize this intersection, the feasibility of the recommended mitigation measure is unknown. Therefore, no feasible mitigation measures were found to reduce the proposed Project's significant impact at Intersection #12 to a less-than-significant level, and rendering this cumulative impact significant and unavoidable.

With respect to Intersection #13, the proposed Project would increase traffic along the northbound approach of this intersection by about 222 vehicles (33 percent), altering the worst approach and resulting in an increase in traffic of the northbound approach at the Cesar Chavez Street/ US 101 Off-Ramp intersection by more than five percent. Improving the traffic operations at this intersection would require widening of the US 101 Off-ramp, in addition to installing a traffic signal. However, widening of the off-ramp would involve substantial right-of-way acquisition, ramp construction, and pavement striping. Additionally, when signal warrants are met at any intersection, before a signal is recommended, additional review and prioritization is required by SFMTA. SFMTA does not have any plans to install a traffic signal at this intersection currently, and therefore the project contributing to a potential future signalization at this intersection would not be a feasible mitigation measure. Mitigation Measure C-M-TR-1d, which would require the Project Sponsor to work with SFMTA to identify any alternative improvements at this intersection and contribute its fair share to those improvements, was identified and included in the MMRP to potentially reduce this impact. However, due to the uncertainty of the implementation of Mitigation Measure C-M-TR-1d, the feasibility of the recommended mitigation measure is unknown. Therefore, no feasible mitigation measures were found to reduce the proposed Project's significant impact at Intersection #13 to a less-than-significant level, rendering this cumulative impact significant and unavoidable.

Impact C-TR-4(a): The proposed Project would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to capacity utilization exceedences on the 10 Townsend and 48 Quintara-24th Street Muni lines. The 10 Townsend/Sansome line would operate with capacity utilization exceeding the Muni's 85 percent threshold under 2030 Cumulative No Project Conditions. Under 2030 Cumulative Plus Project Conditions, during the weekday PM peak hour, the Proposed Project would substantially increase the ridership of outbound 10 Townsend/Sansome by about 68 riders (about 23 riders per bus during the peak hour) and inbound 10 Townsend/Sansome by about 36 riders (about 12 riders per bus during the peak hour). This would result in an increase in capacity utilization of 15 percent (from 94 to 109 percent) in the inbound direction and an increase of 27 percent (from 87 to 114 percent) in the outbound direction. The 48 Quintara-24th Street line would operate with capacity utilization exceeding the Muni's 85 percent threshold under 2030 Cumulative No Project Conditions. Under 2030 Cumulative Plus Project Conditions, during the weekday peak hour, the Proposed Project would increase outbound 48 Quintara-24th Street by about 19 riders (about 3 riders per bus during the peak hour) and inbound 48 Quintara-24th Street by about 30 riders (about 5 riders per bus during the peak hour). This would result in an increase in capacity utilization of 12 percent (from 89 to 101 percent) in the inbound direction and an increase of 8 percent (from 91 to 99 percent) in the outbound direction. The operations of the 10 Townsend/Sansome and 48 Quintara-24th Street Muni lines can only be improved by increasing their capacity, which requires providing more buses serving those routes. A fair-share funding agreement with SFMTA could help offset the Proposed Project's contribution as outlined in M-TR-4. However, because the ability of SFMTA to provide the additional service on these lines to accommodate the Proposed Project is uncertain, the effectiveness of fair-share mitigation is unknown. Therefore, no feasible mitigation measures were found to reduce the proposed Project's significant impact on the 10 Townsend and 28 Quintara-24th Street Muni lines to a less-than-significant level, rendering this cumulative impact significant and unavoidable.

Impact C-TR-5(a): The proposed Project would result in a cumulatively consideration contribution to capacity utilization exceedances on Muni Southeast screenline. The Proposed Project would result in a 5.9 percent increase in ridership that would increase the capacity utilization of all other lines (consisting of J Church, 12 Folsom, and 19 Polk lines) from 85 percent to 90 percent. Because the Proposed Project would increase the capacity utilization for all other Muni lines crossing the Southeast Screenline by 5.9 percent and the increase would cause the 85 percent threshold to be exceeded, this would be a significant cumulative impact for all other lines crossing the Muni Southeast Screenline. The operations of the other Muni lines crossing the Southeast Screenline (consisting of J Church, 12 Folsom, and 19 Polk lines) can only be improved by increasing their capacity, which requires providing more buses serving those routes. A fair-share funding agreement with SFMTA could help offset the Proposed Project's contribution, and is incorporated as a mitigation measure in the MMRP (Mitigation Measure C-M-TR-5). However, because the ability of SFMTA to provide the additional service on the other lines to accommodate the Proposed Project is uncertain, the effectiveness of fair-share mitigation is unknown. Therefore, no feasible mitigation measures were found to reduce the proposed Project's significant impact on the Muni Southeast screenline to a less-than-significant level, rendering this cumulative impact significant and unavoidable.

The FEIR/FEIS identifies the following impact on noise, for which no feasible mitigation measures were identified to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level:

Impact NO-3: The proposed Project would cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project. For the Existing plus Project scenario, noise levels would meet or exceed the 3 dBA threshold at the following segments: 25th Street from Wisconsin Street to Connecticut Street, Connecticut Street to Dakota Street, and Dakota Street to Indiana Street; Connecticut Street from Cesar Chavez Street to 25th Street, and 25th Street to 23rd Street; Texas Street from 25th Street to 22nd Street; and Missouri Street from 20th Street to 22nd Street, and 22nd Street to 23rd Street. Cumulative traffic noise levels would meet or exceed the 3 dBA threshold at the following segments: 25th Street from Connecticut to Dakota Street, and Dakota Street to Indiana Street; and Texas Street from 25th Street to 22nd Street. No feasible mitigation measures were found to reduce the proposed Project's significant impact on ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity to a less-than-significant level, rendering this impact significant and unavoidable.

The FEIR/FEIS identifies the following impacts on air quality, for which no feasible mitigation measures were identified to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels:

Impact AQ-2: The proposed Project would violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing air quality violation, and result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. Construction of the proposed Project would require the use of on-road and off-road construction vehicles that would generate criteria pollutant emissions that could worsen air quality. Operational emissions generated by stationary, area, and mobile sources would result from normal day-to-day activities within the Project area. Stationary source emissions would be generated from the operation of the proposed back up diesel generator. Area source emissions would be generated by the consumption of natural gas for space and water heating devices, and the operation of landscape maintenance equipment. Mobile emissions would be generated by the motor vehicles traveling to, within, and from the Project site. Because construction of the proposed Project would be phased over the course of approximately 10 years, construction activities would overlap with operational activity at the Project site. While implementation of Mitigation Measures M-AQ-2a and M-AQ-2b, both of which were

identified and included in the MMRP, would reduce emissions associated with vehicle exhaust during construction by requiring utilization of efficient construction equipment, emissions would continue to exceed the daily and annual NOx thresholds throughout the construction phase of the Proposed Project. Although the mitigation measures would reduce daily emissions in 2016 and 2018 to a less-than-significant level, NOx emissions would exceed the daily thresholds in 2017 and 2019–2024. ROG, PM10 and PM2.5 emissions would continue to be below the applicable thresholds for all years, however. No additional feasible mitigation measures have been identified to further reduce NOx emissions. Therefore, during the construction phase, the proposed Project would contribute substantially to an existing air quality violation and result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants, rendering this impact significant and unavoidable.

Impact C-AQ-1: The proposed Project would exceed the project-level NOx thresholds for multiple years during construction; thus, the proposed Project would result in criteria air pollutant emissions that would be cumulatively considerable, resulting in a significant cumulative impact. Mitigation Measures M-AQ-2a and M-AQ-2b have been identified and included in the MMRP to reduce NOx emissions during construction by requiring utilization of efficient construction equipment. However, even with implementation of these mitigation measures, the proposed Project would still exceed the NOx significance criteria and would result in a considerable contribution to cumulative air quality impacts, rendering this cumulative impact significant and unavoidable.

V. EVALUATION OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

A. Alternatives Analyzed in the FEIR/FEIS

This section describes the alternatives analyzed in the Project FEIR/FEIS and the reasons for rejecting the alternatives as infeasible. CEQA mandates that an EIR evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the Project or the Project location that generally reduce or avoid potentially significant impacts of the Project. CEQA requires that every EIR also evaluate a "No Project" alternative. Alternatives provide a basis of comparison to the Project in terms of their significant impacts and their ability to meet project objectives. This comparative analysis is used to consider reasonable, potentially feasible options for minimizing environmental consequences of the Project.

The Planning Department considered a range of alternatives in Chapter 2.3 of the FEIR/FEIS. The FEIR/FEIS analyzed Alternative No. 1: Reduced Development Alternative; Alternative No. 2: Housing Replacement Alternative; and Alternative No. 3: No Project Alternative. Each alternative is discussed and analyzed in these findings, in addition to being analyzed in Chapter 2.3 of the FEIR/FEIS. The Planning Commission certifies that it has independently reviewed and considered the information on the alternatives provided in the FEIR/FEIS and in the record. The FEIR/FEIS reflects the Planning Commission's and the City's independent judgment as to the alternatives. The Planning Commission finds that the Project provides the best balance between satisfaction of Project objectives and mitigation of environmental impacts to the extent feasible, as described and analyzed in the FEIR/FEIS.

