

ABBREVIATED CEQA CHECKLIST
For Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP) Improvements
(Renamed to Muni Forward)
Subsequent to Certification of the TEP EIR
 Planning Department Case Number: 2011.0558E

I. Project Information			
Agency (Project Sponsor):	SFMTA	Date submitted: August 8, 2017	Issued: August 28, 2017
Primary Project Contact:	Tracey Lin, Tracey.Lin@sfmta.com , 415-646-2596		
Secondary Contact (responsible for TEP Abbreviated CEQA Checklist completion): (SFMTA Staff name, phone, email, address)	Felipe Robles, 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 7 th Floor, SF Felipe.Robles@sfmta.com , 415-701-2457		
Project Name and Identifier from the TEP EIR (i.e. OWE.6, TTRP.M, or Service Improvement 35 Eureka):	TTRP.71_2 for the 7 Haight Noriega, also known as the 7 Haight Noriega Transit Priority Project: West of Stanyan	<input type="checkbox"/> Service Improvement or Service Variant <input type="checkbox"/> Service-related Capital Improvement <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TTRP or TTRP Variant	
Is this a Modification of a Project Covered at a Project level in TEP EIR?	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N		
Has this project received subsequent environmental review since EIR certification? If yes, provide date(s), document types, and specify project segment based on prior submittals.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N If yes: Date/ Document type: Segment:		
For Project-level TTRPs, identify if proposed project is closer to the Moderate or Expanded Alternative.	<input type="checkbox"/> Moderate <input type="checkbox"/> Expanded <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable		
Project Location, specify limits especially if only one segment of the corridor is proposed for modification [i.e. Identify the TTRP Corridor primary streets, inbound/outbound, and segment limits. For Service-related Capital Improvements, identify the Route/Line and project area. For Service Improvements identify Route/Line, inbound/outbound, and general limits for proposed changes.]	Noriega Street, between 42 nd Avenue and 47 th Avenue		
Timeline for construction/ implementation	Implementation estimated to be completed by October 2017		
Project Approval(s) [List all – include others besides SFMTA Board]	TASC, SFMTA Board		
Other Anticipated Hearing Date(s) (Engineering Public Hearing; ISCOTT etc.)	Engineering Public Hearing 8/4/2017		

II. PURPOSE

On March 27, 2014, the San Francisco Planning Commission certified a Final Environmental Impact Report for the Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP EIR). This Program and Project EIR analyzed the impacts of all components of the TEP comprised of a Service Policy Framework, Service Improvements and Service Variants, Service-related Capital Improvements, and Travel Time Reduction Proposals (TTRP) for the City of San Francisco's (San Francisco) Rapid Network within the transit system.

The EIR prepared for the TEP was both a Program EIR and Project EIR. This written checklist, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(c), Use With Later Activities, serves to evaluate whether the environmental effects of the proposed project based on a review of the site(s) and the activity or activities proposed now were covered in the TEP EIR. This checklist will be utilized to ascertain whether the impacts of TEP proposals identified at a conceptual level in the EIR (program level) and/or modifications to project-level components were sufficiently addressed in the TEP EIR. Based on a review of the project described herein and Section 15162(a), the San Francisco Planning Department, as the lead agency for CEQA, would assess whether the activity or activities is/are within the scope of the project covered by the Transit Effectiveness Project EIR (TEP EIR), a Program and Project EIR, such that project approval(s) may be considered by the City of San Francisco (San Francisco).

III. TEP EIR Project Characteristics

The TEP EIR contains a full description of all project components beginning on p. 2-1. The TEP project overview is provided on pp. 2-7 to 2-15. Specific details for the project components including the Service Policy Framework, the Service Improvements and Service Variants, the Service-related Capital Improvements, and the Travel Time Reduction Proposals (TTRPs) are provided on the following TEP EIR pages, respectively. Please use these TEP EIR references to provide a narrative project description that presents the current proposal in the context of what was analyzed in the TEP EIR.

Program level:

- Service Policy Framework is described on TEP EIR pp. 2-19 to 2-23.
- Program-level Service-related Capital Improvement Projects are described on TEP EIR pp. 2-11 and 2-23 and in Figure 2 on TEP EIR p. 2-12.
- TPS Toolkit Categories and Elements as applied to the Muni Rapid Corridors are listed in Table 3 on TEP EIR p. 2-14. The complete project description and figures illustrating each TPS Toolkit element are found on TEP EIR pp. 2-23 to 2-51.
- Program level TTRPs are described in Table 4 on TEP EIR pp. 2-17 to 2-18. In addition, these program level TTRP corridors are described on p. 2-51, and pp. 2-54 to 2-56. Specifically on the following TEP EIR pages:

Program TTRP Corridor: TEP EIR Page References	Program TTRP Corridor: TEP EIR Page References	Program TTRP Corridor: TEP EIR Page References
TTRP.K: pp. 2-55 to 2-56	TTRP.22_2: p. 2-54	TTRP.71_2: Figure 3 p. 2016 and p. 2-55
TTRP.M: p. 2-56	TTRP.28_2: p. 2-55	
TTRP.1: p. 2-54	TTRP.30_2: p. 2-55	

Project level:

- Service Improvements and Service Variants are described on TEP EIR pp. 2-57 to 2-102, including Tables 6, 7, and 8. In addition, the Service Improvements and Service Variants are illustrated on the route maps provided in Appendix 2 to the TEP EIR.
- Project-level Service-related Capital Improvement Projects are described on TEP EIR pp. 2-102 to 2-110 and the locations are shown on Figure 2 on TEP EIR p. 2-12.
- Project-level TTRPs are described in Table 4 on TEP EIR pp. 2-17 to 2-18. In addition, a Moderate and an Expanded Alternative for the project-level TTRP corridors are described on TEP EIR pp. 2-110 to 2-162 and illustrated with graphics as appropriate. TEP EIR pages references for the individual corridors are as follows:

Project TTRP Corridor: TEP EIR Page References	Project TTRP Corridor: TEP EIR Page References	Project TTRP Corridor: TEP EIR Page References	Project TTRP Corridor: TEP EIR Page References
TTRP.J: pp. 2-212 to 2-118	TTRP.5: p. 2-121 to 128	TTRP.14: p. 2-2-135 to 2-147	TTRP.30_1: p. 2-156 to 2-160
TTRP.L: pp. 2-117 to 2-118h	TTRP.8X: p. 2-126 to 135	TTRP.22_1: p. 2-144 to 153	TTRP.71: p. 2-159 to 2-160e
TTRP.N : pp. 2-117 to 2-122	TTRP.9: p. 2-135 to 2-135i	TTRP.28_1: p. 2-152 to 2-156	

Provide a complete Narrative Project Description, including TPS Toolkit Element dimensions, if applicable, and a comparison of the modified project with the applicable TEP EIR project description. If the current project is a TTRP project, please use the template provided by EP, organize project changes by TPS Toolkit Category, and note whether or not overall the current project or project segment is closer to the Moderate Alternative or to the Expanded Alternative. Please also include any elements (curb color, parking spaces, etc.) that will be specifically described in the SFMTA Board packet for the approval hearing.

PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT A.

