

File No. 251217

Committee Item No. 4  
Board Item No. \_\_\_\_\_

## COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

### AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Budget and Finance Committee \_\_\_\_\_ Date January 14, 2026  
Board of Supervisors Meeting Date \_\_\_\_\_

#### Cmte Board

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Motion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Resolution
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ordinance
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Legislative Digest
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Budget and Legislative Analyst Report
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Youth Commission Report
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Introduction Form
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report
• <b>ESER 2026 GO Bond Report</b>		
• <b>MYR Cover Letter 12/9/2025</b>		
• <b>CON Costing Letter 1/7/2026</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	MOU
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Grant Information Form
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Grant Budget
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Subcontract Budget
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Contract/Agreement
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Form 126 – Ethics Commission
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Award Letter
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Application
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Correspondence

#### OTHER (Use back side if additional space is needed)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>PLN Letter 2/13/2024</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>PLN Memo to File 10/20/2024</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>PC Motion No. 21482 1/11/2024</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>PC Motion No. 21483 1/11/2024</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>GPR Determination Letter 12/9/2025</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>DHR Meet and Confer Response 12/12/2025</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>PLN CEQA Determination 12/18/2025</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Referral Documents – PLN, Mandated, CON, DHR 12/12/2025</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>ORE Presentation 1/14/2026</u>

Completed by: Brent Jalipa Date January 8, 2026  
Completed by: Brent Jalipa Date \_\_\_\_\_

1 [General Obligation Bonds - Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response - Not to Exceed  
2 \$535,000,000]

3 **Resolution determining and declaring that the public interest and necessity demand**  
4 **the construction, acquisition, improvement, rehabilitation, expansion, renovation, and**  
5 **seismic retrofitting of the Emergency Firefighting Water System, Firefighting Facilities**  
6 **and Infrastructure, Police Facilities and Infrastructure, transportation facilities for the**  
7 **Municipal Railway Bus Storage and Maintenance Facility at Potrero Yard, and other**  
8 **Public Safety Facilities and Infrastructure for earthquake and public safety and related**  
9 **costs necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes (collectively, the “ESER**  
10 **Facilities”); authorizing landlords to pass-through 50% of the resulting property tax**  
11 **increase, if any, to residential tenants in accordance with Chapter 37 of the**  
12 **Administrative Code; finding that the estimated cost of \$535,000,000 for the proposed**  
13 **ESER Facilities is and will be too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income**  
14 **and revenue of the City and County and will require expenditures greater than the**  
15 **amount allowed therefore by the annual tax levy; finding that portions of the bond**  
16 **proposal are not a “project” under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)**  
17 **and adopting findings under CEQA for the remaining portion of the bond proposal;**  
18 **finding that the proposed bond is in conformity and consistent with the General Plan,**  
19 **and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1(b); and waiving the time**  
20 **requirements specified in Section 2.34 of the Administrative Code.**

21  
22 WHEREAS, Based on the 2014 Uniform California Rupture Forecast, the United States  
23 Geological Survey (“U.S.G.S.”) estimates a 72% chance that one or more earthquakes of a  
24 magnitude of 6.7 or larger will occur in the Bay Area before the year 2042; and

1           WHEREAS, The U.S.G.S. predicts that a large earthquake occurring today on the San  
2   Andreas or Hayward Fault would likely cause hundreds of deaths and billions of dollars in  
3   damage; and

4           WHEREAS, A large magnitude earthquake would damage critical City and County of  
5   San Francisco ("City") facilities and infrastructure, thereby compromising the capacity of first  
6   responders, including fire and police personnel, to respond effectively; and

7           WHEREAS, With adequate funding, the City can undertake to "harden" and make more  
8   resilient critical infrastructure to mitigate the potential loss of life, damage, and the loss of  
9   economic activity resulting from a large magnitude earthquake; and

10          WHEREAS, With adequate funding the City can renovate, seismically upgrade,  
11   improve, and expand the emergency firefighting water system ("EFWS") and related facilities,  
12   including but not limited to cisterns, pipes and tunnels, and related facilities (collectively, the  
13   "EFWS Project"); and

14          WHEREAS, With adequate funding the City can construct, acquire, improve, renovate,  
15   retrofit, and replace critical firefighting facilities and infrastructure for earthquake safety and  
16   emergency response including without limitation, neighborhood fire stations and related  
17   facilities (collectively, the "Firefighting Facilities and Infrastructure"); and

18          WHEREAS, With adequate funding the City can construct, acquire, improve, renovate,  
19   retrofit, and replace police facilities and infrastructure for earthquake safety and emergency  
20   response including without limitation, neighborhood police stations and related facilities  
21   (collectively, the "Police Facilities and Infrastructure"); and

22          WHEREAS, With adequate funding the City can construct, acquire, or retrofit critical  
23   transportation facilities and infrastructure, including replacing the existing Municipal Railway  
24   ("Muni") Potrero Yard, a 110-year-old, bus storage and maintenance facility that is seismically  
25   unsafe and outmoded, with a seismically resilient facility designed to store and maintain Muni

1        vehicles and support continued transit operations after a major earthquake (collectively, the  
2        "Muni Bus Storage and Maintenance Facility at Potrero Yard"); and

3            WHEREAS, With adequate funding the City can repair, improve, renovate, or retrofit of  
4        the City's critical public safety facilities (collectively, the "Public Safety Facilities and  
5        Infrastructure"); and

6            WHEREAS, The proposed Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response General  
7        Obligation Bond ("Bond") will provide necessary funding for the EFWS Project, Firefighting  
8        Facilities and Infrastructure, Police Facilities and Infrastructure, Muni Bus Storage and  
9        Maintenance Facility at Potrero Yard, and Public Safety Facilities and Infrastructure; and

10           WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors ("Board") recognizes the need to safeguard and  
11        enhance the City's earthquake and emergency response, resilience, and recovery by  
12        improving, retrofitting, expanding, and rehabilitating critical facilities that support the City's first  
13        responders, and maintain Muni service after a major seismic event; now, therefore, be it

14           RESOLVED, By the Board as follows:

15           Section 1. The Board determines and declares that the public interest and necessity  
16        demand the construction, acquisition, improvement, renovation, completion, and seismic  
17        retrofitting of the EFWS Project, Firefighting Facilities and Infrastructure, Police Facilities and  
18        Infrastructure, Muni Bus Storage and Maintenance Facility at Potrero Yard, and Public Safety  
19        Facilities and Infrastructure, and the payment of related costs necessary or convenient for the  
20        foregoing purposes.

21           Section 2. The estimated cost of \$535,000,000 of the Bond is and will be too great to  
22        be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City, will require an expenditure  
23        greater than the amount allowed by the annual tax levy, and will require the incurrence of  
24        bonded indebtedness in an amount not to exceed \$535,000,000.