B. Reasons for Approving the Project

- To increase by more than 30 percent the number of affordable residential units from what is currently located at the Project site in an area with a critical need for additional affordable housing.

- To provide modern, upgraded public housing units to current residents and households of the Terrace and Annex.

- To increase the City's supply of affordable dwelling units by inclusion of up to 42 percent (approximately 450 units) affordable housing, for a total (when combined with the public housing) of up to 63 percent affordable housing.

- To rebuild and reconstruct the street ways, transit and utility infrastructure into a workable, transit-friendly design.

- To increase the City's supply of affordable dwelling units.

- To provide ground floor, neighborhood-serving retail and flex space and inject much needed commercial opportunities.

- To provide a Community Center, a numerous parks and open space areas to enhance the sense of a vibrant community atmosphere.

- To increase the number of preschool and daycare slots for area residents and provide children with an optimal learning facility.

- To construct streetscape improvements that encourage and enliven pedestrian activity.

- To construct a high-quality project with superior design and a sufficient number of dwelling units to produce a reasonable return on investment for the Project Sponsor and investors and attract investment capital and construction financing.

- To improve the architectural and urban design character of the Project site by replacing run-down structures with a high-quality residential project incorporating a superior design.

- To provide adequate parking and vehicular access to serve the needs of Project residents and their visitors.

C. Evaluation of Project Alternatives

CEQA provides that alternatives analyzed in an EIR may be rejected if "specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible . . . the project alternatives identified in the EIR." (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(3).) The Commission has reviewed each of the alternatives to the Project as described in the FEIR/FEIS that would reduce or avoid the impacts of the Project and finds that there is substantial evidence of specific economic, legal, social, technological and other considerations that make these Alternatives infeasible, for the reasons set forth below.

In making these determinations, the Planning Commission is aware that CEQA defines "feasibility" to mean "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors." The Commission is also aware that under CEQA case law the concept of "feasibility" encompasses (i) the question of whether a particular alternative promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project, and (ii) the question of

whether an alternative is "desirable" from a policy standpoint to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors.

Alternative No. 1 – Reduced Development Alternative

The Reduced Development Alternative would retain the same overall development footprint as the proposed Project, however the maximum building heights would not exceed 40-feet. This alternative would include up to 1,280 residential units, with up to 80 affordable senior units, 796 affordable units (including replacement public housing units), and 404 market rate units. Additionally, this alternative would include up to 15,000 sf of ground-floor retail or flex space. The Community Center, including day care and preschool facilities, would be up to 25,000 sf in size. The Reduced Development Alternative would provide for 773 off-street covered parking spaces, with 10 designated for retail uses, 5 designated for the Community Center, and 30 designated for disabled and handicapped uses. Overall parking would include seven car-share spaces and 600 on-street parking spaces. The phasing and construction of the Reduced Development Alternative would proceed on the same schedule as the proposed Project.

The Planning Commission rejects the Reduced Development Alternative as infeasible because it would fail to meet the Project Objectives and the City's policy objectives for the following reasons:

1) The Reduced Development Alternative would limit the project to 1,280 dwelling units; whereas the proposed Project would provide 1,700 total new units to the City's housing stock and maximize the creation of new residential units. The City's important policy objective is to increase the housing stock whenever possible to address a shortage of housing in the City.

2) The Reduced Development Alternative would create a project that would not fully utilize this site for housing production, thereby not fully satisfying General Plan policies such as Housing Element Policies 1.1 and 1.4, among others. The alternative would not create a project that is consistent with and enhances the existing scale and urban design character of the area or furthers the City's housing policies to create more housing, particularly affordable housing opportunities.

3) The Reduced Development Alternative would eliminate none of the significant and unavoidable impacts that the proposed Project faces, thereby not enhancing mitigation of environmental impacts for purposes of CEQA analysis.

4) The Reduced Development Alternative is also economically infeasible. Large development projects are capital-intensive and depend on obtaining financing from equity investors to cover a significant portion of the project's costs, obtain a construction loan for the bulk of construction costs, and provide significant costs out-of-pocket. Equity investors require a certain profit margin to finance development projects and must achieve established targets for their internal rate of return and return multiple on the investment. Because the Reduced Development Alternative would result in a project that is significantly smaller than the Project, and contains 420 fewer residential units, the total potential for generating revenue is lower while the construction cost per square foot is higher due to lower economies of scale and the impact of fixed project costs associated with development. The reduced unit count would not generate a sufficient economic return to obtain financing and allow development of the proposed project and therefore would not be built.

5) The Reduced Development Alternative would create a project with fewer housing units in an area well-served by transit, services and shopping and adjacent to employment opportunities which would then push demand for residential development to other sites in the City or the Bay Area. This would result in the Reduced Development Alternative not meeting, to the same degree as the Project, the City's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* or CEQA and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's ("BAAQMD") requirements for a GHG reductions, by not maximizing housing development in an area with abundant local and region-serving transit options.

For the foregoing reasons, the Planning Commission rejects the Reduced Development Alternative as infeasible.

Alternative No. 2 – Housing Replacement Alternative

The FEIR/FEIS identified both the No Project Alternative and the Housing Replacement Alternative as the environmentally superior alternatives.

The Housing Replacement Alternative would demolish all existing housing units at the Project site. The housing units would then be rebuilt using the same building pattern that currently exists. The existing site plan and street pattern at the Project site would be retained. As such, this alternative would reconstruct 620 affordable housing units, a 35-space preschool center, a 15-space child day care center, and associated residential parking facilities. Secured bicycle parking would be provided at the ground floor of each reconstructed residential building at or near building entrances. Parking would remain the same with approximately 1,301 on-street parking spaces and 64 off-street parking spaces. Other amenities provided under the proposed Project, such as additional parks, retail facilities, and the Community Center, would not be provided as part of this alternative.

The Planning Commission rejects the Housing Replacement Alternative as infeasible because it would fail to meet the Project Objectives and City policy objections for the following reasons:

1) The Housing Replacement Alternative would limit the project to replacement of the 620 existing public housing units; whereas the proposed project would replace 606 of those public housing units while providing an additional 1,080 residential units to the City's housing stock and maximize the creation of new residential units. The City's important policy objective is to increase the housing stock, particularly affordable housing, whenever possible to address a shortage of housing in the City.

2) The Housing Replacement Alternative would not meet many of the Project Sponsor's objectives, including increased employment opportunities, establishing physical and social connections with the larger Potrero Hill neighborhood, building new safe streets and open spaces, and providing space for community-serving retail stores.

3) The Housing Replacement Alternative would not maximize the opportunity to reconfigure roadways and overall Project footprint to maximize the space available, or the opportunity to upgrade and resize water, wastewater, drainage, gas and electric, and other utility infrastructure within the existing Project site.

4) The Housing Replacement Alternative would create a project that would not fully utilize this site for housing production, thereby not fully satisfying General Plan policies such as Housing Element Policies 1.1 and 1.4, among others. While the Housing Replacement Alternative would ameliorate most (but not all) of the significant unavoidable impacts of the proposed project, the alternative would not create a project that is consistent with and enhances the existing scale and urban design character of the area or furthers the City's housing policies to create more housing, particularly affordable housing opportunities.

5) The Housing Replacement Alternative would create a project with fewer housing units in an area well-served by transit, services and shopping and adjacent to employment opportunities which would then push demand for residential development to other sites in the City or the Bay Area. This would result in the Housing Replacement Alternative not meeting, to the same degree as the Project, the City's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* or CEQA and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's ("BAAQMD") requirements for a GHG reductions, by not maximizing housing development in an area with abundant local and region-serving transit options.

For the foregoing reasons, the Planning Commission rejects the Housing Replacement Alternative as infeasible.

Alternative No. 3 – No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, the Project Site would remain in its existing condition. Existing buildings and tenants would remain at the Project site and no new buildings or uses would be constructed. Baseline conditions described in detail for each environmental topic in Chapter 4, Affected Environment, would remain and none of the impacts associated with the Project would occur.

The existing 38 residential buildings in the Terrace and 23 residential buildings in the Annex, along with the administrative office in the Terrace and the Family Resource Center and child care center in the Annex, would remain and continue operating as-is. Building heights on the site would not be changed. No open space would be developed within the site and no changes to streets or infrastructure would occur.

The Planning Commission rejects the No Project Alternative as infeasible because it would fail to meet the Project Objectives and the City's policy objectives for the following reasons:

1) The No Project Alternative would not meet any of the Project Sponsor's objectives;

2) The No Project Alternative would be inconsistent with key goals of the City's General Plan with respect to housing production. With no new housing created here and no construction, the No Project Alternative would not increase the City's housing stock of both market rate and affordable housing, would not create new job opportunities for construction workers, and would not expand the City's property tax base.