IV. Project Screening - Topic Areas Addressed in the TEP EIR [Parts A (Transportation), B (Noise) and C (Air Quality)]

IV.A. Transportation and Circulation

Instructions – Review the analysis sections cited below for the TEP component being reviewed. For example, a change to the project design for TTRP.5 requires review of the Project level TTRPs discussion. In addition, should the proposed project introduce a TPS Toolkit Element not previously analyzed for the TTRP.5, then review the analysis for the TPS Toolkit Category/Elements to complete this form.

IV.A.1. Transit

Project component	Project-level Analysis [Please review the Impact discussion referenced below to respond to applicable questions; TEP EIR Page References provided.]	Program-level Analysis [Please review the Impact discussion referenced below to respond to applicable questions; TEP EIR Page References provided]	Cumulative Analysis [Please review the Impact discussion referenced below to respond to applicable questions; TEP EIR Page References provided]	Are the potential impacts covered or disclosed in the TEP EIR?	If no, briefly describe how the potential impact(s) would differ.	Notes – To be used by the Environmental Planner
Service Improvements and/or Service Variants	Impact TR-18: pp. 4.2-121 to 4.2-141 (LTS Impact).	N/A	Impact C-TR-1: pp. 4.2-267 to 4.2-271. (S/U cumulative impact on the Mission Corridor) Impact C-TR-4: pp. 4.2-276 to 4.2-278. (LTS impact on regional transit.)	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A		Mitigation measure C-M-TR-1: SFMTA Monitoring of Muni Service is applicable to the cumulative transit Impact C-TR-1 for the Service Improvements and Service Variants.
Service-related Capital Improvements	Impact TR-19: pp. 4.2-163 to 4.2-164. (LTS impact)	Impact TR-12: pp. 4.2-97 to 4.2-98 (LTS impact).	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A		

<p>Travel Time Reduction Proposals (TTRPs)</p>	<p>Moderate TTRP Alternatives TTRP.J, L, N, 5, 8X, 9, 14, 22_1, 28_1, 30_1, or 71:</p> <p>Impact TR-20: pp. 4.2-169 to 4.2-174 plus Tables 12 and 13 on pp. 4.2-122 to 4.2-135, (LTS Impact); and</p> <p>Expanded TTRP Alternatives TTRP.J, L, N, 5, 8X, 9, 14, 22_1, 28_1, 30_1, or 71:</p> <p>Impact TR-21: pp. 4.2-174 to 4.2-177 plus Tables 12 and 13 on pp. 4.2-122 to 4.2-135, and Tables 14 and 15 on pp. 4.2-172 to 4.2-173 (LTS Impact).</p>	<p>All TPS Toolkit categories implemented along the program level TTRPs:</p> <p>Impact TR-13: pp. 4.2-103 to 4.2-105 (LTS impact).</p>	<p>Moderate Alternative</p> <p>Impact C-TR-2: pp. 4.2-272 to 4.2-273 plus Tables 20 and 21 on pp. 4.2-268 to 4.2-269. (S/U cumulative impact on the Fulton/Hayes & Mission corridors)</p> <p>Impact C-TR-5: p. 4.2-278, (LTS impact)</p> <p>Expanded Alternative</p> <p>Impact C-TR-3: pp. 4.2-273 to 4.2-276 plus Tables 20 and 21 on pp. 4.2-268 to 4.2-269. (S/U cumulative impact on the Fulton/Hayes & Mission corridors)</p> <p>Impact C-TR-6: p. 4.2-278, (LTS impact)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Y</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>		<p>Mitigation measure C-M-TR-1: SFMTA Monitoring of Muni Service is applicable to the cumulative transit Impact C-TR-2 for the Moderate Alternative; and Impact C-TR-3 for the Expanded Alternative.</p>
<p>TPS Toolkit Categories and Elements on the Muni Rapid Network Corridors</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>All TPS Toolkit categories: Impact TR-7: pp. 4.2-81 to 4.2-83 (LTS impact)</p>	<p>Moderate Alternative</p> <p>Impact C-TR-2: pp. 4.2-272 to 4.2-273 plus Tables 20 and 21 on pp. 4.2-268 to 4.2-269. (S/U cumulative impact)</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>		<p>Mitigation measure C-M-TR-1: SFMTA Monitoring of Muni Service is applicable to the cumulative transit Impact C-TR-2 for the Moderate Alternative; and Impact C-TR-3 for</p>

			<p>Impact C-TR-5: p. 4.2-278, (LTS impact).</p> <p>Expanded Alternative</p> <p>Impact C-TR-3: pp. 4.2-273 to 4.2-276 plus Tables 20 and 21 on pp. 4.2-268 to 4.2-269 (S/U cumulative impact on the Fulton/Hayes & Mission corridors)</p> <p>Impact C-TR-6: p. 4.2-278, (LTS impact).</p>			the Expanded Alternative.
--	--	--	---	--	--	---------------------------

Section Instructions:

For Service Improvements or Service Variant, complete questions 1, 2, 3, and 4. Question 5 is not applicable (N/A).

For TTRPs or their variants, please complete question 5. Other questions are not applicable (N/A). Note that if stop consolidation or stop optimization are not part of the project modification, then question 5 is not applicable to the project change.

The only relevant question for the Service-related Capital Improvements is most likely question 5, but it depends on project description. Please consult EP staff if uncertain.

1. Would the proposed project result in an increase in transit service hours greater than the 12 percent annual increase in service hours analyzed in the TEP EIR? [Note: This question only applies to changes resulting from Service Improvements and Service Variants]

Y N N/A

If yes, please consult EP.

2. Would the proposed project remove transit service from a street or street segment(s) not analyzed in the TEP EIR?

Y N N/A

If so, provide information regarding the closest alternate transit service to this existing service.

3. Would the proposed project add transit service to a street or street segment(s) not analyzed in the TEP EIR?

Y N N/A

If so, specify route and/or line number(s), identify street segment(s), and provide peak period and midday frequencies.

4. For service added to new streets or street segments, please confirm that new transit stop locations meet the Stop Spacing Guidelines.

Y N N/A

If No, then provide additional information regarding the deviation from the Stop Spacing Guidelines.

5. If the proposed project or project modification includes the removal or consolidation of transit stops, or the optimization of transit stops (nearside or farside), do those changes meet the current Stop Spacing Guidelines? Y N If No, then please provide additional information regarding the deviation from the Stop Spacing Guidelines.

IV.A.2. Traffic Operations [Refer to Attachment(s) to this TEP Abbreviated Checklist if supplemental documentation is required.]

Senate Bill 743 – Automobile Delay and Vehicle Miles Traveled

CEQA Section 21099(b)(1) requires that the State Office of Planning and Research (OPR) develop revisions to the CEQA Guidelines establishing criteria for determining the significance of transportation impacts of projects that promote the “reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses.” CEQA Section 21099(b)(2) states that upon certification of the revised CEQA Guidelines for determining transportation impacts pursuant to Section 21099(b)(1), automobile delay, as described solely by level of service (LOS) or similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion, shall not be considered a significant impact on the environment under CEQA.