25           Section 3. The Board, having reviewed the proposed legislation, makes the following

1 findings in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”), California  
2 Public Resources Code, Sections 21000 et seq., the CEQA Guidelines, 14 California Code of  
3 Regulations Sections 15000 et seq. (“CEQA Guidelines”), and Administrative Code,  
4 Chapter 31 (“Chapter 31”):

5 (i) EFWS Project. For the reasons set forth in the letter from the Environmental  
6 Review Officer of the Planning Department, dated December 18, 2025, a copy of which is on  
7 file with the Clerk of the Board in File No. 251217 and incorporated by reference, the Board  
8 finds that the bond proposal as it relates to funds for the EFWS Project is not subject to  
9 CEQA, because the establishment of a government financing mechanism that does not  
10 involve any commitment to specific projects to be constructed with the funds is not a project  
11 as defined by CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The use of bond proceeds to finance any  
12 project or portion of any project with funds for the EFWS Project portion of the Bond will be  
13 subject to approval of the City upon completion of planning and any further required  
14 environmental review under CEQA for the individual EFWS projects.

15 (ii) Firefighting Facilities and Infrastructure. For the reasons set forth in the letter  
16 from the Environmental Review Officer of the Planning Department, dated December 18,  
17 2025, a copy of which is on file with the Clerk of the Board in File No. 251217 and  
18 incorporated by reference, the Board finds that the bond proposal as it relates to funds for  
19 Firefighting Facilities and Infrastructure is not subject to CEQA, because the establishment of  
20 a government financing mechanism that does not involve any commitment to specific projects  
21 to be constructed with the funds is not a project as defined by CEQA and the CEQA  
22 Guidelines. The use of bond proceeds to finance any project or portion of any project with  
23 funds for the Firefighting Facilities and Infrastructure portion of the Bond will be subject to  
24 approval of the City upon completion of planning and any further required environmental  
25 review under CEQA for the individual Firefighting Facilities and Infrastructure projects.

12 (iv) Muni Bus Storage and Maintenance Facility at Potrero Yard. The Muni Bus  
13 Storage and Maintenance Facility at Potrero Yard refers to the “modified project” described in  
14 the Memorandum to File for the Potrero Yard Modernization Project (2500 Mariposa Street),  
15 Case No. 2019-021884ENV, dated October 25, 2024 (“Memorandum to File”), a copy of  
16 which is on file with the Clerk of the Board in File No. 251217 and incorporated by reference.  
17 The Muni Bus Storage and Maintenance Facility at Potrero Yard project is a portion of the  
18 Potrero Yard Modernization Project that was described and analyzed in the Final  
19 Environmental Impact Report for the Potrero Yard Modernization Project (“FEIR”), a copy of  
20 which is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 231256 and incorporated  
21 by reference, that the Planning Commission certified as adequate, accurate, and complete on  
22 January 11, 2024, by Motion No. 21482, a copy of which is on file with the Clerk of the Board  
23 in File No. 231256 and incorporated by reference, pursuant to CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines,  
24 and Chapter 31 of the Administrative Code. On January 11, 2024, by Motion No. 21483, a  
25 copy of which is on file with the Clerk of the Board in File No. 240047 and incorporated by

1 reference, the Planning Commission, based on substantial evidence in the entire recording of  
2 proceedings, made certain findings regarding the environmental impacts of the Potrero Yard  
3 Modernization Project that was analyzed in the FEIR, rejected alternatives as infeasible,  
4 adopted the proposed mitigation monitoring and reporting program (“MMRP”), and set forth a  
5 “Statement of Overriding Considerations” explaining why the benefits of the project outweigh  
6 the unavoidable adverse environmental effects identified in the FEIR and that those adverse  
7 environmental effects are therefore acceptable.

8 On March 12, 2024, by Ordinance No. 57-24 passed by the Board of Supervisors on  
9 March 12, 2024, and signed by the Mayor on March 22, 2024, a copy of which is on file with  
10 the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 240047, the Board of Supervisors, having  
11 reviewed the FEIR, concurred with the Planning Commission’s conclusions regarding the  
12 FEIR and affirmed the Planning Commission’s certification of the FEIR. In addition, in  
13 Ordinance No. 57-24, the Board of Supervisors adopted and incorporated by reference the  
14 CEQA findings that the Planning Commission adopted in Motion No. 21483 including the  
15 Statement of Overriding Considerations and the MMRP. On March 22, 2024, the Mayor  
16 approved Ordinance No. 57-24.

17 On October 25, 2024, the Planning Department issued the Memorandum to File, which  
18 reviewed proposed modifications to the Potrero Yard Modernization Project including a net  
19 increase of 33 buses, altered striping on the second level of the replacement transit facilities,  
20 the conversion of 67 of the 60-foot bus parking spaces to 100 40-foot bus parking spaces, and  
21 301 additional bus operators, and found that the modified project would not cause new  
22 significant impacts or result in a substantial increase in the severity of the impacts identified in  
23 the FEIR, and no new or revised mitigation measures would be required. In the Memorandum  
24 to File, the Planning Department determined that no additional environmental review is  
25 necessary for the reasons set forth in the Memorandum to File and that the Memorandum to

1 File provides sufficient documentation that the modified project does not warrant additional  
2 environmental review. The “CEQA Findings” shall refer to the CEQA findings included in the  
3 Motion No. 21482, Motion No. 21483, the Statement of Overriding Considerations, Ordinance  
4 No. 57-24, and the Memorandum to File, all as described in this Section 3(iv).

5 (a) The Board has reviewed and considered the FEIR, the MMRP, the  
6 Memorandum to File, and the record as a whole and incorporates the CEQA Findings by this  
7 reference.

8 (b) The Board finds that the FEIR is adequate for its use as the decision-  
9 making body for approval of this Resolution.

10 (c) The Board hereby adopts as its own the preceding CEQA Findings  
11 including the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

12 (d) The Board further finds that since the FEIR was finalized, there have  
13 been no substantial project changes and no substantial changes in project circumstances that  
14 would require major revisions to the FEIR due to the involvement of new significant  
15 environmental effects or an increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts,  
16 and there is no new information of substantial importance that would change the conclusions  
17 set forth in the FEIR.

18 (e) In accordance with CEQA, the Board has considered the mitigation  
19 measures described in the FEIR and hereby requires that the MMRP be imposed as  
20 conditions on the implementation of the Muni Bus Storage and Maintenance Facility at Potrero  
21 Yard project approved by the ordinance submitting this bond to the voters.

22 (f) With the implementation of the mitigation measures contained in the  
23 MMRP, any potential environmental impacts resulting from the Muni Bus Storage and  
24 Maintenance Facility at Potrero Yard project will be less than significant as described in the  
25 FEIR.

(g) Based on the FEIR, the Memorandum to File, and the record as a whole including all written materials and any oral testimony received by the Board for the Potrero Yard Modernization Project, the Board hereby finds that the FEIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Planning Department and the Board, is adequate and complete, and that there is no substantial evidence that the proposed Muni Bus Storage and Maintenance Facility at Potrero Yard project, given the implementation of the mitigation measures as stated in the FEIR and the adoption of the MMRP, could have a significant effect on the environment as shown in the analysis of the FEIR. The Board hereby adopts the FEIR and the MMRP on file with the Clerk of the Board.

(v) Public Safety Facilities and Infrastructure. For the reasons set forth in the from the Environmental Review Officer of the Planning Department, dated December 18, 2025, a copy of which is on file with the Clerk of the Board in File No. 251217 and incorporated by reference, the Board finds that the bond proposal as it relates to funds for Public Safety Facilities and Infrastructure is not subject to CEQA, because the establishment of a government financing mechanism that does not involve any commitment to specific projects to be constructed with the funds is not a project as defined by CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. Bond proceeds used to finance any project or portion of any project with funds for the Public Safety Facilities and Infrastructure portion of the Bond will be subject to approval of the City upon completion of planning and any further required environmental review under CEQA for the individual Public Safety Facilities and Infrastructure projects.