3) The No Project Alternative would leave the Project Site physically unchanged, and thus would not achieve any of the objectives regarding the redevelopment of a large underutilized site (primarily consisting of older buildings in need of significant repair and/or replacement), creation

of a mixed-use project within the Showplace Square/Potrero Area Plan, which is a part of the greater Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, contribution to regional housing needs, provision of affordable dwelling units, provision of publicly-accessible open space, and provision of new neighborhood services.

For the foregoing reasons, the Planning Commission rejects the No Project Alternative as infeasible.

VI. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The Planning Commission finds that, notwithstanding the imposition of all feasible mitigation measures and alternatives, significant impacts related to Transportation and Circulation, Noise, and Air Quality will remain significant and unavoidable. Pursuant to CEQA section 21081 and CEQA Guideline Section 15093, the Planning Commission hereby finds, after consideration of the Final EIR/EIS and the evidence in the record, that each of the specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological and other benefits of the Project as set forth below independently and collectively outweighs these significant and unavoidable impacts and is an overriding consideration warranting approval of the Project. Any one of the reasons for approval cited below is sufficient to justify approval of the Project. Thus, even if a court were to conclude that not every reason is supported by substantial evidence, the Commission will stand by its determination that each individual reason is sufficient. The substantial evidence supporting the various benefits can be found in the preceding findings, which are incorporated by reference into this Section, and in the documents found in the record, as defined in Section I.

On the basis of the above findings and the substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding, the Planning Commission specifically finds that there are significant benefits of the Project to support approval of the Project in spite of the unavoidable significant impacts, and therefore makes this Statement of Overriding Considerations. The Commission further finds that, as part of the process of obtaining Project approval, significant effects on the environment from implementation of the Project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible. All mitigation measures proposed in the FEIR/FEIS and MMRP are adopted as part of the Approval Actions described in Section I, above.

Furthermore, the Commission has determined that any remaining significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable are acceptable due to the following specific overriding economic, technological, legal, social and other considerations.

The Project will have the following benefits:

1. The Project would increase the number of units at the site from 620 to approximately 1,700, adding up to 1,080 new dwelling units to the City's housing stock.

2. In addition to the 1,080 new dwelling units, the Project would replace 606 public housing units, currently in various stages of decay, with new, modern, upgraded units for existing residents.

3. The Project would increase the stock of permanently affordable housing by creating up to approximately 450 units affordable to low-income households on-site (not including the 606 public housing units), a total exceeding the percentage required by the City's Affordable Inclusionary Housing Ordinance.

4. The Project site is currently underused and in various stages of decay, and the construction of up to 1,080 new housing units and a total of 1,700 units at this underutilized site will directly help to alleviate the City's housing shortage and lead to more affordable housing. A primary objective of the Eastern Neighborhood Area Plan is to increase housing locally through the build out of the plan area. The Project develops the project site in a manner envisioned by the Plan in its density and design.

5. The Project will increase the availability of open space, parks and community-serving retail uses in the area, fostering a sense of community.

6. In constructing new streets with all new utilities on a gridded pattern, the Project will eliminate the physical isolation experienced by the current community and ensure that the new development is connected to the surrounding residential fabric and utility infrastructure.

7. The Project implements and fulfills the goals of the City's HOPE SF Initiative Program. The HOPE SF program has identified the need for redevelopment of the Potrero housing developments and has included it as a part of its program to revitalize distressed public housing developments in San Francisco. The Project site is comprised of two of the oldest public housing developments in San Francisco, Potrero Terrace and Potrero Annex, and contains 620 units that are in various stages of physical decay. Together, these public housing developments house a population of approximately 1,370 people, a Family Resource Center, and a child care center. In addition to distressed and deteriorated housing, the development contains dead-end streets and steep topography that isolate residents from the surrounding Potrero Hill neighborhood. The Project would replace the deteriorated existing housing units and provide new infrastructure and other site improvements.

8. The Project promotes a number of General Plan Objectives and Policies, including Housing Element Policy 1.1, which provides that "Future housing policy and planning efforts must take into account the diverse needs for housing;" and Policies 11.1, 11.3 and 11.6, which "Support and respect the diverse and distinct character of San Francisco's Neighborhoods." San Francisco's housing policies and programs should provide strategies that promote housing at each income level, and furthermore identify sub-groups, such as middle income and extremely low income households that require specific housing policy. In addition to planning for affordability, the City should plan for housing that serves a variety of household types and sizes." The Project will provide a mix of housing types at this location, including approximately 100 affordable senior units, up to 970 affordable family units, and approximately 630 market-rate units, ranging from one to four bedrooms, increasing the diversity of housing types in this area of the City.

9. The Project meets the City's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* and the BAAQMD requirements for a GHG reductions by maximizing development on an infill site that is well-served by transit, services and shopping and is suited for dense residential development, where residents can commute and satisfy convenience needs without frequent use of a private automobile and is adjacent to employment opportunities, in an area with abundant local and region-serving transit options. The Project would leverage the site's location and proximity to transit by building a dense mixed use project that allows people to live and work close to transit sources.

10. The Project's design furthers Housing Element Policy 11.1, which provides that "The City should continue to improve design review to ensure that the review process results in good design that complements existing character."

11. The Project promotes a number of Showplace Square/Potrero Area Plan Objectives and Policies, including Policies 1.2.1 and 1.2.2, which "In areas of Showplace/Potrero where housing and mixed use in encouraged, maximize development potential in keeping with neighborhood character;" Policies 2.1.1 and 2.1.3, which "Ensure that a significant percentage of new housing created in the Showplace/Potrero is affordable to people with a wide range of incomes;" and Policies 2.3.1 and 2.3.3, which "Require that a significant number of units in new developments have two or more bedrooms []." As discussed in Paragraphs 2 and 4 above, the Project includes a mix of housing types, a substantial number of two-plus bedroom units, and creates over 1,000 affordable housing or public housing units that will benefit low-income households.

12. The Project would construct a development that is in keeping with the scale, massing and density of other structures in the immediate vicinity.

13. The Conditions of Approval for the Project will include all the mitigation and improvement measures that would mitigate the Project's potentially significant impact to insignificant levels, except for its impacts on Transportation and Circulation, Noise, and Air Quality.

14. The Project will create temporary construction jobs and permanent jobs in the retail and community services sectors. These jobs will provide employment opportunities for San Francisco residents, promote the City's role as a commercial center, and provide additional payroll tax revenue to the City, providing direct and indirect economic benefits to the City .

15. The Project will substantially increase the assessed value of the Project Site, resulting in corresponding increases in tax revenue to the City.

16. The Project will contribute to ending the cycle of inter-generational poverty by implementing a robust social services program.

Having considered the above, the Planning Commission finds that the benefits of the Project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects identified in the FEIR/FEIS, and that those adverse environmental effects are therefore acceptable.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM for the POTRERO HOPE SF MASTER PLAN DRAFT EIR/EIS

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	*Responsibility for Implementation*	*Mitigation Schedule*	*Mitigation Action*	*Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility*	*Monitoring Schedule*
MITIGATION MEASURES AGREED TO BY PROJECT SPONSOR					
VISUAL QUALITY/AESTHETICS					
Mitigation Measure M-AE-1: Reduce Heights of Buildings Along 24th Street					
The project sponsor shall reduce heights of buildings along 24th Street in order to preserve views of the McLaren Ridge and San Bruno Mountain from the Potrero Hill Recreation Center. Specifically, the height of Block J along 24th Street shall not exceed 30 feet; the height of Block K along 24th Street shall not exceed 40 feet; and the northwest portion of Block L shall not exceed 40 feet.	Project sponsor and contractor	During project design.	Design plans must abide by the height restrictions	City and County of San Francisco	Considered complete when approved by the County and City of San Francisco.
Improvement Measure IM-AE-2a: Construction Period Screening and Cleaning					
Prior to the issuance of any site activity or building permits, construction documents shall be prepared to require all contractors to strictly control the staging and cleanliness of construction equipment stored or driven beyond the limits of the work area. Construction equipment shall be parked and staged on the Project site, and staging areas shall be screened from view at the street level. Before building permits are issued, the project applicant (through the construction contractors) shall submit a construction staging, access, and parking plan to the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection for review and approval. Construction workers shall be prohibited from parking their vehicles on the street outside of the Project site. Vehicles shall be kept clean and free of mud and dust before leaving the Project site. Each week, the project contractors shall be required to sweep surrounding streets used for construction access to maintain them free of dirt and debris.	Project sponsor and contractor	Prior to the issuance of any site activity or building permits.	Construction equipment must be parked and staged on the Project site, and staging areas shall be screened from view at the street level. Construction workers prohibited from parking vehicles on the street outside of the Project site.	Department of Building Inspection construction staging, access, and parking plan.	Considered complete after construction activities have ended.