In January 2016, OPR published for public review and comment a *Revised Proposal on Updates to the CEQA Guidelines on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA*¹ (proposed transportation impact guidelines) recommending that transportation impacts for projects be measured using a vehicle miles traveled (VMT) metric. VMT measures the amount and distance that a project might cause people to drive, accounting for the number of passengers within a vehicle.

OPR’s proposed transportation impact guidelines provides substantial evidence that VMT is an appropriate standard to use in analyzing transportation impacts to protect environmental quality and a better indicator of greenhouse gas, air quality, and energy impacts than automobile delay. Acknowledging this, San Francisco Planning Commission Resolution 19579, adopted on March 3, 2016:

- Found that automobile delay, as described solely by LOS or similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion, shall no longer be considered a significant impact on the environment pursuant to CEQA, because it does not measure environmental impacts and therefore it does not protect environmental quality.
- Directed the Environmental Review Officer to remove automobile delay as a factor in determining significant impacts pursuant to CEQA for all guidelines, criteria, and list of exemptions, and to update the Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review and Categorical Exemptions from CEQA to reflect this change.
- Directed the Environmental Planning Division and Environmental Review Officer to replace automobile delay with VMT criteria which promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses; and consistent with proposed and forthcoming changes to the CEQA Guidelines by OPR.

Planning Commission Resolution 19579 became effective immediately for all projects in the City and County of San Francisco that have not received a CEQA determination and all projects that have previously received CEQA determinations, but require additional environmental analysis. Therefore, impacts and mitigation measures from the TEP EIR associated with automobile delay are not discussed in this checklist. Instead, a VMT and induced automobile travel impact analysis is provided in the Traffic section, as applicable.

¹ This document is available online at: https://www.opr.ca.gov/s_sb743.php.

Induced Automobile Travel Analysis

Transportation projects may substantially induce additional automobile travel. The following identifies thresholds of significance and screening criteria used to determine if transportation projects would result significant impacts by inducing substantial additional automobile travel.

Pursuant to OPR's proposed transportation impact guidelines, a transportation project would substantially induce automobile travel if it would generate more than 2,075,220 VMT per year. This threshold is based on the fair share VMT allocated to transportation projects required to achieve California's long-term greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030.

OPR's proposed transportation impact guidelines includes a list of transportation project types that would not likely lead to a substantial or measureable increase in VMT. If a project fits within the general types of projects (including combinations of types) described below, then it is presumed that VMT impacts would be less than significant and a detailed VMT analysis is not required. Accordingly, the TEP projects would not result in a substantial increase in VMT because these projects would include the following components and features:

- Active Transportation, Rightsizing (a.k.a. Road Diet), and Transit Projects:
 - Reduction in number of through lanes
 - Infrastructure projects, including safety and accessibility improvements, for people walking or bicycling
 - Installation or reconfiguration of traffic calming devices
 - Creation of new or expansion of existing transit service
 - Creation of new or conversion of existing general purpose lanes (including vehicle ramps) to transit lanes
- Other Minor Transportation Projects:
 - Rehabilitation, maintenance, replacement and repair projects designed to improve the condition of existing transportation assets (e.g., highways, roadways, bridges, culverts, tunnels, transit systems, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities) and that do not add additional motor vehicle capacity
 - Installation, removal, or reconfiguration of traffic lanes that are not for through traffic, such as left, right, and U-turn pockets, or emergency breakdown lanes that are not used as through lanes
 - Conversion of existing general purpose lanes (including vehicle ramps) to managed lanes (e.g., HOV, HOT, or trucks) or transit lanes
 - Grade separation to separate vehicles from rail, transit, pedestrians or bicycles, or to replace a lane in order to separate preferential vehicles (e.g. HOV, HOT, or trucks) from general vehicles
 - Installation, removal, or reconfiguration of traffic control devices, including Transit Signal Priority (TSP) features
 - Traffic metering systems

- Timing of signals to optimize vehicle, bicycle or pedestrian flow on local or collector streets
- Installation of roundabouts
- Addition of transportation wayfinding signage
- Removal of off- or on-street parking spaces
- Adoption, removal, or modification of on-street parking or loading restrictions (including meters, time limits, accessible spaces, and preferential/reserved parking permit programs)

Accordingly, the intersection level of service traffic analysis in the TEP EIR is for informational purposes and is removed from this checklist.

If the proposed project modification would alter trip distribution in the project vicinity, please describe the changes and discuss the potential for conflicts and hazardous conditions.

N/A

IV.A.3. Pedestrian and Bicycles

Project component	Project-level Analysis [Please review the Impact discussion referenced below to respond to applicable questions; TEP EIR Page References provided.]	Program-level Analysis [Please review the Impact discussion referenced below to respond to applicable questions; TEP EIR Page References provided]	Cumulative Analysis [Please review the Impact discussion referenced below to respond to applicable questions; TEP EIR Page References provided]	Are the potential impacts covered or disclosed in the TEP EIR?	If no, briefly describe how the potential impact(s) would differ.	Notes – To be used by the Environmental Planner.
Service Improvements and/or Service	Impact TR-18: Pedestrians and Bicycles, pp. 4.2-154 to 4.2-162 (LTS Impact).	N/A	Impact C-TR-40: Pedestrians, 4.2-298 to 4.2-300; Bicycles, 4.2-300 to 4.2-302 (LTS Impact).	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N		

Variants			<p>Service Improvements plus Moderate TTRPs</p> <p>Impact C-TR-41: Pedestrians, 4.2-302 to 4.2-303; Bicycles, 4.2-304 to 4.2-305 (LTS Impact).</p> <p>Service Improvements plus Expanded TTRPs</p> <p>Impact C-TR-42: Pedestrians, 4.2-305 to 4.2-306; Bicycles, 4.2-306 to 4.2-307 (LTS Impact).</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A		
Service-related Capital Improvements	Impact TR-19: Pedestrians, pp. 4.2-165 to 4.2-166, and Bicycles, pp. 4.2-166 to 4.2-167 (LTS Impact).	Impact TR-12: Pedestrians, p. 4.2-99, and Bicycles, pp. 4.2-99 to 4.2-100.	<p>Service Improvements plus Moderate TTRPs</p> <p>Impact C-TR-41: Pedestrians, 4.2-302 to 4.2-303; Bicycles, 4.2-304 to 4.2-305 (LTS Impact).</p> <p>Service Improvements plus Expanded TTRPs</p> <p>Impact C-TR-42: Pedestrians, 4.2-305 to 4.2-306; Bicycles, 4.2-306 to 4.2-307 (LTS Impact).</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A		
Travel Time Reduction Proposals	All TTRP Moderate Alternatives:	All TPS Toolkit Categories on the	Service Improvements plus Moderate TTRPs	<input type="checkbox"/> Y		

(TTRPs)	<p>Impact TR-44, Pedestrians and Bicycles, pp. 4.2-205 to 4.2-213 (LTS Impact).</p> <p>All TTRP Expanded Alternatives:</p> <p>Impact TR-45, Pedestrians and Bicycles, pp. 4.2-213 to 4.2-225 (LTS Impact).</p>	<p>Rapid Network</p> <p>Impact TR-13: Pedestrians, pp. 4.2-105 to 4.2-107; and Bicycles, pp. 4.2-107 to 4.2-108 (LTS Impact).</p>	<p>Impact C-TR-41: Pedestrians, 4.2-302 to 4.2-303; Bicycles, 4.2-304 to 4.2-305(LTS Impact).</p> <p>Service Improvements plus Expanded TTRPs</p> <p>Impact C-TR-42: Pedestrians, 4.2-305 to 4.2-306; Bicycles, 4.2-306 to 4.2-307 (LTS Impact).</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> N</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>		
TPS Toolkit Categories and Elements on the Muni Rapid Network Corridors	N/A	<p>All TPS Toolkit Categories</p> <p>Impact TR-7: Pedestrians, pp. 4.2-83 to 4.2-85, LTS; and Bicycles, pp. 4.2-85 to 4.2-87 (LTS Impact).</p>	<p>Impact C-TR-40: Pedestrians, 4.2-298 to 4.2-300; Bicycles, 4.2-300 to 4.2-302 (LTS Impact).</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>		

Section Instructions:

For Service Improvements or Service Variant, the questions in this section are likely not applicable (N/A).