Section 4. The Board finds and declares that the proposed Bond is (i) in conformity with the eight priority policies of Section 101.1(b) of the Planning Code, (ii) in accordance with Section 4.105 of the Charter and Section 2A.53(f) of the Administrative Code, and (iii) consistent with the General Plan, and adopts the findings of the Planning Department, as set forth in the General Plan Referral Report dated December 9, 2025, a copy of which is on file

1 with the Clerk of the Board in File No. 251217 and incorporates such findings by reference.

2       Section 5. The time limit for approval of this resolution specified in Section 2.34 of the  
3       Administrative Code is waived.

4       Section 6. In accordance with Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code, landlords are  
5       hereby authorized to pass-through 50% of the resulting property tax increase, if any, to  
6       residential tenants if the proposed measure is approved by two-thirds of voters voting on the  
7       measure.

8       Section 7. Documents referenced in this Resolution are on file with the Clerk of the  
9       Board of Supervisors in File No. 251217, which is hereby declared to be a part of this  
10      Resolution as if set forth fully herein.

11      Section 8. That this Resolution shall take effect upon its enactment. Enactment occurs  
12      when the Mayor signs the Resolution, the Mayor returns the Resolution unsigned or does not  
13      sign the Resolution within ten days of receiving it, or the Board of Supervisors overrides the  
14      Mayor's veto of the Resolution.

15  
16      APPROVED AS TO FORM:  
17      DAVID CHIU, City Attorney

18      By:/s/ MARK D. BLAKE  
19      MARK D. BLAKE  
20      Deputy City Attorney  
21      4936-3849-2798, v. 1

<b>Items 3 &amp; 4</b> <b>Files 25-1216, 25-1217</b>	<b>Departments:</b> Public Utilities Commission, Municipal Transportation Agency, Police, Fire, City Administrator, Controller
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	
<b>Legislative Objectives</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>File 25-1216:</b> is an ordinance that would provide for a special election on June 2, 2026, to request voter approval for a \$535 million general obligation bond to fund five Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response program areas.</li> <li>• <b>File 25-1217:</b> is a resolution that would determine and declare that incurring the proposed debt is necessary and in the public interest.</li> </ul>	
<b>Key Points</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The FY 2026-2035 Capital Plan includes a schedule of planned debt and other capital financing and was approved by the Board of Supervisors in April 2025 (File 25-0233). In December 2025, the Capital Planning Committee approved an amended FY 2026-2035 Capital Plan, which is currently pending approval by the Board of Supervisors (File 25-1215).</li> <li>• The proposed bonds, which would require approval by at least two-thirds of San Francisco voters, would fund: \$130 million for the Emergency Firefighting Water System, \$100 million for firefighting facilities and infrastructure projects, \$72 million for police facilities and infrastructure projects, \$200 million for Potrero Bus Yard resiliency upgrades, and \$33 million for public safety facilities and infrastructure projects.</li> </ul>	
<b>Fiscal Impact</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• According to the Office of Public Finance, the proposed bonds are assumed to have an annual interest rate of 6.0 percent and term of 26 years, with estimated total debt service payments of \$933 million, including approximately \$398 million in interest and \$535 million in principal. Because the bonds will be sold in tranches, the Office of Public Finance estimates average annual debt service payments of \$35.9 million.</li> </ul>	
<b>Policy Consideration</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific bond projects for the \$33 million Public Safety Building Repairs program area have not yet been determined. Examples of potential projects include renovations or improvements of boilers, roofs, generators, elevators, HVAC systems, and electrical upgrades. The Office of Resilience and Capital Planning will work with the public safety departments and Public Works to develop specific project recommendations for consideration by the Mayor's Office, Capital Planning Committee, and Board of Supervisors, which will have to approve bond sales and appropriations of bond proceeds. The project selection process may include criteria related to project readiness, legal mandates, life safety, and other factors.</li> </ul>	
<b>Recommendation</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approve the proposed ordinance and resolution.</li> </ul>	

## MANDATE STATEMENT

City Administrative Code Section 2.34 requires that a resolution determining the public interest and necessity for the acquisition, construction or completion of any municipal improvement funded by property taxes be adopted by the Board of Supervisors not less than 141 days before the election at which such proposal will be submitted to the voters. Approval of such resolutions requires a 2/3 vote by the Board of Supervisors.

City Charter Section 9.106 states that the Board of Supervisors is authorized to provide for the issuance of general obligation bonds in accordance with the Constitution of the State of California. There shall be a limit on outstanding general obligation bond indebtedness of three percent of the assessed value of all taxable real and personal property, located within the City and County.

According to Article 16, Section 18(a) of the State of California Constitution, no county, city, town, township, board of education, or school district, shall incur any indebtedness or liability for any purpose exceeding in any year the income and revenue provided for such year, without the approval of two-thirds of the voters of the public entity voting at an election to be held for that purpose.

## BACKGROUND

The FY 2026-2035 Capital Plan includes a schedule of planned debt and other capital financing and was approved by the Board of Supervisors in April 2025 (File 25-0233). In December 2025, the Capital Planning Committee approved an amended FY 2026-2035 Capital Plan. Exhibit 1 below shows the amendments to the government obligation bond program schedule.

### Exhibit 1. Amended FY 2026-2035 Capital Plan's Government Obligation Bond Program

<b>Bond Program</b>	<b>Original</b>		<b>Amended</b>	
	<b>Election Date</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Election Date</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response	Nov 2028	\$350,000,000	June 2026	\$535,000,000
Parks and Open Space	June 2030	\$200,000,000	March 2028	\$250,000,000
Waterfront & Climate Safety	March 2028	\$350,000,000	Nov 2028	No change
Public Health	Nov 2030	\$250,000,000	No change	No change
Transportation	Nov 2026	\$235,000,000	Removed	Removed
	Nov 2032	\$200,000,000	No change	No change
Affordable Housing	Nov 2034	\$200,000,000	No change	No change

Source: FY 2026-2035 Original and Amended Capital Plans

The proposed resolution amending the FY 2026-2035 Capital Plan to reflect these changes to the government obligation bond program is currently pending approval by the Board of Supervisors (File 25-1215).

## DETAILS OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

**File 25-1216:** is an ordinance that would provide for a special election on June 2, 2026, to request voter approval for a \$535 million general obligation bond to fund five Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response (ESER) program areas listed below.

- (1) \$130 million for the Emergency Firefighting Water System,
- (2) \$100 million for firefighting facilities and infrastructure projects,
- (3) \$72 million for police facilities and infrastructure projects,
- (4) \$200 million for Muni bus storage and maintenance facility improvements and infrastructure projects at Potrero Yard, and
- (5) \$33 million for public safety facilities and infrastructure projects.

All contracts funded by bond proceeds must comply with the City's First Source Hiring program and Local Business Enterprise program.