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	*Responsibility for Implementation*	*Mitigation Schedule*	*Mitigation Action*	*Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility*	*Monitoring Schedule*
			Vehicles must be kept free of mud and dust before leaving the Project site.		
CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES					
Mitigation Measure M-CP-2a: Archaeological Resource Discovery					
The project applicant shall retain the services of an archaeological consultant from the pool of qualified archaeological consultants maintained by the Planning Department archaeologist. The archaeological consultant shall undertake an archaeological testing program as specified herein. In addition, the consultant shall be available to conduct an archaeological monitoring and/or data recovery program if required pursuant to this measure. The archaeological 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. Archaeological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction of the Proposed 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 archaeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a)(c). *Consultation with Descendant Communities.* On discovery of an archaeological site[1] associated with descendant Native Americans or the Overseas Chinese an appropriate representative[2] of the descendant group and the ERO shall be contacted. The representative of the descendant group	Project sponsor	During construction if archaeological resources are discovered.	Archaeological consultant will conduct an archaeological testing program. The consultant will conduct an archaeological monitoring and/or data recovery program if necessary.	Environmental Review Officer	Considered complete after potential effects on a significant archaeological resource reduced to a less-than-significant level.

[1] The term "archaeological site" is intended here to minimally include any archaeological deposit, feature, burial, or evidence of burial.

[2] An "appropriate representative" of the descendant group is here defined to mean, in the case of Native Americans, any individual listed in the current Native American Contact List for the City and County of San Francisco maintained by the California Native American Heritage Commission and in the case of the Overseas Chinese, the Chinese Historical Society of America.

Adopted Mitigation Measures	*Responsibility for Implementation*	*Mitigation Schedule*	*Mitigation Action*	*Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility*	*Monitoring Schedule*
shall be given the opportunity to monitor archaeological field investigations of the site and to consult with ERO regarding appropriate archaeological treatment of the site, of recovered data from the site, and, if applicable, any interpretative treatment of the associated archaeological site. A copy of the Final Archaeological Resources Report shall be provided to the representative of the descendant group. *Archaeological Testing Program.* The archaeological consultant shall prepare and submit to the ERO for review and approval an archaeological testing plan (ATP). The archaeological testing program shall be conducted in accordance with the approved ATP. The ATP shall identify the property types of the expected archaeological resource(s) that potentially could be adversely affected by the Proposed Project, the testing method to be used, and the locations recommended for testing. The purpose of the archaeological testing program will be to determine to the extent possible the presence or absence of archaeological resources and to identify and to evaluate whether any archaeological resource encountered on the site constitutes a historical resource under CEQA. At the completion of the archaeological testing program, the archaeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings to the ERO. If based on the archaeological testing program the archaeological consultant finds that significant archaeological resources may be present, the ERO in consultation with the archaeological consultant shall determine if additional measures are warranted. Additional measures that may be undertaken include additional archaeological testing, archaeological monitoring, and/or an archaeological data recovery program. If the ERO determines that a significant archaeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the Proposed Project, at the discretion of the project applicant either: ■ The Proposed Project shall be redesigned so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archaeological resource; or ■ A data recovery program shall be implemented, unless the ERO determines that the archaeological resource is of greater interpretive than research significance and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible.					

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	*Responsibility for Implementation*	*Mitigation Schedule*	*Mitigation Action*	*Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility*	*Monitoring Schedule*
Archaeological Data Recovery Program. The archaeological data recovery program shall be conducted in accord with an archaeological data recovery plan (ADRP). The archaeological consultant, project applicant, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the ADRP prior to preparation of a draft ADRP. The archaeological 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 archaeological 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 archaeological resources if nondestructive methods are practical. The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements: ■ *Field Methods and Procedures.* Descriptions of proposed field strategies, procedures, and operations. ■ *Cataloguing and Laboratory Analysis.* Description of selected cataloguing system and artifact analysis procedures. ■ *Discard and Deaccession Policy.* Description of and rationale for field and post-field discard and deaccession policies. ■ *Interpretive Program.* Consideration of an on-site/off-site public interpretive program during the course of the archaeological data recovery program. ■ *Security Measures.* Recommended security measures to protect the archaeological resource from vandalism, looting, and non-intentionally damaging activities. ■ *Final Report.* Description of proposed report format and distribution of results. ■ *Curation.* Description of the procedures and recommendations for the curation of any recovered data having potential research value, identification of appropriate curation facilities, and a summary of					

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
the accession policies of the curation facilities. *Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects.* The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and Federal laws. 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 NAHC who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (Pub. Res. Code Sec. 5097.98). The archaeological consultant, project applicant, and MLD shall make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of, with appropriate dignity, human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(d)). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects. *Final Archaeological Resources Report.* The archaeological consultant shall submit a Draft Final Archaeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archaeological resource and describes the archaeological and historical research methods employed in the archaeological testing/monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archaeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the final report. Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey NWIC shall receive one (1) copy and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Environmental Planning division of the Planning Department shall receive one bound, one unbound, and one unlocked, searchable PDF copy on CD of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the NRHP/CRHR. In instances of high public interest in or the high interpretive value of the resource, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.					
Mitigation Measure M-CP-2a: Discovery of Paleontological Resources					
If the ERO in consultation with the archaeological consultant determines that	Archaeological	During construction if	Archaeological	Environmental	Considered complete

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	*Responsibility for Implementation*	*Mitigation Schedule*	*Mitigation Action*	*Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility*	*Monitoring Schedule*
an archaeological monitoring program (AMP) shall be implemented, the AMP shall minimally include the following provisions: The archaeological consultant, project applicant, 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 archaeological consultant shall determine what Project activities shall be archaeologically 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 archaeological monitoring because of the risk these activities pose to potential archaeological resources and to their depositional context; The archaeological consultant shall advise all Project contractors to be on the alert for evidence of the presence of the expected resource(s), of how to identify the evidence of the expected resource(s), and of the appropriate protocol in the event of apparent discovery of an archaeological resource; The archaeological monitor(s) shall be present on the Project site according to a schedule agreed upon by the archaeological consultant and the ERO until the ERO has, in consultation with Project archaeological consultant, determined that Project construction activities could have no effects on significant archaeological deposits; The archaeological monitor shall record and be authorized to collect soil samples and artifactual/ecofactual material as warranted for analysis; If an intact archaeological deposit is encountered, all soils-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit shall cease. The archaeological 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 archaeological monitor has cause to believe that the pile driving activity may affect an archaeological resource, the pile driving activity shall be terminated until an appropriate evaluation of the resource has been made in consultation with the ERO. The archaeological consultant shall immediately notify the ERO of the encountered archaeological deposit. The archaeological consultant shall make a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archaeological deposit, and present the findings of this assessment to the ERO.	consultant, project sponsor, and contractor	the ERO in consultation with the archaeological consultant determines that an AMP shall be implemented.	consultant, project applicant, and ERO will consult on the scope of the AMP. Archaeological consultant/ monitors to advise contractor, be present during construction, collect soil samples, and cease construction activities if an archaeological deposit is encountered	Review Officer	after construction activities have ended.

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	*Responsibility for Implementation*	*Mitigation Schedule*	*Mitigation Action*	*Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility*	*Monitoring Schedule*
Mitigation Measure M-CP-3a: Discovery of Paleontological Resources					
The project applicant shall retain the services of a qualified paleontological consultant having expertise in California paleontology to design and implement a monitoring and mitigation program. The program shall include a description of when and where construction monitoring would be required; emergency discovery procedures; sampling and data recovery procedures; procedures for the preparation, identification, analysis, and curation of fossil specimens and data recovered; preconstruction coordination procedures; and procedures for reporting the results of the monitoring program. If potential paleontological resources (fossilized invertebrate, vertebrate, plant, or micro-fossil) are encountered during excavation, work shall cease within 25 feet of the feature, the ERO shall be notified, and the paleontologist shall identify and evaluate the significance of the potential resource, documenting the findings in an advisory memorandum to the ERO. If it is determined that avoidance of effect to a significant paleontological resource is not feasible, the paleontologist shall prepare an excavation plan that may include curation of the paleontological resource in a permanent retrieval paleontological research collections facility such as the University of California Museum of Paleontology or California Academy of Sciences. The San Francisco Environmental Planning division of the Planning Department shall receive two copies of a final paleontological excavation and recovery report. The paleontologist's work shall be conducted in accordance with this measure and at the direction of the ERO. Plans and reports prepared by the paleontologist 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. Paleontological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction for a maximum of four weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of construction could 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 paleontological resource as previously defined.	Project sponsor	During construction if paleontological resources are discovered.	Design and implement a monitoring and mitigation program to include a description of when and where construction monitoring would be required; emergency discovery procedures; sampling and data recovery procedures; procedures for the preparation, identification, analysis, and curation of fossil specimens and data recovered; preconstruction coordination procedures; and procedures for reporting the results of the monitoring program.	Environmental Review Officer	Considered complete after construction activities have ended.