For TTRPs or their variants, please complete questions 6 and 7, if applicable.

The questions below are most likely not applicable to the Service-related Capital Improvements, but it depends on the project description. Consult EP if uncertain.

6. Would the proposed project involve changes to signal phases and timing? Y N N/A

If yes, please describe and confirm that these changes would meet the minimum crossing time requirements in the CA MUTCD.

7. Would the project changes occur along a designated Bicycle Route? Y N N/A

If yes, list the bicycle route number and any existing facilities in the project area (bicycle lanes, bicycle racks, etc.).

IV.A.4. Passenger and Commercial Loading						
Project component	Project-level Analysis [Please review the Impact discussion referenced below to respond to applicable questions; TEP EIR Page References provided.]	Program-level Analysis [Please review the Impact discussion referenced below to respond to applicable questions; TEP EIR Page References provided]	Cumulative Analysis [Please review the Impact discussion referenced below to respond to applicable questions; TEP EIR Page References provided]	Are the potential impacts covered or disclosed in the TEP EIR?	If no, briefly describe how the potential impact(s) would differ.	Notes – To be used by the Environmental Planner.
Service Improvements and/or Service Variants	Impact TR-18: pp. 4.2-141 to 4.2-154 (LTS Impact).	N/A	Impact C-TR-46: pp. 4.2-309 to 4.2-310 (LTS Impact).	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A		
Service-related Capital Improvements	Impact TR-19: p. 4.2-167 (LTS Impact).	Impact TR-12: All loading, pp. 4.2-100 to 4.2-101 (LTS Impact).	Impact C-TR-46: pp. 4.2-309 to 4.2-310 (LTS Impact).	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A		

<p>Travel Time Reduction Proposals (TTRPs)</p>	<p>Moderate Alternative: TTRP.J, L, N, 5, 8X, 9, 22_1, or 28_1, 71</p> <p>Impact TR-46: Commercial Loading, pp. 4.2-225 to 4.2-227 (LTS Impact); and</p> <p>TTRP.14 and Variants 1 and 2</p> <p>Impacts TR-48 and TR-49, pp. 4.2-230 to 4.2-233 (SU impact with mitigation on the Mission corridor);</p> <p>TTRP.30_1</p> <p>Impact TR-51, pp. 4.2-235 to 4.2-236 (SU impact with mitigation on the Stockton corridor);</p> <p>Expanded Alternative:</p> <p>TTRP.J, L, N, 5, 8X, 9, 22_1 and Variants 1 and 2, 28_1, or 71</p> <p>Impact TR-47, Commercial Loading, pp. 4.2-227 to 4.2-230 (LTS Impact);</p> <p>TTRP.14</p>	<p>Transit Stop Changes, Lane Modifications, and Pedestrian Improvements</p> <p>Impact TR-16: Commercial loading, pp. 4.2-115 to 4.2-116 (SU With Mitigation); and</p> <p>Traffic Signal and Stop Sign Changes</p> <p>Impact TR-17: Loading, p. 4.2-116 (LTS Impact).</p>	<p>TTRP Moderate Alternative (J, L, N, 5, 8X, 9, 22_1, 28_1, and 71):</p> <p>Impact C-TR-47: p. 4.2-310 (LTS Impact)</p> <p>Moderate Alternative TTRP 14 and Variants and TTRP.30_1:</p> <p>Impact C-TR-44: pp. 4.2-308 to 4.2-309 (SU with mitigation on the Mission and Stockton corridors);</p> <p>TTRP Expanded Alternative (J, L, N, 5, 8X, 9, 22_1, 28_1, and 71):</p> <p>Impact C-TR-48: pp. 4.2-310 to 4.2-311 (LTS Impact).</p> <p>Expanded Alternative TTRP.14 and TTRP.30_1 and Variants:</p> <p>Impact C-TR-45: p. 4.2-309 (SU impact with mitigation on the Mission and Stockton corridors);</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Y</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>		<p>Mitigation measure M-TR-10 Provision of Replacement Commercial Loading Facilities is applicable to Impacts TR-16, C-TR-43.</p> <p>M-TR-48 Enforcement of Parking Violations</p> <p>Mitigation measure M-TR-48 is applicable to:</p> <p>Moderate and Expanded TTRP.14 and Variants for Impacts TR-48, TR-49, and TR-50</p> <p>Moderate and Expanded TTRP.30_1 and Variants for impacts TR-51, TR-52, TR-53, and TR-54.</p>
---	---	---	---	--	--	--

	<p>Impact TR-50, pp. 4.2-234 to 4.2-235 (SU impact with mitigation on the Mission Corridor);</p> <p>TTRP.30_1 and Variants 1 and 2</p> <p>Impacts TR-52 to TR-54, pp. 4.2-236 to 4.2-238 (SU impacts with mitigation on the Stockton corridor).</p>					
<p>TPS Toolkit Categories and Elements on the Muni Rapid Network Corridors</p>	N/A	<p>All TPS Toolkit Categories</p> <p>Impact TR-7: Passenger loading, pp. 4.2-87 to 4.2-88 (LTS Impact);</p> <p>TPS Toolkit Categories: Transit Stop Changes, Lane Modifications, Parking and Turn Restrictions, and Pedestrian Improvements</p> <p>Impact TR-10: Commercial loading, pp. 4.2-95 to 4.2-96 (SU impact with mitigation); and</p>	<p>TPS Toolkit Categories: Transit Stop Changes, Lane Modifications, Parking and Turn restrictions, and Pedestrian Improvements along Program level TTRPs</p> <p>–</p> <p>Impact C-TR-43: pp. 4.2-307 to 4.2-308 (SU with mitigation).</p> <p>TPS Toolkit Categories: Traffic Signal and Stop Sign Changes</p> <p>Impact C-TR-46: Commercial loading, pp. 4.2-309 to 4.2-310</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>		<p>For Impacts TR-10 and C-TR-43, mitigation measure M-TR-10 Provision of Replacement Commercial Loading Facilities is applicable when implementing TPS Toolkit categories - Transit Stop Changes, Lane Modifications, Parking and Turn Restrictions, and Pedestrian Improvements unless project-level analysis demonstrates no significant impact.</p>

		TPS Toolkit Categories: Traffic Signal and Stop Sign Changes Impact TR-11: Commercial loading, pp. 4.2-96 to 4.2-97 (LTS Impact).	(LTS Impact).			
--	--	---	---------------	--	--	--

Section Instructions:

For Service Improvements or Service Variant, the question in this section is likely not applicable (N/A).