**File 25-1217:** is a resolution that would determine and declare that the public interest and necessity demand the improvement, renovation, construction, expansion, acquisition, rehabilitation, and seismic retrofitting of the following: Emergency Firefighting Water System, Firefighting Facilities and Infrastructure, Police Facilities and Infrastructure, transportation facilities for the Municipal Railway Bus Storage and Maintenance Facility at Potrero Yard, and other Public Safety Facilities and Infrastructure projects.

The proposed legislation would also:

- Find that the estimated cost of \$535 million for such proposed projects will be too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed by the annual tax levy;
- Find that the bond proposal is not subject to review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA);
- Find that the proposed bonds are in conformity with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1(b);
- Waive the time requirements for approving the resolution specified in Administrative Code Section 2.34; and
- Authorize landlords to pass-through 50 percent of the resulting property tax increase to residential tenants under Administrative Code, Chapter 37; and,

Proposed uses of the bond proceeds are summarized in Exhibit 2 below, including projects that have been identified in the bond report associated with this request and projects identified by

City departments that could be funded within each program. Appendix I provides more details on the projects to be funded by the proposed bond proceeds.

### Exhibit 2: Proposed Uses of Bond Funds

Program	Amount <sup>1</sup>	Projects
Emergency Firefighting Water System	\$130,000,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction of Westside pipeline segment<sup>2</sup></li> <li>Construction of fireboat manifold at Fort Mason<sup>3</sup></li> </ul>
Neighborhood Fire Stations and Support Facilities	\$100,000,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neighborhood Fire Station 2 (1340 Powell St.) replacement<sup>4</sup>/seismic improvements</li> <li>Neighborhood Fire Station 40 (2155 18<sup>th</sup> Ave) replacement/seismic improvements</li> <li>Neighborhood Fire Station 8 (36 Bluxome St.) replacement/retrofit</li> <li>Relocation of the Community Paramedicine Facility</li> </ul>
District Police Stations and Support Facilities	\$72,000,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retrofit of Taraval Police Station</li> <li>Relocation of the Property Control Division from the Hall of Justice</li> </ul>
Potrero Bus Yard Resiliency Upgrades	\$200,000,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Replacement of Potrero Bus Yard with modern facility</li> </ul>
Public Safety Building Repairs	\$33,000,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Repairs and improvements of public safety facilities. Specific projects to be determined. Examples of potential projects include replacement of roofs, boilers, generators, elevators, HVAC systems, electrical upgrades or other necessary renovations or improvements.</li> </ul>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$535,000,000</b>	

Sources: Public Utilities Commission, Municipal Transportation Agency, Police, Fire, City Administrator, 2026 ESER Bond Report

Approval of the proposed \$535 million general obligation bond would require approval by at least two-thirds of San Francisco voters. All issuances of the bonds and appropriations of the bond fund proceeds would be subject to Board of Supervisors' approval. At that time, CEQA review and approval of specific projects may be required, and the project costs would be identified.

<sup>1</sup> Amounts include estimated costs of issuance and other financing costs (e.g., City Services Auditor) for each program area. Amounts are rounded.

<sup>2</sup> According to SFPUC, the new infrastructure for the remaining westside pipeline segments will require system monitoring, exercise valves, etc., which are relatively minor operational impacts relative to SFPUC's overall system (based on the department's assessment).

<sup>3</sup> SFPUC states this project will not have any new operational impacts.

<sup>4</sup> According to the Fire Department, the replacement of a fire station includes the demolition of the existing facility and construction of a new facility that meets current standards. For the proposed fire station replacement projects, the personnel and equipment assigned to the location are temporarily relocated during construction.

**Bond Oversight**

As required by Administrative Code Section 5.31, the Citizen's General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee will conduct an annual review of bond expenditures and report on the bond program to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

The City must maintain a public webpage outlining the bond program, progress, and updates. In addition, the City will hold annual and periodic public hearings on the program and its implementation before the Capital Planning Committee, the Police and Fire Commissions, and the Citizen's General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee.

**FISCAL IMPACT****Debt Service**

According to the Controller's Office of Public Finance, the proposed bonds are assumed to have an annual interest rate of 6.0 percent<sup>5</sup> over approximately 26 years, with estimated total debt service payments of \$933 million, including approximately \$398 million in interest and \$535 million in principal. Because the bonds will be sold in tranches, the Office of Public Finance estimates average annual debt service payments of \$35.9 million.

**Property Taxes**

Property tax revenue would be used to secure and pay for the proposed debt service. According to the Office of Public Finance, the average property tax rate for the proposed bonds would be \$7.45 per \$100,000 of assessed valuation, half of which could be passed through to tenants in accordance with Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code.

**Debt Limits**

According to the Office of Public Finance, the proposed bonds are consistent with the City's current debt management policy to maintain the property tax rate for City general obligation bonds at or below the FY 2005-06 rate of \$0.12 per \$100 of assessed value and are also consistent with the City Charter limit for outstanding general obligation bond indebtedness to stay below three percent of assessed property values.

**POLICY CONSIDERATION****List of Public Safety Building Repairs Projects to Be Funded Not Yet Final**

Specific bond projects for the \$33 million Public Safety Building Repairs program area have not yet been determined. According to the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning, the funds will be used for critical repairs and improvements at public safety facilities in departments such as

---

<sup>5</sup> The Office of Public Finance uses a standardized planning assumption of 6.0% for tax-exempt debt and 7.0% for potentially taxable debt.

Fire, Police, Juvenile Probation, Sheriff's Office, and Emergency Management. This may include projects such as renovations or improvements of boilers, roofs, generators, elevators, HVAC systems, and electrical upgrades. The Office of Resilience and Capital Planning will work with the public safety departments and Public Works to develop specific project recommendations for consideration by the Mayor's Office, Capital Planning Committee, and Board of Supervisors, which will have to approve bond sales and appropriations of bond proceeds. The project selection process may include criteria related to project readiness, legal mandates, life safety, and other factors.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Approve the proposed ordinance and resolution.

### Appendix I: Projects to be Funded by Proposed 2026 ESER Bonds

Project	Bond Amount	Description	Project Phase	Estimated Completion	Basis for Estimate
<b>Emergency Firefighting Water System</b>					
Sunset District/Richmond District/Golden Gate Park Pipelines	\$92,000,000	Construction of the Westside pipeline segments to Golden Gate Park and the Richmond District. Seismic and electrical evaluation of Lake Merced Pump Station.	Design	2029-2032 depending on segment	Construction cost estimate at 95% design for initial segment and interpolated to subsequent segments.
Fireboat Manifold at Fort Mason	\$36,000,000	Construction of the fireboat manifold and associated piping at Fort Mason.	Design	Winter 2032	Construction cost estimate at the planning level.
<i>Cost of Issuance/Other Financing</i>	<i>\$1,920,000</i>				
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$129,920,000</b>				
<b>Neighborhood Fire Stations and Support Facilities</b>					
Neighborhood Fire Station 2 (1340 Powell St.)	\$35,000,000	Replacement of the aging and seismically unsafe Battalion Station 2.	Design	Fall 2031	Cost estimate developed by external cost estimator based on preliminary design option, schedule and anticipated date of mid-point of construction
Neighborhood Fire Station 40 (2155 18th Ave)	\$20,000,000	Replacement of the aging and seismically unsafe Battalion Station 40.	Planning	Spring 2030	Cost estimate developed by external cost estimator based on preliminary design option, schedule and anticipated date of mid-point of construction
Neighborhood Fire Station 8 (36 Bluxome St.)	\$30,000,000	Replacement or retrofit of seismically unsafe Battalion Station 8.	Planning	Spring 2032	Unit cost based on completed prior similar projects multiplied by the project's total area plus escalation through the anticipated mid-point of construction