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	*Responsibility for Implementation*	*Mitigation Schedule*	*Mitigation Action*	*Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility*	*Monitoring Schedule*
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION					
Mitigation Measure M-TR-4: Fair-Share Contribution to Improve 10 Townsend Line Capacity (Proposed Project and Reduced Development Alternative Only)					
The project applicant shall work with the SFMTA to determine the feasible mitigation measures and contribute its fair share to improvements to the 10 Townsend Muni line by financially compensating SFMTA for the cost of providing the service needed to accommodate the project at proposed levels of service. The financial contribution shall be calculated and applied in a manner that is consistent with the SFMTA cost/scheduling model. The amount and schedule of payment and commitment to application of service needs shall be set forth in a Transit Mitigation Agreement between the project applicant and SFMTA.	Project sponsor	Determined in the Transit Mitigation Agreement between the project applicant and SFMTA. The Transit Mitigation Agreement will be prepared prior to operation of Phase 1 of the project.	Determine the feasible mitigation measures and contribute its fair share to improvements to the 10 Townsend Muni line by financial compensation.	SFMTA	Determined in the Transit Mitigation Agreement between the project applicant and SFMTA.
Mitigation Measure M-TR-14: Construction Traffic Control Plan (Proposed Project, Reduced Development Alterative, and Housing Replacement Alternative).					
To reduce construction-related impacts, the project applicant shall develop and implement a Construction Transportation Control Plan (TCP) for each construction phase to anticipate and minimize impacts of various construction activities associated with the Proposed Project, Reduced Development Alternative and Housing Replacement Alternative. The TCP shall be submitted to Transportation Advisory Staff Committee (TASC), consisting of representatives from the SFMTA and Muni operations, Fire Department, Police Department, and SFDPW for review/approval. Specifically, the plan shall: Identify construction traffic management and a cohesive program of operational and demand management strategies designed to maintain acceptable levels of travel flow during periods of construction activities. These include, but are not limited to, construction strategies, demand management activities, alternative route strategies, and public information strategies consistent with best practices in San Francisco, as well as other cities or agencies that, although not being implemented in the city, could provide valuable management practices for the project. Management	Project sponsor	Prior to construction.	Develop and implement a Construction TCP for each construction phase to identify construction traffic management strategies. Describe procedures required by different departments. Notify emergency	Transportation Advisory Staff Committee	Considered complete once the Construction Transportation Control Plan is approved by the Transportation Advisory Staff Committee.

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
practices include, but are not limited to: Planning site construction and truck deliveries such as to minimize construction-related traffic operations during the weekday morning and evening peak commute hours. Identifying ways to reduce construction worker vehicle trips through transportation demand management programs and methods to manage construction work parking demands, such as promoting carpooling/vanpooling, encouraging transit usage, discouraging workers from parking off-site, etc. Working further with SFDPW to identify the best traffic detours during each construction phase. Identifying best practices to accommodate pedestrians, such as temporary pedestrian wayfinding signage or temporary walkways. Working with the SFMTA to identify relocated Muni routes and stops. Identifying ways to consolidate truck delivery trips, including a plan to consolidate deliveries from a centralized construction material and equipment storage facility. Identifying best practices to manage traffic flows on surrounding streets. Describe procedures required by different departments and/or agencies in the city for implementation of the TCP, such as reviewing agencies, approval processes, and estimated timelines. For example: The project applicant shall coordinate temporary and permanent changes to the transportation network within the city of San Francisco, including traffic, street and parking changes and lane closures, with the SFMTA. All travel lane, parking lane, or sidewalk closures shall be reviewed by the TASC. Any permanent changes may require meeting with the SFMTA Board of Directors or one of its sub-Committees. This may require a public hearing. Temporary traffic and transportation changes must be coordinated through the SFMTA's Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation (ISCOTT) and would require a public meeting. As part of this process, the Construction Plan may be reviewed by the TASC to resolve internal differences between different transportation modes. Caltrans Deputy Directive 60 (DD-60) requires TCP and contingency plans for all state highway activities. These plans shall be part of the normal project development process and must be considered during the planning stage to			vehicle providers about the planned street closures/detours, develop a public information plan, and hire a transportation manager.		

Adopted Mitigation Measures	*Responsibility for Implementation*	*Mitigation Schedule*	*Mitigation Action*	*Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility*	*Monitoring Schedule*
allow for the proper cost, scope and scheduling of the TCP activities on Caltrans right-of-way. These plans shall adhere to Caltrans standards and guidelines for stage construction, construction signage, traffic handling, lane and ramp closures and TCP documentation for all work within Caltrans right-of-way. Notify emergency vehicle providers about the planned street closures/detours and their duration for each construction phase. Develop a public information plan to provide adjacent residents and businesses with regularly updated information regarding project construction, including construction activities, durations, peak construction vehicle activities (e.g., concrete pours), travel lane closures, and other lane closures. Hire a transportation manager to actively manage the construction vehicle, truck loading, passenger loading and emergency vehicle access to the Project site through at least the most intense phases of construction. Develop a public information plan to provide adjacent residents and businesses with regularly updated information regarding project construction, including construction activities, durations, peak construction vehicle activities (e.g., concrete pours), travel lane closures, and other lane closures. Hire a transportation manager to actively manage the construction vehicle, truck loading, passenger loading and emergency vehicle access to the Project site through at least the most intense phases of construction.					
Mitigation Measure M-TR-16: Design of Bulb-Outs and Driveways (Proposed Project, Reduced Development Alternative, and Housing Replacement Alternative).					
During the design of each phase of the project, the project applicant shall develop designs for intersection bulb-outs and driveways connecting to parking garages incorporating the guidelines and design controls provided below. These design recommendations were identified from Better Streets Plan and guidelines provided by SFMTA, and the Planning Department. Bulb-out Design (Source – Better Streets Plan) All streets within the Project site shall adhere to standards contained in the Better Streets Plan by the San Francisco Planning Department, including the following: Streets and bulb-outs shall be designed to accommodate emergency vehicle	Project sponsor	During the design of each phase of the project.	Develop designs for intersection bulb-outs and driveways connecting to parking garages incorporating the guidelines and design controls provided below.	SFMTA and Planning Department	Considered complete after the design of each phase of the project.

Adopted Mitigation Measures	*Responsibility for Implementation*	*Mitigation Schedule*	*Mitigation Action*	*Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility*	*Monitoring Schedule*
(WB-40) turns. Streets and bulb-outs along Muni routes shall be designed to accommodate a 40-foot (B-40) bus. Bulb-outs shall be designed consistent with the SFDPW and other City agency specifications to accommodate use of mechanical street sweepers, and shall be consistent with SFFD and SFMTA regulations. All bulb-outs require the approval of the interagency TASC committee. Driveway Design (Source – Better Streets Plan, Planning Department, and SFMTA) All driveways leading to parking garages shall be designed in accordance with the San Francisco Planning Code Sections 145.1 and 155 standards applicable in RM zoning districts and the Planning Department's Guidelines for Adding Garages and Curb Cuts. Garages with more than 20 parking spaces would be subject to the Planning Department's Queue Abatement Condition of Approval, requiring the project applicant to design for and prevent through monitoring the potential for vehicle queues in the public right-of-way. Garage entrances and curb cuts shall be designed to minimize their impact on other modes of travel, including pedestrian circulation. Garage entrances shall be no wider than 20 feet if combined for ingress and egress, and no wider than 12 feet if ingress and egress are separated. Garage entrances located along streets with transit service (Missouri, Arkansas, and Wisconsin Streets) shall not encumber any bus stop and not be located directly before a bus stop.					
Mitigation Measure C- M-TR-1a: Pennsylvania Avenue/Southbound I-280 Off-Ramp Traffic Signal (Proposed Project and Reduced Development Alternative Only).					
The project applicant shall mitigate its impact to traffic related to the project development by coordinating with SFMTA on the appropriateness of signalization at this location or similar improvements to traffic operations. The project applicant shall financially compensate SFMTA for its fair share of the cost of signalization at this location or other similar traffic-related improvements in the vicinity which would similarly improve traffic operating conditions. The financial contribution shall be calculated and applied based	Project sponsor	During project design.	Determine improvements to signalization to mitigate for impacts from the project and financially contribute	SFMTA	Considered complete when financial contribution is calculated and applied based on the proposed development's fair share of the identified

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	*Responsibility for Implementation*	*Mitigation Schedule*	*Mitigation Action*	*Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility*	*Monitoring Schedule*
on the proposed development's fair share of the identified improvements.			proposed development's fair share of the identified improvements.		improvements.
Mitigation Measure C- M-TR-1b: 25th Street/Indiana Street/Northbound I-280 On-Ramp Eastbound Approach Turn Lane Modification or Traffic Signal (Proposed Project Only).					
Restripe the eastbound approach so as to convert the existing shared left-through lane to a through lane and provide a new 75-foot left-turn pocket. The restriping would require prohibition of on-street parking for approximately 75 feet in the eastbound approach (loss of two parking spaces).	Project sponsor	During or post construction.	Restripe the eastbound approach so as to convert the existing shared left-through lane to a through lane and provide a new 75-foot left-turn pocket.	SFMTA	Considered complete when required restriping is complete.
Mitigation Measure C- M-TR-1c: Cesar Chavez Street/Vermont Street Intersection Traffic Signal (Proposed Project and Reduced Development Alternative Only).					
The project applicant shall therefore mitigate its impact to traffic related to the project development by coordinating with SFMTA on the appropriateness of signalization at this location or similar improvements to traffic operations. The project applicant shall financially compensate SFMTA for its fair share of the cost of signalization at this location or other similar traffic-related improvements in the vicinity which would similarly improve traffic operating conditions. The financial contribution shall be calculated and applied based on the proposed development's fair share of the identified improvements.	Project sponsor	During project design.	Determine improvements to signalization to mitigate for impacts from the project and financially contribute proposed development's fair share of the identified improvements.	SFMTA	Considered complete when financial contribution is calculated and applied based on the proposed development's fair share of the identified improvements.