For TTRPs or their variants, please complete question 8, if applicable.

The question below is not likely applicable to the Service-related Capital Improvements, but it depends on the project description. Complete this if any loading spaces are affected by the project change. Please consult EP if uncertain.

8. Would the project remove or relocate any commercial loading spaces not analyzed in the TEP EIR? Y N

If yes, specify approximate number of commercial loading spaces removed, the approximate location(s), and occupancy, if known.

Please provide information regarding potential for relocation of the existing commercial loading space(s) proposed for removal within a reasonable distance (i.e. 250 feet of the existing commercial loading space location).

IV.A.5. Emergency Vehicle Access					
Project component	Project-level Analysis [Please review the Impact discussion referenced below to respond to applicable questions; TEP EIR Page References provided.]	Program-level Analysis [Please review the Impact discussion referenced below to respond to applicable questions; TEP EIR Page References provided]	Are the potential impacts covered or disclosed in the TEP EIR?	If no, briefly describe how the potential impact(s) would differ.	Notes – To be used by the Environmental Planner.

Service Improvements and/or Service Variants	Impact TR-18: pp. 4.2-141 to 4.2-154 (LTS Impact).	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A		
Service-related Capital Improvements	Impact TR-19: pp. 4.2-167 to 4.2-168 (LTS Impact).	Impact TR-12: p. 4.2-101 (LTS Impact).	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A		
Project component	Project-level Analysis [Please review the Impact discussion referenced below to respond to applicable questions; TEP EIR Page References provided.]	Program-level Analysis [Please review the Impact discussion referenced below to respond to applicable questions; TEP EIR Page References provided]	Are the potential impacts covered or disclosed in the TEP EIR?	If no, briefly describe how the potential impact(s) would differ.	Notes – To be used by the Environmental Planner.
Travel Time Reduction Proposals (TTRPs)	TTRP Moderate Alternative(All): Impact TR-55, pp. 4.2-238 to 4.2-240 (LTS Impact); and TTRP Expanded Alternative (All): Impact TR-56: pp. 4.2-240 to 4.2-241 (LTS Impact).	Impact TR-13: pp. 4.2-108 to 4.2-109 (LTS Impact).	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A		
TPS Toolkit Categories and	N/A	Impact TR-7: pp. 4.2-88 to 4.2-89 (LTS Impact).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N		

Elements on the Muni Rapid Network Corridors			<input type="checkbox"/> N/A		
---	--	--	------------------------------	--	--

As specified in the TEP EIR in the sections referenced provided above, the proposed project components would be designed to meet the SFPW and SFFD standards and/or the California Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD) specifications. In addition, the San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD) along with other city agencies participates in the review of changes to the public right-of-way through the Transportation Advisory Staff Committee (TASC), which would address any safety issues including emergency vehicle access related to project design.

IV.A.6. Parking						
Project component	Project-level Analysis [Please review the Impact discussion referenced below to respond to applicable questions; TEP EIR Page References provided.]	Program-level Analysis [Please review the Impact discussion referenced below to respond to applicable questions; TEP EIR Page References provided]	Cumulative Analysis [Please review the Impact discussion referenced below to respond to applicable questions; TEP EIR Page References provided]	Are the potential impacts covered or disclosed in the TEP EIR?	If no, briefly describe how the potential impact(s) would differ.	Notes – To be used by the Environmental Planner
Service Improvements and/or Service Variants	Impact TR-18: pp. 4.2-141 to 4.2-154 (LTS Impact).	N/A	Impact C-TR-50: pp. 4.2-313 to 4.2-315 (LTS Impact).	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A		

Service-related Capital Improvements	Impact TR-19: p. 4.2-168 (LTS Impact).	Impact TR-12: p. 4.2-102 (LTS Impact).	Impact C-TR-50: pp. 4.2-313 to 4.2-315 (LTS Impact).	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A		
Travel Time Reduction Proposals (TTRPs)	<p>TTRP Moderate Alternative (All): Impact TR-57, pp. 4.2-242 to 4.2-254 (LTS impact); and</p> <p>TTRP Expanded Alternative (All): Impact TR-58: pp. 4.2-254 to 4.2-265 (LTS impact).</p>	Impact TR-13: pp. 4.2-109 to 4.2-110 (LTS Impact).	<p>TTRP Moderate Alternative (J, L, N, 5, 8X, 9, 22_1, 28_1, 30_1, and 71):</p> <p>Impact C-TR-51: pp. 4.2-315 to 4.2-316 (LTS impact)</p> <p>TTRP.14 Moderate Alternative and Variants:</p> <p>Impact C-TR-52: pp. 4.2-316 to 4.2-319 (S/U impact on the 14 corridor)</p> <p>TTRP Expanded Alternative (J, L, N, 5, 8X, 9, 14, 28_1, 30_1, and 71):</p> <p>Impact C-TR-53: pp. 4.2-319 to 4.2-320 (LTS impact).</p> <p>TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative:</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A		<p>Mitigation measure M-C-TR-49 is applicable to Moderate TTRP.14 Variants as well as Expanded TTRP.22 and Variants for cumulative parking impacts Impact C-TR-52 and Impact C-TR-54.</p> <p>M-C-TR-49 Explore Implementation of Parking Management Strategies.</p>

			Impact C-TR-54: pp. 4.2-320 to 4.2-322 (SU impact on the 22 corridor)			
TPS Toolkit Categories and Elements on the Muni Rapid Network Corridors	N/A	TPS Toolkit Categories: Transit Stop Changes, Lane Modifications, Parking and Turn restrictions, Traffic Signal and Stop Sign Changes, and Pedestrian Improvements Impact TR-7: pp. 4.2-89 to 4.2-91 (LTS Impact)	TPS Toolkit Categories: Lane Modifications, Parking and Turn Restrictions, Pedestrian Improvements along Program level TTRPs Impact C-TR-49: pp. 4.2-311 to 4.2-313 (SU with Mitigation). TPS Toolkit Categories: Transit Stop Changes, Traffic Signal and Stop Sign Changes, Pedestrian Improvements along Program level TTRPs Impact C-TR-50: pp. 4.2-313 to 4.2-315 (LTS Impact)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		Mitigation measure M-C-TR-49 is applicable to implementation of TPS Toolkit Categories: Lane Modifications, Parking and Turn Restrictions, Pedestrian Improvements along Program level TTRPs for cumulative parking impacts unless project level analysis demonstrates that there would be no significant parking impact. M-C-TR-49 Explore the implementation of Parking Management Strategies

Section Instructions: This section should be completed for all project components. Confirm that there are no changes to parking removal numbers compared to what was analyzed in the TEP EIR.