Project	Bond Amount	Description	Project Phase	Estimated Completion	Basis for Estimate
Community Paramedicine Facility	\$13,400,000	Relocation of the Paramedicine Facility from the seismically unsafe Bureau of Equipment at 1415 Evans Street.	Planning	TBD	Rough Order of Magnitude based on preliminary project scope
<i>Cost of Issuance/Other Financing</i>	<i>\$1,476,000</i>				
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$99,876,000</b>				
<b>District Police Stations and Support Facilities</b>					
Taraval Police Station	\$61,000,000	Retrofit of the seismically unsafe Taraval Station and addition of an annex.	Design	Summer 2030	Cost estimate developed by external cost estimator based on preliminary design option, schedule and anticipated date of mid-point of construction
Property Control Division Phase II	\$10,000,000	Relocation of the Property Control Division from the seismically unsafe Hall of Justice to 1828 Egbert Street.	Planning	Summer 2029	Cost estimate developed by external cost estimator based on preliminary design option, schedule and delivery timeframe.
<i>Cost of Issuance/Other Financing</i>	<i>\$1,065,000</i>				
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$72,065,000</b>				
<b>Potrero Bus Yard Resilience Upgrades</b>					
Potrero Yard Modernization Project	\$197,000,000	Replacement of the seismically unsafe Potrero bus yard with a modern facility that will allow Muni to service electric vehicles and remain functional after an earthquake.	Design	Summer 2030	Preliminary Design-Build Contractor pricing based on 30% of the design.
<i>Cost of Issuance/Other Financing</i>	<i>\$2,955,000</i>				
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$199,955,000</b>				

Project	Bond Amount	Description	Project Phase	Estimated Completion	Basis for Estimate
<b>Public Safety Building Repairs</b>					
Projects TBD	\$32,600,000	Specific projects TBD. Projects will address critical repairs and improvements to keep Public Safety facilities safe and functional.	Varies/TBD	2027-2031	Level of funding is expected to fund high priority Public Safety renewal projects for three to four years. Estimates are based on average annual facility renewal funding levels for public safety departments (e.g., Fire, Police, Juvenile Probation, Sheriff, Emergency Management)
<i>Cost of Issuance/Other Financing</i>	<i>\$489,000</i>				
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$33,089,000</b>				
<b>Proposed 2026 ESER Total</b>	<b>\$534,905,000</b>				

Sources: Public Utilities Commission, Municipal Transportation Agency, Police, Fire, City Administrator

# **2026 Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response (ESER) G.O. Bond and Related 10-Year Capital Plan Updates**



Brian Strong, Office of Resilience and Capital Planning

# Budget and Finance Committee

- ❑ 251214: Ordinance amending Administrative Code Sec 3.20. for future Capital Plan update schedule (even-year updates instead of odd-year updates)
- ❑ 251215: Resolution amending FY2026-2035 Capital Plan to update General Obligation (G.O.) Bond Program
- ❑ 251216: Ordinance Authorizing the Proposed 2026 Earthquake Safety And Emergency Response (ESER) General Obligation (G.O.) Bond In The Amount Of \$535,000,000
- ❑ 251217: Resolution of Public Interest and Necessity Authorizing the Proposed 2026 Earthquake Safety And Emergency Response (ESER) General Obligation (G.O.) Bond In The Amount Of \$535,000,000

## 251214: Admin Code Sec 3.20. Amendment

### Changing Capital Plan updates from odd-years to even-years

- ▣ Currently the Capital Plan is updated every odd year (current Plan was approved in **April 2025**)
- ▣ The change in the Mayoral election schedule (from odd years to even years – *Prop H, 2022*) means that a new Mayor must adopt a new Capital Plan very soon after taking office
- ▣ The proposed change in Capital Plan update schedule enables the Mayor's Office to fully engage with the Capital Plan process and aligns the General Fund and Enterprise Depts. Capital Plan update cycle
- ▣ With this amendment, the next Capital Plan would be approved in **April 2028** and cover the 10 years from **FY2029 – 2040**

# 251215: Capital Plan Amendment

## General Obligation Bond Schedule

### CURRENT CAPITAL PLAN

Election Date	Bond Program	Amount (\$M)
Nov 2026	Transportation	235
Mar 2028	Waterfront & Climate Safety	350
Nov 2028	Earthquake Safety & Emergency Response	350
June 2030	Parks & Open Space	200
Nov 2030	Public Health	250
Nov 2032	Transportation	200
Nov 2034	Affordable Housing	200
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,785</b>

### AMENDED CAPITAL PLAN

Election Date	Bond Program	Amount (\$M)
Jun 2026	Earthquake Safety & Emergency Response	535
Mar 2028	Parks and Open Space	250
Nov 2028	Waterfront & Climate Safety	350
Nov 2030	Public Health	250
Nov 2032	Transportation	200
Nov 2034	Affordable Housing	200
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,785</b>



- ESER Bond brought forward from 2028 to 2026, and increased to include Potrero Bus Yard (formerly part of Transportation 2026 Bond)
- Parks Bond brought forward from 2030 to 2028 and increased by \$50M

# 251216 & 251217: ESER 2026 Program Overview

Component	Proposed Allocation	Description & Key Deliverables
<b>Emergency Firefighting Water System (EFWS)</b>	<b>\$130M</b>	Renovate, expand and seismically upgrade the City's Emergency Firefighting Water System, including extending the Potable Emergency Firefighting Water System into the Richmond District and constructing the fireboat manifold at Fort Mason.
<b>Neighborhood Fire Stations &amp; Support Facilities</b>	<b>\$100M</b>	Strengthen, improve and rehabilitate Neighborhood Fire Stations and Support Facilities, including the replacement of fire stations that are seismically unsafe.
<b>District Police Stations &amp; Support Facilities</b>	<b>\$72M</b>	Renovate, improve and expand dilapidated Police Stations that are no longer adequate for the operational needs of the SFPD.
<b>Muni Bus Storage &amp; Maintenance Facility at Potrero Yard</b>	<b>\$200M</b>	Replace a 110-year-old, seismically unsafe Muni bus yard with a modern bus maintenance and storage facility to help ensure Muni has buses available to provide transit service after a disaster.
<b>Critical Public Safety Building Repairs</b>	<b>\$33M</b>	Make critical building repairs and improvements at public safety facilities.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$535M</b>	

# ESER 2026 – Emergency Firefighting Water System

- Planned 2026 bond allocation: **\$130 million**
- Next phase of EFWS: Expand capacity to include a separate component that uses drinking water
- This extension of the system can supply water for both fighting fires and for drinking
- Expanded system would extend high-pressure water pipelines, hydrants and key connection points into the City's western neighborhoods



New pipe for Potable Emergency Firefighting Water Systems pipeline at 19th Ave and Sloat Blvd.