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	*Responsibility for Implementation*	*Mitigation Schedule*	*Mitigation Action*	*Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility*	*Monitoring Schedule*
Mitigation Measure C- M-TR-1d: Cesar Chavez Street/US 101 Off-Ramp Traffic Signal (Proposed Project and Reduced Development Alternative Only).					
The project applicant shall therefore mitigate its impact to traffic related to the project development by coordinating with SFMTA on the appropriateness of signalization at this location or similar improvements to traffic operations. The project applicant shall financially compensate SFMTA for its fair share of the cost of signalization at this location or other similar traffic-related improvements in the vicinity which would similarly improve traffic operating conditions. The financial contribution shall be calculated and applied based on the proposed development's fair share of the identified improvements.	Project sponsor	During project design.	Determine improvements to signalization to mitigate for impacts from the project and financially contribute proposed development's fair share of the identified improvements.	SFMTA	Considered complete when financial contribution is calculated and applied based on the proposed development's fair share of the identified. improvements.
Mitigation Measure C-M-TR-5: Fair-Share Contribution for Southeast Screenline Improvements (Proposed Project and Reduced Development Alternative Only).					
The project applicant shall work with SFMTA to ensure that the transit capacity impact to the All Other Lines corridor related to the Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative under cumulative conditions is reduced to a less-than-significant level by financially compensating SFMTA for the cost of providing the service needed to accommodate the project at proposed levels of service. The financial contribution shall be calculated and applied in a manner that is consistent with the SFMTA cost/scheduling model. The amount and schedule of payment and commitment to application of service needs shall be set forth in a Transit Mitigation Agreement between the project applicant and SFMTA.	Project sponsor	Determined in the Transit Mitigation Agreement between the project applicant and SFMTA.	Financially compensate SFMTA for the cost of providing the service needed to accommodate the project at proposed levels of service.	SFMTA	Determined in the Transit Mitigation Agreement between the project applicant and SFMTA.
NOISE					
Mitigation Measure NO-1a: Submit a Construction Noise Plan to Reduce Construction Noise.					
The project applicant shall submit a Construction Noise Plan for review and approval prior to the issuance of the demolition permit.	Project sponsor	Prior to the issuance of the demolition	Submit a Construction	City and County of San Francisco	Considered complete when approved by

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	*Responsibility for Implementation*	*Mitigation Schedule*	*Mitigation Action*	*Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility*	*Monitoring Schedule*
		permit and construction.	Noise Plan for review and approval prior to the issuance of the demolition permit.		the County and City of San Francisco.
Mitigation Measure M-NO-1b: Implement a Construction Noise Plan to Reduce Construction Noise.					
The project applicant shall implement the following measures during demolition and construction of the Proposed Project: To the extent feasible, the noisiest construction activities shall be scheduled during times that would have the least impact on nearby residential land uses. This includes restricting typical demolition and exterior construction activities to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. Equipment and trucks used for project construction shall use the best available noise control techniques (e.g., improved mufflers, equipment redesign, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures and acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds) wherever feasible. Impact tools (e.g., jackhammers, pavement breakers, and rock drills) used for project construction shall be hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools. However, where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust shall be used; this muffler can lower noise levels from the exhaust by up to about 10 dBA. External jackets on the tools themselves shall be used where feasible, and this could achieve a reduction of 5 dBA. Quieter procedures shall be used, such as drills rather than impact equipment, whenever feasible. Construction contractors, to the maximum extent feasible, shall be required to use "quiet" gasoline-powered compressors or other electric-powered compressors, and use electric rather than gasoline or diesel powered forklifts for small lifting. Stationary noise sources, such as temporary generators, shall be located as far from nearby receptors as possible, and they shall be muffled and enclosed within temporary sheds, incorporate insulation barriers, or other measures to the extent feasible.	Project sponsor and contractor	During construction.	Schedule noisy construction during times with least impact to residents, equipment and truck must have best available noise control techniques, impact tools must be hydraulically or electrically powered, use "quiet" gasoline-powered compressors, stationary noise sources must be located as far from nearby receptors as possible, install temporary plywood noise barriers eight feet in height , and trucks	City and County of San Francisco	Considered complete when construction has ended.

Adopted Mitigation Measures	*Responsibility for Implementation*	*Mitigation Schedule*	*Mitigation Action*	*Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility*	*Monitoring Schedule*
Install temporary plywood noise barriers eight feet in height around the construction site to minimize construction noise to 80 dBA as measured at 100 feet from the Project site boundary unless an acoustical engineer submits documentation that confirms that the barriers are not necessary to achieve the attenuation levels. Trucks shall be prohibited from idling along streets serving the construction site.			prohibited from idling along streets.		
AIR QUALITY					
Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2a: Utilize Efficient Construction Equipment at the Start of Construction.					
For construction activities occurring in year 2015, all off-road construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower (hp) shall have engines that meet or exceed USEPA or ARB Tier 3 off-road emission standards, or the project applicant must prepare a construction emissions minimization plan designed to reduce NOx by a minimum of 39 percent from Tier 2 equivalent engines. In addition, for the Project construction period, all trucks that haul materials to and from the Project site shall have engines that meet or exceed ARB 2010 On-Road Engine Standards to the extent feasible. Where access to alternative sources of power are available, backup diesel generators shall be prohibited. If access to alternative sources of power is not available, backup diesel generators shall meet USEPA Tier 4 Interim emissions standards.	Project sponsor and contractor	During or prior to construction in 2015.	All off-road construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower (hp) must have engines that meet or exceed USEPA or ARB Tier 3 off-road emission standards, or construction emissions minimization plan must be prepared.	City and County of San Francisco	Considered complete when implemented prior to or during construction.
Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2b: Utilize More Efficient Construction Equipment after 2016.					
For all construction occurring after 2016, all off-road construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall have engines that meet or exceed USEPA or ARB Tier 4 interim off-road emission standards, or the project applicant must prepare a construction emissions minimization plan designed to reduce NOx by a minimum of 21 percent from Tier 3 equivalent engines. Where access to alternative sources of power are available, backup diesel generators shall be	Project sponsor and contractor	During or prior to construction after 2016.	All off-road construction equipment greater than 50 hp must have engines that	City and County of San Francisco	Considered complete when implemented prior to or during construction.

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	*Responsibility for Implementation*	*Mitigation Schedule*	*Mitigation Action*	*Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility*	*Monitoring Schedule*
prohibited. If access to alternative sources of power is not available, backup diesel generators shall meet USEPA Tier 4 Interim emissions standards.			meet or exceed USEPA or ARB Tier 4 interim off-road emission standards, or a construction emissions minimization plan must be prepared.		
Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4: Construction Emissions Minimization					
A. Construction Emissions Minimization Plan. Prior to issuance of a construction permit, the project applicant shall submit a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan (Plan) to the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) for review and approval by an Environmental Planning Air Quality Specialist. The Plan shall detail project compliance with the following requirements: 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 meet the following requirements: a. Where access to alternative sources of power is available, portable diesel engines shall be prohibited; b. All off-road equipment shall have: i. (See Mitigation Measures M-AQ-2a and M-AQ-2b) ii. Engines that are retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy (VDECS). c. Exceptions: i. Exceptions to A(1)(a) may be granted if the project applicant has submitted information providing evidence to the satisfaction of the ERO that an alternative source of power is limited or infeasible at the project site and that the requirements of this exception provision apply. Under this circumstance, the applicant shall submit documentation of compliance with A(1)(b) for on-site power generation. ii. Exceptions to A(1)(b)(ii) may be granted if the project applicant has	Project Sponsor	Prior to issuance of a construction permit.	Submit a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan.	City and County of San Francisco	Considered complete once the construction permit is issued.