9. Would the proposed project remove or restrict the use of parking spaces not previously analyzed in the TEP EIR? Y N

If yes, please provide the approximate number of parking spaces removed and the general location(s), and/ provide information regarding parking restrictions including the location and hours (i.e. change restriction to no parking between 7:00 am to 7:00 pm, etc.), as applicable. How would these numbers and/or times differ from the analysis in the TEP EIR for the affected area(s) [i.e. only for the area(s) where changes are being proposed.]?

This project would remove up to four unmetered parking spaces on the north side of Noriega Street, east of 44th Avenue, due to the relocation of the existing bus zone to the far side of the intersection. The project would add up to four unmetered parking spaces at the former bus zone location. These parking changes were not analyzed in the TEP EIR. There would be no net change in on-street parking as a result of this change.

IV.A.7. Transportation-related Construction					
Project component	Project-level Analysis [Please review the Impact discussion referenced below to respond to applicable questions; TEP EIR Page References provided.]	Program-level Analysis [Please review the Impact discussion referenced below to respond to applicable questions; TEP EIR Page References provided]	Are the potential impacts covered or disclosed in the TEP EIR? (Is there anything regarding the construction of this change that would differ from that anticipated for this proposal?)	If no, briefly describe how the potential impact(s) would differ.	Notes – To be used by the Environmental Planner
Service Improvements and/or Service Variants	Impact TR-1 – pp. 4.2-66 to 4.2-71 (LTS Impact)	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A		Improvement Measure I-TR-1 is applicable to any
Service-related Capital Improvements	Impact TR-1 – pp. 4.2-66 to 4.2-71 (LTS Impact)	Impact TR-1 – pp. 4.2-66 to 4.2-71 (LTS Impact)	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A		Improvement Measure I-TR-1 is applicable to any TEP construction.

Travel Time Reduction Proposals (TTRPs)	Impact TR-1 – pp. 4.2-66 to 4.2-71 (LTS Impact)	Impact TR-1 – pp. 4.2-66 to 4.2-71 (LTS Impact)	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A		Improvement Measure I-TR-1 is applicable to any TEP construction.
TPS Toolkit Categories and Elements on the Muni Rapid Network Corridors	N/A	Impact TR-1 – pp. 4.2-66 to 4.2-71 (LTS Impact)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		Improvement Measure I-TR-1 is applicable to any TEP construction.

Provide any additional information relevant for the environmental review.

There is no additional information needed.

Continues on the next page.

IV.B. Project Screening for Noise and Vibration

Noise and Vibration impacts as a result of the TEP are discussed on TEP EIR pp. 4.3-1 to 4.3-54. As described on p 4.3-1, the noise and vibration analysis provided in the TEP EIR addresses the effects from all of the TEP components (program level and project level), except for the E Line Independent Terminal (TTPI.3).

IV.B.1. Construction Noise and Vibration

Pursuant to the discussion on TEP EIR p. 4.3-26, construction directly associated with the Service Improvements and Service Variants would be limited to installation of curb ramps and striping for transit zones and/or parking. Therefore, construction noise and vibration as a result of the TEP would result from construction of the Service-related Capital Improvements, such as installation of overhead wires, and from construction of the TTRPs and TTRP Variants. ***This section is not applicable to Service Improvements and Service Variants.***

	(DO NOT FILL IN, THIS SECTION IS FOR EP PLANNER ASSESSMENT ONLY) EP Planner to confirm Yes or No with Applicable Comments	
<p>IV.B.1.a. Construction noise is addressed under Impact NO-1 on TEP EIR pp. 4.3-25 to 4.3-32.</p> <p>Potential Impacts for this proposal are covered or disclosed in the TEP EIR?</p> <p>If yes, no further environmental analysis is needed.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	N/A for Service Improvements or Service Variants
<p>IV.B.1.b. Construction vibration is addressed under Impact NO-2 on TEP EIR pp. 4.3-32 to 4.3-35.</p> <p>Potential Impacts for this proposal are covered or disclosed in the TEP EIR?</p> <p>If yes, no further environmental analysis is needed.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	N/A for Service Improvements or Service Variants

IV.B.2. Operational Noise and Vibration

Pursuant to the discussion on TEP EIR p. 4.3-35, once the Service-related Capital Improvements and Transit Travel Time Reduction Proposals (TTRPs) have been constructed, there would be no operational noise or vibration impacts as a result of these components. The operational noise and vibration impacts of the TEP would result from the transit service provided by the Service Improvements and Service Variants. ***This section is not applicable to Service-related Capital Improvements or TTRPs.***

For Service Improvements or Service Variants, or modifications to same, please include proposed frequencies, if different from information in the TEP EIR. Attach a modified route map should changes in alignment be proposed.

<p>IV.B.2.a. Operational noise is addressed under Impact NO-3 on TEP EIR pp. 4.3-35 to 4.3-48.</p> <p>Potential Impacts for this proposal are covered or disclosed in the TEP EIR?</p> <p>If yes, no further environmental analysis is needed.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	<p>If project is a Service Improvement or Service Variant and proposes a substantial increase in service frequency, then provide the ambient noise level for the affected area(s): _____</p>
<p>IV.B.2.b. Operational vibration is addressed under Impact NO-4 on TEP EIR pp. 4.3-48 to 4.3-51.</p> <p>Potential Impacts for this proposal are covered or disclosed in the TEP EIR?</p> <p>If yes, no further environmental analysis is needed.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
<p>IV.B.2.c. Cumulative Noise and Vibration is addressed under Impact C-NO-1 on TEP EIR pp. 4.3-51 to 4.3-54.</p> <p>Potential Impacts are covered or disclosed in the TEP EIR?</p> <p>If yes, no further environmental analysis is needed.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	

IV.C. Project Screening for Air Quality

Air Quality impacts that would result from the TEP are discussed on TEP EIR pp. 4.4-1 to 4.4-55. As described on TEP EIR p 4.4-1 to 4.4-2, the air quality analysis provided in the TEP EIR addresses the effects from all of the TEP components (program level and project level), except for the E Line Independent Terminal (TTPI.3).

IV.C.1. Construction Air Quality Impacts

The TEP EIR construction air quality analysis identified two worst-case or maximum construction scenario(s). TEP Components that would include fewer construction activities within a two-block street segment would not exceed the construction air quality impacts identified for the maximum construction scenario(s), which were found to be less than significant. TEP EIR p. 4.4-38 describes that construction directly associated with the Service Improvements and Service Variants would be limited to installation of curb ramps and striping for transit zones and/or parking. Therefore, construction air quality impacts as a result of the TEP would result from construction of the Service-related Capital Improvements, such as installation of overhead wires, or from the implementation of TTRPs and TTRP Variants. ***This section (IV.C.1.) is not applicable to Service Improvements or Service Variants.***

For TTRPs, please identify the two-block segment proposed (or proposed for modification) with the greatest amount of construction. For Service-related Capital improvement projects, identify the construction activities. Generally describe the TPS Toolkit Elements including number of TPS Toolkit types (i.e. four pedestrian bulbs) as well as the approximate dimension for those elements that are within the identified two-block segment or

project area.