# ESER 2026 – Neighborhood Fire Stations & Support Facilities

- Planned 2026 bond allocation: **\$100 million**
- Renovate/replace fire stations with the highest-priority needs to provide improved life-safety and seismic performance, meet essential facility standards and create a healthy work environment for firefighters and EMTs
- Vulnerable stations in need of improvements include:
  - Fire Station No. 2, 1340 Powell St.
  - Fire Station No. 7, 2300 Folsom St.
  - Fire Station No. 8, 36 Bluxome St.
  - Fire Station No. 40, 2155 18th Ave.



In a 2017 Public Works seismic survey, Fire Station 2 was listed as a high safety hazard with an SHR rating of 4, placing it in the highest risk category.

# ESER 2026 – District Police Stations & Support Facilities


- Planned 2026 bond allocation: **\$72 million**
- Some police stations are more than a century old and at risk of failure during a major earthquake
- Additionally, some Police Department stations and support facilities are outdated, inadequate and don't meet today's policing needs
- Stations and facilities in need of improvements include:
  - Taraval Police Station
  - SFPD Property Control Division



Built in 1915, the Taraval Police Station's historic building has a high probability of collapsing after a major earthquake and would not be operational, potentially increasing response times and delaying service.

# ESER 2026 – Critical Public Safety Building Repairs

- Planned 2026 bond allocation: **\$33 million**
- State-of-good-repair projects would include building improvements, such as the repair or replacement of roofs and plumbing and electrical systems
- The City will prioritize the improvement projects that are the most necessary, beneficial and cost-effective



# ESER 2026 – Muni Bus Storage & Maintenance Facility at Potrero Yard

- Planned 2026 bond allocation: **\$200 million**
- Maintenance facilities like Potrero Yard, which was built in 1915 and is Muni's second oldest bus yard, are essential to repairing and keeping buses running during an emergency event
- A partial or total collapse of the bus yard (SHR-4), risks employee lives and the destruction of the fleet
- In the event of a large-scale disaster, Muni's fleet must be prepared to provide transit services to help evacuate residents, commuters and tourists
- Buses may be needed for disaster response, including transporting disaster service workers, emergency responders and emergency supplies to key deployment locations across the City




The Potrero Yard is more than a century old and long past its lifespan.

# FY 2026-2035 Capital Plan

## G.O. Bond Program

Capital Plan - General Obligation Debt Program FY2026-2035  
\$535M June 2026 ESER Bond Scenario



*Adopted Capital Plan AV assumptions from Nov 2024*


*Assumes AAB reserves in FY26, and growth of 0.52% in FY27, 2.63% in FY28, 3.18% in FY29, 3.28% in FY30, and 3% per year thereafter*

Revised 11-7-25

# Thank you!

---

## Questions?



ESER Webpage:  
<https://sfpublicworks.org/eser>



2026

---

## EARTHQUAKE SAFETY AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE BOND





Firefighter putting out a fire at Divisadero and Beach streets caused by the Loma Prieta earthquake on Oct. 17, 1989.

# CONTENTS

---

---

- 4      **ESER 2026 BOND OVERVIEW**
- 6      **SAFEGUARDING SAN FRANCISCO**
- 6      **ACT NOW FOR A SAFER TOMORROW**
- 8      **A CITY HEMMED IN BY FAULT LINES**
- 11     **THE 2026 EARTHQUAKE SAFETY AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE  
GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND PROGRAM**
- 12     **EMERGENCY FIREFIGHTING WATER SYSTEM**
- 18     **NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE STATIONS AND SUPPORT FACILITIES**
- 23     **DISTRICT POLICE STATIONS AND SUPPORT FACILITIES**
- 26     **POTRERO BUS YARD RESILIENCY UPGRADES**
- 29     **BUILDING ON PROGRESS: ACCOMPLISHMENTS TO DATE**
- 31     **FIRE DEPARTMENT FACILITIES**
- 34     **POLICE DEPARTMENT FACILITIES**
- 38     **OFFICE OF THE CHIEF MEDICAL EXAMINER**
- 39     **9-1-1 CALL CENTER**
- 40     **ACCOUNTABILITY & TRANSPARENCY**
- 42     **10-YEAR CAPITAL PLAN**
- 44     **CONCLUSION**

# ESER 2026 BOND OVERVIEW

---

---

The City and County of San Francisco is proposing a \$535 million Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response (ESER) Bond for the June 2026 ballot to fund seismic upgrades and much-needed improvements to aging first responder facilities and capital infrastructure.

These improvements will increase San Francisco's capacity to quickly respond to a major earthquake or other disaster and recover from the aftermath. The ability to respond quickly in an emergency will have a direct impact on how well San Francisco recovers after the next big earthquake.

San Francisco, located close to two major fault lines, has experienced several large earthquakes. Much of the damage and loss of life from these disasters was due to the collapse of buildings and the resulting fires.

ESER 2026 will provide funding for seismic

upgrades and essential improvements to vitally important infrastructure to make sure that San Francisco responds promptly and has the capacity to launch an effective, safe recovery that protects the City's residents, businesses and assets.

The City's time-tested policy is to issue new bonds only after previously issued bonds are paid off. This strategy aims to keep property tax rates unchanged.

ESER 2026 will be subject to rigorous accountability, fiscal responsibility and transparency standards. This includes public review by the Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee to ensure the integrity of bond fund expenditures. Additional layers of mandated oversight will come from the Capital Planning Committee, the Controller's Office and the Board of Supervisors.

## THE ESER 2026 BOND CONSISTS OF THE FOLLOWING PROGRAM COMPONENTS


<b>BOND COMPONENT</b>	<b>BUDGET</b>
Renovate, expand and seismically upgrade the City's aging Emergency Firefighting Water System	\$130 million
Repair and replace deteriorating and seismically unsafe neighborhood fire stations	\$100 million
Make seismic, safety and operational improvements to district police stations and support facilities	\$72 million
Critical building repairs and improvements at public safety facilities	\$33 million
Replace a 110-year-old, seismically unsafe bus yard with a modern bus maintenance and storage facility to help ensure Muni has buses available to provide transit service after a disaster	\$ 200 million
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$535 million</b>

# SAFE GUARDING SAN FRANCISCO

## ACT NOW FOR A SAFER TOMORROW

The \$535 million Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response Bond (ESER 2026) builds on the vital capital improvements that began under the voter-approved 2010, 2014 and 2020 ESER bonds – all under a unified program set up to provide funding for the delivery of critical infrastructure upgrades in a phased, tactical approach. In keeping with previous ESER upgrades,

ESER 2026 focuses on improving the structural resilience of essential facilities so first responders can deploy to emergencies safely and effectively without interruption. These repairs and improvements ensure that infrastructure assets supporting first responders can remain safe and ready during and after a major earthquake or other disaster.



Traffic Company and Forensic Services Division, Photo by Bruce Damonte

It is imperative to continue these repairs and upgrades under the coordinated and strategic ESER Program to strengthen earthquake resiliency and disaster preparedness in San Francisco. Responding quickly in an emergency is critical to reducing the number of injuries and deaths and jumpstarting the City's recovery. A speedy recovery will enable San Francisco residents to keep working and businesses to keep operating in the crucial weeks and months after a major earthquake or other disaster.