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
submitted information providing evidence to the satisfaction of the ERO that a particular piece of off-road equipment with an ARB Level 3 VDECS is (1) technically not feasible, (2) would not produce desired emissions reductions due to expected operating modes, (3) installing the control device would create a safety hazard or impaired visibility for the operator, or (4) there is a compelling emergency need to use off-road equipment that are not retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 VDECS and the applicant has submitted documentation to the ERO that the requirements of this exception provision apply. If granted an exception to A(1)(b)(ii), the project applicant must comply with the requirements of A(1)(c)(iii). iii. If an exception is granted pursuant to A(1)(c)(ii), the project applicant shall provide the next cleanest piece of off-road equipment as provided by the step down schedules as follows and shall provide documentation that emissions are sufficiently reduced to ensure excess cancer risks and PM2.5 concentrations do not exceed the air pollution exposure zone criteria: 1. Compliance Alternative 1: Engine Emission Standard 2 with ARB Level 2 VDECS 2. Compliance Alternative 2: Engine Emission Standard 2 with ARB Level 1 VDECS 3. Compliance Alternative 3: Engine Emission Standard 2 with alternative fuels (Alternative fuels are not VDECS) If the requirements of (A)(1)(b) cannot be met, then the project applicant would need to meet Compliance Alternative 1. Should the project applicant not be able to supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 1, then Compliance Alternative 2 would need to be met. Should the project applicant not be able to supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 2, then Compliance Alternative 3 would need to be met. 2. The project applicant shall require the idling time for off-road and on-road equipment be limited to no more than two minutes, except as provided in exceptions to the applicable state regulations regarding idling for off-road and on-road equipment. Legible and visible signs shall be posted in multiple languages (English, Spanish, Chinese) in designated queuing areas and at the construction site to remind operators of the two minute idling limit.					

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	*Responsibility for Implementation*	*Mitigation Schedule*	*Mitigation Action*	*Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility*	*Monitoring Schedule*
3. The project applicant shall require that construction operators properly maintain and tune equipment in accordance with manufacturer specifications.					
4. 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. Off-road equipment descriptions and information 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: 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, reporting shall indicate the type of alternative fuel being used.					
5. The Plan shall be kept on site and available for review by any persons requesting it and a legible sign shall be posted at the perimeter of the construction site indicating to the public the basic requirements of the Plan and a way to request a copy of the Plan. The project applicant shall provide copies of Plan to members of the public as requested.					
B. Reporting. Monthly reports shall be submitted to the ERO indicating the construction phase and off-road equipment information used during each phase including the information required in A(4). In addition, for off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall include the actual amount of alternative fuel used. Within 6 months of the completion of construction activities, the project applicant shall submit to the ERO a final report summarizing construction activities. The final report shall indicate the start and end dates and duration of each construction phase. For each phase, the report shall include detailed information required in A(4). In addition, for off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall include the actual amount of alternative fuel used.					
C. Certification Statement and On-site Requirements. Prior to the commencement of construction activities, the project applicant must certify (1) compliance with the Plan, and (2) all applicable requirements of the Plan have been incorporated into contract specifications.					
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES					

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	*Responsibility for Implementation*	*Mitigation Schedule*	*Mitigation Action*	*Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility*	*Monitoring Schedule*
Mitigation Measure M-BI-4a: Bird Nest Preconstruction Survey.					
Given that the presence of mature trees and shrubs on the Project site could potentially provide nesting habitat for raptors and a variety of other migratory birds, tree removal associated with the Proposed Project could result in "take" caused by the direct mortality of adult or young birds, nest destruction, or disturbance of nesting native bird species (including migratory birds and other special-status species) resulting in nest abandonment and/or the loss of reproductive effort. Bird species are protected by both state (California Fish and Game Code Sections 3503 and 3513) and federal (Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918) laws. Disruption of nesting birds, resulting in the abandonment of active nests, or the loss of active nests through structure removal would be a potentially significant impact. The project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct preconstruction breeding-season surveys (i.e., approximately February 15 through August 31) of the Project site and immediate vicinity with suitable nesting habitat during the same calendar year that construction is planned to begin, in consultation with the City of San Francisco and CDFW. If phased construction procedures are planned for the Proposed Project, the results of the above survey shall be valid only for the season when it is conducted. A report shall be submitted to CDFW and the City of San Francisco, following the completion of the bird nesting survey that includes, at a minimum, the following information: A description of the methodology including dates of field visits, the names of survey personnel with resumes, and a list of references cited and persons contacted. A map showing the location(s) of any bird nests observed on or in the immediate vicinity of the Project site. If the above survey does not identify any nesting bird species on or in the immediate vicinity of the Project site, no further mitigation would be required. However, should any active bird nests be located on or in the immediate vicinity of the Project site that could be directly or indirectly affected by construction activities, Mitigation Measure M-BI-4b shall be implemented.	Project sponsor	Prior to construction.	Conduct pre-construction nesting bird surveys.	City and County of San Francisco and CDFW	Considered complete when preconstruction surveys are completed.

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	*Responsibility for Implementation*	*Mitigation Schedule*	*Mitigation Action*	*Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility*	*Monitoring Schedule*
Mitigation Measure M-BI-4b: Bird Nest Buffer Zone.					
The project applicant, in consultation with the City and County of San Francisco and CDFW, shall delay construction in the vicinity of active bird nest sites located on or adjacent to the Project site during the breeding season (approximately February 15 through August 31), while the nest is occupied with adults and/or young. If active nests are identified in the Project site or adjacent areas, a qualified biologist will establish a restricted work zone in consultation with CDFW. The qualified biologist, as determined by the Environmental Review Officer, shall monitor the active nest until the young have fledged, until the biologist determines that the nest is no longer active, or if it is reasonable that construction activities are not disturbing nesting behaviors. The buffer zone shall be delineated by highly visible temporary construction fencing.	Project sponsor	Prior to or during construction.	Delay construction in the vicinity of active bird nest sites located on or adjacent to the Project site during the breeding season (approximately February 15 through August 31), while the nest is occupied with adults and/or young.	City and County of San Francisco and CDFW	Considered complete when biologist determines the nest is no longer active or if it is reasonable that construction activities are not disturbing nesting behaviors.
GEOLOGY AND SOILS					
Mitigation Measure M-GE-1: Landslide Hazard Mitigation (Proposed Project and Reduced Development Alternative Only).					
Prior to issuance of a grading permit for each phase of project development, the recommendations for mitigating potential slope stability hazards outlined in the *Geotechnical Exploration: Potrero Annex and Terrace Redevelopment San Francisco, CA* shall be included in project design. Measures to reduce landslide hazard may include, but would not be limited to, adhering to graded slope and cut/fill guidelines identified in Section 5.5 of the geotechnical report, ongoing inspection and monitoring of cut slopes during construction, proper fill conditioning, placement and compaction, and installation of keyways and subdrains as recommended by the engineer of record.	Project sponsor	Prior to issuance of a grading permit for each phase of project development.	Measures to reduce landslide hazard may include, but would not be limited to, adhering to graded slope and cut/fill guidelines identified in Section 5.5 of the geotechnical report, ongoing inspection and	City and County of San Francisco	Considered complete when grading permit is issued.

Adopted Mitigation Measures	*Responsibility for Implementation*	*Mitigation Schedule*	*Mitigation Action*	*Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility*	*Monitoring Schedule*
			monitoring of cut slopes during construction, proper fill conditioning, placement and compaction, and installation of keyways and subdrains as recommended by the engineer of record.		
Mitigation Measure M-GE-2a – Preventative Erosion Control Measures (Proposed Project, Reduced Development Alternative, and Housing Replacement Alternative).					
The construction contractor shall implement preventative measures recommended in the *Geotechnical Exploration: Potrero Annex and Terrace Redevelopment San Francisco, CA*. Such preventative measures may include placing topsoil strippings over all open space cut and fill slopes immediately following grading and prior to installation of erosion control measures, landscaping and concrete or asphalt-lined drainage facilities on slopes graded to a steepness of 3:1 (horizontal: vertical) or steeper.	Contractor	During construction.	Preventative measures may include placing topsoil strippings over all open space cut and fill slopes immediately following grading and prior to installation of erosion control measures, landscaping and concrete or asphalt-lined drainage facilities on slopes graded to a steepness of 3:1 (horizontal:	City and County of San Francisco	Considered completed when construction is complete.

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	*Responsibility for Implementation*	*Mitigation Schedule*	*Mitigation Action*	*Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility*	*Monitoring Schedule*
			vertical) or steeper.		
Mitigation Measure M-GE-2b: Cut Slopes and Engineered Fill (Proposed Project, Reduced Development Alternative, and Housing Replacement Alternative).					
Prior to construction, existing fill and loose surface soil shall be removed and replaced as engineered fill. Cut slopes that exceed recommended gradient guidelines identified in Section 5.5 of the Geotechnical Exploration: Potrero Annex and Terrace Redevelopment San Francisco, CA, shall be reconstructed as fill slopes. Fill slopes that exceed the recommended gradient guidelines shall be constructed with geogrid reinforcement.	Contractor	Prior to construction.	Existing fill and loose surface soil shall be removed and replaced as engineered fill.	City and County of San Francisco	Considered complete when construction begins.
Mitigation Measure M-GE-2c: Erosion Control Measures in Response to Heavy Rains (Proposed Project, Reduced Development Alternative, and Housing Replacement Alternative).					
In the case that construction activities are halted due to the onset of heavy rains, before work is stopped, a positive gradient away from the slopes shall be provided to carry the surface runoff away from the slopes to areas where erosion can be controlled.	Contractor	During construction.	During heavy rains, a positive gradient away from the slopes shall be provided to carry the surface runoff away from the slopes to areas where erosion can be controlled.	City and County of San Francisco	Considered complete after construction activities have ended.
Mitigation Measure M-GE-3 – Unstable Soils and Slopes (Proposed Project and Reduced Development Alternative Only).					
Prior to approval of 40-scale grading plans, upper and lower bound settlement estimates and specific corrective procedures for the site to address settlement of deep fills, including a quantitative analysis of the grading scope, shall be provided consistent with the recommendations in the *Geotechnical Exploration: Potrero Annex and Terrace Redevelopment San Francisco, CA*. Remedial grading shall be performed to reduce differential fill thickness to no more than 10 feet across an individual building pad, and a	Project sponsor and contractor	Prior to approval of 40-scale grading plans and construction.	Upper and lower bound settlement estimates and specific corrective procedures for the site to	City and County of San Francisco	Considered complete when construction begins.