Construction work needed to implement this project consists of striping within the right-of-way and minor construction to install two Stop sign posts. Changes to bus stop locations and the related parking changes would require curb paint and street paint work only. The two-block segment requiring the most work would be Noriega Street between 42nd and 44th avenues. The addition of paint in the right of way was determined to result in negligible emissions which would not contribute substantially to any changes in air quality. The installation of two stops signs would be completed quickly and not require heavy off-road equipment.

Compare the above information with the maximum construction scenarios in the EIR pp. 4.4-34 to 4.4-36a. Would the proposed project or proposed modification result in greater construction activity than the worst case scenarios in the EIR?

Y N If yes, then please attachment a completed AQ Worksheet for evaluation.

		(DO NOT FILL IN, THIS SECTION IS FOR EP PLANNER ASSESSMENT ONLY) Confirm Yes or No with Applicable Comments
<p>IV.C.1.a. Construction criteria pollutant emissions impacts are addressed in Impact AQ-1 on TEP EIR pp. 4.4-38 to 4.4-41.</p> <p>Potential Impacts are covered or disclosed in the TEP EIR?</p> <p>If yes, no further environmental analysis is needed.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>	<p>The addition of paint in the right of way was determined to result in negligible emissions, which would not contribute substantially to any changes in air quality. See EIR p. 4.4-36a.</p>
<p>IV.C.1.b. Construction health risks and hazard air quality impacts are addressed in Impact AQ-2 on TEP EIR pp. 4.4-41 to 4.4-43.</p> <p>Potential Impacts for this proposal are covered or disclosed in the TEP EIR?</p> <p>If yes, no further environmental analysis is needed.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>	
<p>IV.C.2. Operational Air Quality Impacts. The TEP EIR operational air quality analysis identified that an increase in emissions would result from the Service Improvements (or Service Variants) because the number of transit trips, including diesel motor coach trips within San Francisco, would increase as a consequence of the additional 380,000 yearly service hours. Implementation of the TEP proposals is expected to result in a travel mode shift to public transit by providing a more efficient transit system, which would reduce emissions of criteria pollutants and ozone precursors from privately-owned vehicles. Implementation of some TPS Toolkit elements as part of the TTRPs, such as the introduction of new transit-only lanes, has the potential to result in an increase in non-transit vehicle congestion that could cause an increase in criteria pollutant and ozone precursor emissions due to longer idle times at intersections. Sections IV.C.2.a. and IV.C.2.b. are not applicable to Service-related capital Improvements or TTRPs.</p>		
<p>IV.C.2.a. Operational air quality impacts are addressed in Impact AQ-3 on TEP EIR pp. 4.4-43 to 4.4-47.</p>		

<p>Potential Impacts are covered or disclosed in the TEP EIR?</p> <p>If yes, no further environmental analysis is needed.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
<p>IV.C.2.b. Operational health risks and hazard air quality impacts are addressed in Impact AQ-4 on TEP EIR pp. 4.4-47 to 4.4-49.</p> <p>Potential Impacts for this proposal are covered or disclosed in the TEP EIR?</p> <p>If yes, no further environmental analysis is needed.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
<p>IV.C.2.c. Compliance with 2010 Clean Air Plan is discussed in Impact AQ-5 on TEP EIR pp. 4.4-49 to 4.4-52.</p> <p>Potential Impacts for this proposal are covered or disclosed in the TEP EIR?</p> <p>If yes, no further environmental analysis is needed</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	
<p>IV.C.3. Cumulative Air Quality Impacts</p>		
<p>Please specify any known construction projects within the right-of-way in proximity to the proposed project or project modification.</p> <p>None identified.</p> <p>Specify other TTRP projects for which construction would be concurrent with the project or project modification:</p> <p>TTRP.5, TTRP.71, and TTRP.30 will have concurrent construction with this project. However, TTRP.71_2 construction will take place either during the San Francisco holiday moratorium or at hours during which the other projects will not have construction activity. In addition, the addition of paint in the right-of-way was determined to result in negligible emissions, which would not contribute substantially to any changes in air quality.</p>		
<p>IV.C.3.a. Cumulative Criteria Air Pollutant Air Quality impacts are addressed under Impact C-AQ-1 on TEP EIR p. 4.4-52.</p> <p>Potential Impacts for this proposal are covered or disclosed in the TEP EIR?</p> <p>If yes, no further environmental analysis is needed</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	
<p>IV.C.3.b. Cumulative health risks and hazard air quality impacts are addressed under Impact C-AQ-2 on TEP EIR pp. 4.4-52 to 4.4-52 to 4.4-55.</p> <p>Potential Impacts for this proposal are covered or disclosed in the TEP EIR?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	

<p>If yes, no further environmental analysis is needed</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>	
<p>V- Project Screening – Topic Areas Addressed in the TEP Initial Study (TEP IS)</p> <p>The TEP Initial Study was issued January 23, 2013 and is Appendix 2 of the TEP EIR.</p>		
<p>V.1. Less than Significant Impacts</p> <p>The TEP Initial Study (TEP IS) determined that the program-level and project-level TEP Components (all project components) would result in less than significant impacts with respect to the topics below as analyzed on the referenced TEP IS pages. Therefore, no mitigation is required for any of these topics.</p> <p>Land Use and Land Use Planning (TEP IS pp. 176 – 183), Aesthetics (TEP IS pp. 184 – 194), Population and Housing (TEP IS pp. 195 – 200), Greenhouse Gas Emissions (TEP IS pp. 237 – 256), Wind and Shadow (TEP IS pp. 260 – 266), Recreation (TEP IS pp. 257 – 260), Utilities and Service Systems (TEP IS pp. 266 – 276), Public Services (TEP IS pp. 276 – 284), Biological Resources (TEP IS pp. 284 – 291), Geology and Soils (TEP IS pp. 292 – 303), Hydrology and Water Quality (TEP IS pp. 303 – 320), Mineral and Energy Resources (TEP IS pp. 335 – 340), and Agricultural and Forest Resources (TEP IS pp. 341 – 343).</p> <p>Are the potential Impacts for the proposal TEP EIR disclosed in the TEP Initial Study?</p> <p>If yes, no further environmental analysis is needed.</p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>V.2. Less than Significant Impacts with Mitigation Incorporated.</p> <p>The TEP Initial Study (TEP IS) determined that the TEP Components (all project components) would result in less than significant impacts with mitigation implemented with respect to Cultural and Paleontological Resources (TEP IS pp. 201-230) and Hazards and Hazardous Materials (TEP IS pp. 321 – 334). These topics are addressed on the</p>		

<p>above referenced pages in the TEP Initial Study, Appendix 2 to the TEP EIR.</p> <p>Are the potential Impacts for the proposal disclosed in the TEP Initial Study?</p> <p>If yes, no further environmental analysis is needed</p> <p>Mitigation identified in the TEP IS would be applicable to this project component.</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>If yes, see Applicable Mitigation Measures Section VII. below.</p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
--	---	--

10. Would the proposed project involve removal of streets trees or significant trees?
 Yes No If yes, confirm that SFPW tree removal and replacement procedures and permitting requirements would be complied with. Yes No

11. What is the maximum depth of excavation for the proposed project or project modification – indicate feature requiring this depth?

No excavation is proposed.

VI. Project Screening – Identify known public projects within project vicinity (particularly within ROW). By completing this section, SFMTA is confirming that a search was conducted to identify such projects.