Earthquakes continue to be a particularly capricious force of nature. They can upend thousands of lives at a moment's notice and trigger a cascade of devastating disasters, from surging tsunamis to sprawling infernos.

Recent history is littered with painful examples of the destruction and death large temblors can cause in earthquake country:

- In 2023, a magnitude 7.8 earthquake killed more than 53,000 people in Turkey and destroyed or damaged hundreds of thousands of buildings. Another 6,000 people were killed in the northern parts of neighboring Syria.
- In March 2025, a magnitude 7.7 earthquake struck near Mandalay, Myanmar's second-largest city, home to 1.2 million people. It killed more than 3,800 people and either completely or partially destroyed nearly 29,000 homes across the region.

In the Bay Area, too, a recent spate of smaller earthquakes is a constant reminder that the threat of a more serious tremor is looming. We cannot forecast or predict them, but we know with certainty that we need to be prepared for a worst-case scenario. That is why the most precious commodity in the effort to make San Francisco more earthquake-resilient is time.

Acting today increases our chances for a safer tomorrow.



Aftermath of the 1906 Great Earthquake and Fire



Aftermath of the 1989 Loma Prieta Earthquake

## A CITY HEMMED IN BY FAULT LINES

San Francisco is located in earthquake country. A major quake can occur at any time. There is a 72% likelihood that a 6.7 or greater magnitude earthquake will strike the Bay Area in the next 30 years, according to the U.S. Geological Survey.

The aftermath of both the 1906 and 1989 earthquakes taught San Francisco lessons that have been taken to heart. Most of us are familiar with the Great Earthquake and Fire of 1906. The majority of the damage came not from the shaking, but from the fires that erupted subsequently. Approximately [80% of San Francisco's total loss](#) was attributed to the fires. The result was devastating: approximately 3,000 deaths and the destruction of nearly 28,000 buildings. The National Fire Protection Association estimates the fire losses amounted to \$18 billion in today's dollars.

As a result, less than a decade after the 1906 calamity, San Francisco built a high-pressure dedicated firefighting water system to fight multiple-alarm fires.

More recently, the 1989 Loma Prieta Earthquake, with an epicenter 60 miles south of the City and measuring 6.9 on the Richter scale, [triggered major fires in the Marina District](#). It is expected that a large earthquake closer to San Francisco will have even more devastating consequences.

The potential monetary losses following a major earthquake are staggering. A 7.2 magnitude earthquake on the San Andreas fault would cause an estimated \$44 billion of damage to buildings. Under this scenario, fire damage would account for an estimated 15% of total damage costs. This number could increase if the earthquake occurred under dry and windy weather conditions. A catastrophe of this magnitude will severely damage the Bay Area's economy and San Francisco's capacity to recover. All we need to do is look at the devastation from the fires that ripped through Southern California in early 2025 to see the cataclysmic results – dozens of deaths, thousands of structures destroyed and tens of billions in damages and economic losses.

## RESPONSE TIME MATTERS

- A guiding principle of our City's long history of investing in first responders is committing to the quickest possible response. Responding rapidly in an emergency reduces injuries, deaths and property damage.
- Response times have a direct impact on how well San Francisco recovers after the next big earthquake, accelerating the City's economic recovery and preserving the jobs of San Francisco residents in the weeks and months following a major earthquake.
- Without these essential improvements, we put the lives of our first responders at risk, as well as the lives of the San Franciscans who depend on them in times of greatest need.

By improving backup systems, making seismic upgrades and relocating critical first responder facilities to new or rehabilitated buildings that meet today's safety codes, San Francisco can better protect its residents, homes and businesses in the event of an earthquake or other emergency. We know it's not a matter of if, but a matter of when, the next devastating earthquake strikes – and this bond ensures that San Francisco will be better prepared to meet the moment and be ready when the time comes.



## WHY THIS BOND PROPOSAL NOW?

The Ten-Year Capital Plan (the Plan) is the City's commitment to building a more resilient and vibrant future for the residents, workers and visitors of San Francisco. The Plan prioritizes critical capital projects to protect the public and places a strong emphasis on fiscal accountability and transparency.

The Plan provides for a balanced approach across a 10-year timespan to incrementally address the substantial citywide needs for continued investment in capital facilities and infrastructure. The City is committed to strategically investing in public safety facilities to ensure the effective delivery of fire and police services and improve disaster response capabilities. The previous three ESER bonds were approved by San Francisco voters in 2010, 2014 and 2020 with strong support. The 2026 ESER bond is the important next phase to build on the progress to protect San Francisco.

All bond program components in the \$535 million 2026 ESER bond proposal are included in the current Ten-Year Capital Plan. Projects within the program components will be identified and evaluated using criteria that prioritize enhancements to public safety. All projects will be subject to a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review.



## HOW WILL THIS BOND AFFECT PROPERTY

### TAX RATES?

San Francisco's policy is to issue new bonds after previously issued bonds are retired or the tax base grows, as specified in the City's Ten-Year Capital Plan. Property taxes levied for general obligation bonds will be maintained at or below the Fiscal Year 2006 rate as a result of this bond. Bonds are key to improving, expanding and maintaining our city's infrastructure and have funded the construction of many public assets over the years.

### COST SAVINGS

Timing is critical. Every year that we delay needed improvements to our public safety facilities, the cost increases – especially considering external factors, such as the impact of tariffs. This sound investment is using tax dollars wisely for upgrades to essential infrastructure that we must make sooner or later. By acting now, we can improve safety and save local taxpayer dollars.

### BENEFITS

- Reduce injuries, deaths and property damage by providing first responders with the infrastructure they need to respond to emergencies and protect our communities.
- Create more than 2,000 direct and in-direct construction-related jobs in San Francisco to boost our economy and put San Franciscans to work. This jobs estimate is based on the REMI Policy Insight model used by the Controller's Office of Economic Analysis. A job is defined as one job of full-time work over a year-long period.



San Francisco firefighters demonstrate the Emergency Firefighting Water System

# THE 2026 EARTHQUAKE SAFETY AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND PROGRAM

---

**Emergency Firefighting Water System**

**Neighborhood Fire Stations and Support Facilities**

**District Police Stations and Support Facilities**

**Potrero Bus Yard Resiliency Upgrades**

**Critical Public Safety Building Repairs**

# EMERGENCY FIREFIGHTING WATER SYSTEM

## WHAT IS THE EMERGENCY FIREFIGHTING WATER SYSTEM?

The Emergency Firefighting Water System (EFWS), formerly referred to as the Auxiliary Water Supply System, is a high-pressure water supply system dedicated to fire protection. It was originally constructed in 1913 in response to the Great Earthquake and Fire of 1906 and is owned and operated by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission.

The Emergency Firefighting Water System consists primarily of three components:

1. Core facilities: These structures deliver water at high pressure for the suppression of multiple-alarm fires. San Francisco's current core facilities include the Twin Peaks Reservoir, Ashbury Heights Tank, Jones Street Tank, Pump Station No. 1 and Pump Station No. 2.
2. Pipelines and hydrants: Approximately 135 miles of dedicated pipelines and tunnels deliver water to approximately 1,500 high-pressure hydrants throughout San Francisco neighborhoods.
3. Cisterns: These underground water storage tanks each hold roughly 75,000 gallons of water. The system's more than 200 underground cisterns serve as one of the most basic and reliable means for storing water for firefighting. As independent backup supply components, the cisterns are not connected to the City's piping systems; the stored water is pumped from the cisterns by fire engines to fight fires.