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	*Responsibility for Implementation*	*Mitigation Schedule*	*Mitigation Action*	*Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility*	*Monitoring Schedule*
remedial grading plan shall be prepared that identifies areas where additional over excavation would be necessary to reduce differential fill thickness. Prior to construction, existing fill and loose surface soil shall be removed and replaced as engineered fill. In addition, the construction contractor shall implement preventative measures recommended by the geotechnical investigation. Prior to approval of 40-scale grading plans, project applicant shall incorporate recommendations identified in the geotechnical investigation to address soil creep in grading and design plans. Such measures could include, but would not be limited to, benching through superficial soil during fill placement, soil compaction, foundation selection, and structure setbacks, or equally effective measures or combination thereof.			address settlement of deep fills must be provided, existing fill and loose surface soil shall be removed and replaced as engineered fill, and musts shall incorporate recommendation s identified in the geotechnical investigation.		
Mitigation Measure M-GE-4 – Expansive Soils (Proposed Project and Reduced Development Alternative Only).					
If final construction plans expose identified expansive colluvial soil and slope at or near the final design grades, corrective grading shall be required to reduce the potential impacts from soil swell. Furthermore, building damage due to volume changes associated with expansive soils can be reduced by the following: selectively placing the higher on-site expansive materials in the deeper fill areas (generally at depths below 10 feet of finished grades), or placing these higher expansive on-site materials outside of areas of the proposed structures and site improvements (such as landscape acres); performing proper moisture conditioning and compaction of fill materials within selected ranges to reduce their swell potential; and using deep foundations, structurally reinforced "rigid" mats, or post-tensioned slabs designed to resist the uplift pressures and deflections associated with the soil expansion.	Project sponsor and contractor	During construction	If final construction plans expose identified expansive colluvial soil and slope at or near the final design grades, corrective grading shall be required to reduce the potential impacts from soil swell.	City and County of San Francisco	Considered complete when design plans are completed.

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	*Responsibility for Implementation*	*Mitigation Schedule*	*Mitigation Action*	*Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility*	*Monitoring Schedule*
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS					
Mitigation Measure M HZ 2.1 – Voluntary Remedial Action Program (VRAP) Applications and Work Plans.					
Prior to each phase of development, the project applicant shall submit a VRAP application to the San Francisco DPH SAM. Each VRAP application shall include a Sampling and Analysis Report (SAR) work plan. The work plan shall be submitted sufficiently in advance of planning sampling to allow time for work plan approval, SAR preparation, submittal to and approval by DPH SAM. The work plan submittal timeframe should also be of sufficient duration for subsequent preparation and approval of a Site Mitigation Plan following acceptance of the SAR. The SAR work plan for each phase shall address the following: Description of the Proposed Project phase including number and location of buildings, building configuration, and the depths of excavation. Figures showing proposed building and other feature locations, lateral and vertical extent of excavation. Samples shall be collected prior to grading but may be collected after building demolition. Sampling shall be performed to the depth of any project excavation If groundwater is encountered, a grab sample shall be collected and analyzed. Samples shall be analyzed for TPH gasoline through motor oil ranges, California 17 metals, and asbestos. Include figures showing the proposed number and locations of samples and listing the depths of samples to be collected and analyzed. Sample locations shall be around the existing buildings plus additional random sample locations. A SAR shall be submitted to DPH SAM describing the sampling procedures and results. The SAR shall include a summary and tables of the analyses and figures showing sample locations with sample depths.	Project sponsor	Prior to each phase of development.	Submit a VRAP application to the San Francisco DPH SAM including a Sampling and Analysis Report (SAR) work plan.	City and County of San Francisco	Considered complete when each phase of development is completed.
Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2.2 – Site Mitigation Plan (SMP).					
If DPH SAM's review of the SAR for a project phase indicates a Site Management Plan (SMP) is warranted, an SMP shall be submitted to DPH	Project sponsor	During each phase of	Implement a Site Management	City and County of	Considered complete when all project

Adopted Mitigation Measures	*Responsibility for Implementation*	*Mitigation Schedule*	*Mitigation Action*	*Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility*	*Monitoring Schedule*
SAM no less than six weeks prior to beginning construction grading and excavation work for that phase. The SMP shall be approved by DPH SAM prior to beginning construction field work for that phase, and shall be implemented by the project applicant. The SMP for each phase shall consist of the following: Proposed Project description—building locations, configurations, and maximum proposed lateral and vertical extent of excavation. Figures shall show Proposed Project features and lateral and vertical extent of excavation. Cleanup levels for petroleum hydrocarbons, associated chemicals, asbestos, and/or metals shall be proposed to DPH SAM if elevated concentrations are reported in the SAR. Soils that meet or exceed the California Total Threshold Limit Concentration (TTLC) listed in the CCR 22 66261 for lead (1,000 mg/kg) shall be removed, transported, and handled as Class I hazardous waste. Soils containing less than 1,000 mg/kg lead but more than 200 mg/kg may be reused on-site if placed beneath buildings. If those soils are reused, soils containing between 200 mg/kg and 80 mg/kg lead shall be placed under buildings, sidewalks, roadways, other paved or concrete-capped areas, or covered by two feet of clean fill over which a visual barrier such as brightly colored plastic fencing netting or fabric shall be placed. Mixing or grading of soils to reduce surface lead or other chemical concentrations is prohibited. Confirmation sample collection following implementation of soil remedial measures and excavation. Confirmation sample locations shall be provided on a figure. DPH SAM shall be notified in writing if confirmation sample analytical results exceed the cleanup criteria. The written communication shall include sample locations and the analytical results. Additional excavation shall be performed, or other mitigating measures acceptable to DPH SAM implemented, if confirmation samples exceed the residential cleanup guidelines. The SMP shall identify options for handling contaminated soils, including storage of soils on plastic sheeting and covering with sheeting when soil is not actively being added or removed from a stockpile. Frequency of soil stockpile sampling. All soil samples shall be analyzed for at least lead metal plus other chemicals detected above the environmental screening level (ESL) as reported in the SAR.		development.	Plan (SMP).	San Francisco	phases are completed.

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	*Responsibility for Implementation*	*Mitigation Schedule*	*Mitigation Action*	*Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility*	*Monitoring Schedule*
Contractor/developer shall receive written concurrence from DPH SAM prior to re-using soils that exceed the cleanup limits. Identify the proposed soil transporter and disposal locations. Contingency Plan that describes the procedures for controlling, containing, remediating, testing, and disposing of any unexpected contaminated soil, water, or other material. Stormwater control and noise control protocols as applicable. A SMP completion report shall be prepared and submitted to DPH SAM following SMP implementation. The report shall include documentation of the work performed. The SMP completion report shall include: figures showing the final lateral and vertical extent of the excavation; the finished grade and the location of reused soils relative to proposed buildings and hardscape; a summary of the analytical results for the confirmation and stockpile samples plus copies of the laboratory reports; copies of bills of lading and manifests for hazardous waste transport and disposal.					
Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2.3: Dust Control Plan and Worker Health and Safety Plan.					
A Dust Control Plan (DCP) shall be submitted to DPH SAM that complies with Health Code Article 22B (Demolition and Construction Dust Control) not less than two weeks prior to beginning construction field work for any phase. A site-specific worker Health and Safety Plan shall also be submitted not less than two weeks prior to construction field work for any phase.	Project sponsor and contractor	Prior to construction.	Submit Dust Control Plan	City and County of San Francisco	Considered complete two week prior to the last phase of construction.
Mitigation Measure M HZ 2.4: Underground Storage Tanks.					
Should an underground storage tank (UST) be encountered, work shall be suspended and the construction contractor shall notify the owner/project applicant. The site owner/sponsor shall notify the DPH and proposed response actions. The UST shall be removed under permit from the HMUPA and the SFFD. All related documentation shall be provided to DPH SAM.	Project sponsor and contractor	During construction.	Construction contractor shall notify the owner/project applicant if an underground storage tank is encountered.	City and County of San Francisco	Considered complete when construction is over.