Project Name and Responsible Agency	Approximate location and Date of Implementation	Notes: EP Planner to evaluate if any additional analysis or documentation is needed based on the potential for combined or cumulative effects.
	None identified.	No additional analysis needed. D. Dwyer

VII. Applicable Mitigation Measures and Improvement Measures identified in the TEP EIR and TEP IS.

Provide draft MMRP with mitigation measure text applicable to the proposal for Environmental Planning review.

Mitigation or Improvement Measure [No. and Title – For details see the TEP MMRP.]	Applicable to the proposed project or project modification	Notes – For use by the Environmental Planner

	[Yes, if checked.]	
Mitigation Measure M-CP-2a: Accidental Discovery of Archeological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Applicable to all TEP construction activities causing soils disturbance.
Mitigation Measure M-CP-2b: Archaeological Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>	Once engineering design details for the identified projects (OWE.1, OWE.1 Variant, SCI.2, TTRP.9 and TTRP.22_2) and other projects in archaeologically sensitive areas, as identified by the Environmental Review Officer, are known, the project sponsor shall consult with the Planning Department archeologist regarding a determination of the specific aspects of these proposals that would require archeological monitoring.
Mitigation Measure M-CP-3: Paleontological Resources Accidental Discovery	<input type="checkbox"/>	Applicable to all TEP construction activities.
Mitigation Measure M-HZ-1: Hazardous Materials Soil Testing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Applicable to all TEP construction activities.
Mitigation Measure M-TR-8: Optimization of Intersection Operations	<input type="checkbox"/>	Applicable if the final design of program-level TTRPs includes TPS Toolkit Elements from the Lane Modifications and Pedestrian Improvements categories.
Mitigation Measure M-TR-10: Provision of Replacement Commercial Loading Spaces	<input type="checkbox"/>	Applicable if the final design of program-level TTRPs or project modification would remove commercial loading spaces.
Mitigation Measure M-TR-48: Enforcement of Parking Violations	<input type="checkbox"/>	On streets where the implementation of TTRPs would result in a net reduction of on-street commercial loading spaces that results in a significant commercial loading impact.
Mitigation Measure M-C-TR-1: SFMTA Monitoring of Muni Service	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ongoing
Mitigation Measure M-C-TR-49: Explore the Implementation of Parking Management Strategies.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ongoing, along the TTRP corridors where greater amount of parking is being removed and a significant cumulative parking impact is identified.
Improvement Measure I-TR-1:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Applicable to all TEP Construction activities.

Construction Measures		
-----------------------	--	--

VIII. EVALUATION SUMMARY. This section is to be completed by an EP Planner.

Enclosed information and documentation:

- Existing and Proposed Graphics or Site Plan provided, if available, or upon request.
- Supplemental Transportation Analysis provided, if applicable, and reviewed by EP Planner.
- Air Quality Worksheet, if applicable, and reviewed by EP Planner.
- Noise topic adequately addressed.
- Other, please specify.

CEQA Review

The proposed project is within the scope of the TEP EIR. No new significant effects have been identified and no new mitigation is required for the project, pursuant to CEQA Section 15168:

- Note to file (no additional documentation required)

Proposed project is not within the scope of the TEP EIR and requires subsequent environmental review anticipated to be:

- Addendum
- Supplemental Focused EIR or Focused MND

NOTES:

ATTACHMENT A

to the Abbreviated CEQA Checklist for the TEP Improvements
(Renamed to Muni Forward) Planning Department Case Number: 2011.0558E

Project Description for
Modified TTRP.71_2, segment from Noriega Street and 42nd Avenue
to the Great Highway and Ortega Street
Also named 7 Haight Noriega Transit Priority Project: West of Stanyan



Date: July 19, 2017

To: Debra Dwyer, Environmental Planner

From: Felipe Robles, Transit Planner

Re: Modified TTRP.71_2, segment from Noriega Street and 42nd Avenue to the Great Highway and Ortega Street

The outer portion of the 7 Haight Noriega route (previously known as the 71 Haight Noriega) on Noriega Street from 22nd Avenue to the Great Highway was analyzed in the Transit Effectiveness Project EIR at a program level. Projects developed as part of TEP have been renamed to Muni Forward. In addition, the TTRP.71_2 has been renamed as 7 Haight Noriega Transit Priority Project: West of Stanyan. In response to community requests for an all-way stop sign at the intersection of Noriega Street and 45th Avenue, SFMTA has developed a proposal that also incorporates Transit Preferential Streets (TPS) toolkit items for the portion of the route between 42nd and 47th avenues. In summary, under the modified design proposal, the SFMTA would remove two bus stops, optimize one bus stop, and install one all way stop sign for the segment of Noriega Street from 22nd Avenue to the Great Highway. Existing conditions and proposed changes are detailed below.

Existing Conditions

Currently the bus stops along the Noriega Street corridor are spaced approximately every 1-2 blocks on the segment west of Sunset Boulevard. At some locations the bus stops are located at the same intersection in both the inbound and outbound directions, but at other locations are sometimes offset at two consecutive streets. The bus stop locations are listed in the table below:

Inbound	Outbound
Ortega/48 th (terminal)	Ortega/48 th (terminal)
47 th /Noriega	Noriega/48 th
Noriega/46 th	Noriega/46 th
Noriega/45 th	Noriega/44 th
Noriega/43 rd	Noriega/42 nd

The project would remove two bus stops in the inbound direction and optimize one bus stop in the outbound direction as listed below:

Transit Stop Changes

- a. Noriega Street and 44th Avenue: The project would optimize the outbound 82-foot farside bus zone on the north side of Noriega Street at 44th Avenue to a new 120-foot nearside bus zone at this intersection. The new bus zone would require the removal of up to four parking spaces on the north side of Noriega Street. Up to four parking spaces would be restored on Noriega Street at the old farside bus zone location.
- b. Noriega Street and 45th Avenue: The project would remove the bus stop on Noriega Street at 45th Avenue in the inbound direction. The bus stop is a flag stop and there would not be any parking impacts.

- c. 47th Avenue and Noriega Street: The project would remove the inbound bus stop on the east side of 47th Avenue. The bus stop is a flag stop and there would not be any parking impacts.

Stop Sign Changes

An all way stop sign would be installed at 45th Avenue and Noriega Street. This would require the installation of two additional stop signs on Noriega Street to require eastbound and westbound vehicles to stop at this intersection before continuing on.

Parking Space Changes

There would be a net impact of zero parking spaces with the bus stop changes.

- a. Noriega Street and 44th Avenue: There would be up to four unmetered parking spaces restored on the north side of Noriega Street at the old bus zone location and up to four unmetered parking spaces removed on the north side of Noriega Street at the new bus zone location. There would be a net impact of zero unmetered parking spaces at this location.

New Stop Locations

The new bus stop spacing would be approximately every 2-3 blocks. The proposed bus stop locations are shown in the table below:

Inbound	Outbound
Ortega/48 th (terminal)	Ortega/48 th (terminal)
-	Noriega/48 th
Noriega/46 th	Noriega/46 th
Noriega/43 rd	Noriega/44 th
Noriega/41 st	Noriega/42 nd