The EFWS has unique capabilities that distinguish it from the domestic water system. It can deliver water at very high pressure and draw directly from the San Francisco Bay through two pump stations. In addition, along the northeastern waterfront, 52 connections enable fire engines to pump Bay water into the system, supported by five fireboat manifolds that allow fireboats to pump Bay water directly into EFWS pipelines.



Emergency Firefighting Water System: Twin Peaks Reservoir



Emergency Firefighting Water System: Pump Station No. 1

## WHY DOES THE SYSTEM NEED TO BE UPGRADED?

The EFWS is used as the secondary defense against large, multiple-alarm fires, specifically those that can occur after a large earthquake when the domestic water system may be compromised. If the City's domestic water system is damaged as a result of an earthquake – as has happened previously – sufficient water from the domestic water system will not be available to suppress the flames. The EFWS will serve as the alternative water source and will be vital to extinguishing large fires, saving lives and protecting against the loss of homes, businesses and other structures after a large earthquake or other disaster.

Since assuming management of the EFWS in 2010, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SF-PUC) has invested more than \$200 million from prior ESER bonds to assess system conditions,

construct new cisterns, rehabilitate fireboat manifolds and pipelines, extend pipeline segments and seismically strengthen Pump Station 2. The majority of the current EFWS serves the central and eastern areas of the City. The outer western neighborhoods, such as the Sunset and Richmond districts, currently rely primarily on the existing domestic firefighting water system and emergency water storage cisterns.

This creates a significant vulnerability in the event of a major earthquake or multiple-alarm fire on the west side, where water pressure and supply reliability may be insufficient to meet emergency firefighting needs. Additional ESER bond funding would focus on continued improvements to the existing system and expand coverage in western neighborhoods.



New pipeline work for Potable Emergency Firefighting Water System at 19th Avenue and Sloat Boulevard



Emergency Firefighting Water System bay water test



Roof work underway for the Emergency Firefighting Water System at Ashbury Tank

## ESER 2026 PROJECTS

For the next phase of the Emergency Firefighting Water System, the SFPUC will expand capacity to include a separate component that uses drinking water. This extension of the system can supply water for both fighting fires and for drinking.

This expanded system will extend high-pressure water pipelines, hydrants and key connection points into the City's western neighborhoods, allowing firefighters to use the network as a reliable secondary defense against large-scale fires, particularly after a major earthquake when the domestic system may be damaged and service interrupted.

If the City's domestic water system is damaged as a result of an earthquake, as has happened previously, sufficient water from the domestic water system will not be available to suppress the flames. The planned expansion will serve as a robust system that will be vital to extinguishing large, multiple-alarm fires, saving lives and protecting against the loss of homes, businesses and other structures after a significant earthquake or other disaster.

In addition to expanding coverage, this phase will replace the aging fireboat manifold at Fort Mason, a critical link between the City's fireboats and the EFWS network. Those upgrades will also help protect the Marina District – which was hit hard during the Loma Prieta Earthquake – from devastating fires.

Together, these improvements will enhance system redundancy, reliability and firefighting capacity across San Francisco.

The [SFPUC's EFWS 2050 Planning Study](#), completed in 2020, evaluated alternatives for expanding the system and provided a roadmap for addressing current deficiencies. The study's recommendations have guided current ESER 2020 investments and form the basis for the projects proposed under ESER 2026. Final decisions about projects will be made through coordination between the Fire Department, Public Works and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission.

## BUDGET AND SCHEDULE

Of the \$535 million proposed for the overall ESER 2026 bond, \$130 million will be allocated to continue improvements and seismic upgrades to the Emergency Firefighting Water System. Upon selection of the projects after CEQA clearance, construction will proceed in a phased sequence to work toward the desired levels of service.

*For a description of improvements and upgrades to the Emergency Firefighting Water System facilities that were funded by ESER 2010, ESER 2014 and ESER 2020, see pages 32-33 of this report.*

## LESSONS FROM HISTORY

A pair of catastrophic disasters – one recent, another more than a century old but closer to home – serve as important reminders of why San Francisco has been tactically investing in emergency preparedness and readiness through the ESER Bond Program.

In early January 2025, a tandem of devastating, deadly blazes, later known as the Palisades Fire and the Eaton Fire, ignited and quickly spread through communities in Southern California.

The Los Angeles Department of Water & Power, the nation's largest municipal utility, released a [preliminary report](#) in July 2025 regarding the Palisades Fire Water System and the challenges encountered during the wind-fueled wildfire.


The deadly Palisades Fire spread swiftly, leading to enormous demands on a key water system. Given wind conditions at the time, firefighters could not fight the fire by air, so they used water drawn solely from a large pipe, known as the Westgate Trunk Line. Residents drew on the same trunk line

by turning and leaving on sprinklers while evacuating, using hoses on their houses, and leaving hoses running. In addition, as structures burned, damaged or opened premises pipes leaked more water.

As water from the trunk line was used at extraordinary rates, water pressure rapidly decreased. That pressure loss reduced the ability of pump stations to pump water, leading to water being drawn from three tanks without being replenished. By early morning of the next day, three pump stations had shut down and the tanks had run out of water, leaving homes, businesses and natural areas left to burn out of control. There was not another backup water system that firefighters could tap into.

The Eaton and Palisades fires killed 31 people. [According to Cal Fire](#), they rank as the state's second and third most destructive wildfires, respectively, destroying more than 16,000 structures. [UCLA researchers estimate](#) total property and capital losses from the fires could range between \$76 billion and \$131 billion.





Top and bottom: Emergency crews respond to the Palisades Fire; Middle: Aftermath of the fire

More than a century ago, San Francisco grappled with its own cataclysmic blaze in the wake of the Great Earthquake and Fire of 1906.

After the violent 7.9-magnitude earthquake rattled the Bay Area on April 18, 1906, firestorms – fueled by broken gas lines – raged for days in San Francisco. The City struggled to extinguish the blazes without a reliable, functioning water supply. Officials scrambled for alternate solutions, even unsuccessfully attempting to control the fires by dynamiting specific buildings to create firebreaks.

The inferno proved to be even more damaging than the initial shaking. Approximately 80% of San Francisco's total loss was attributed to the fires.

In the decades that followed the catastrophic earthquake, San Francisco leaders have focused on making the City more resilient in the face of the next major quake, from seismically retrofitting public safety facilities to expanding and upgrading the Emergency Firefighting Water System.



Aftermath of the 1906 Great Earthquake and Fire



Aftermath of the 1989 Loma Prieta Earthquake

# NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE STATIONS AND SUPPORT FACILITIES

## BACKGROUND

ESER 2026 will continue the work of the previous ESER 2010, ESER 2014 and ESER 2020 bonds, all of which passed with high approval from San Francisco voters. The next ESER phase will renovate or replace fire stations with the highest-priority needs to provide improved life-safety and seismic performance, meet essential facility standards and create a healthy work environment for our firefighters and emergency medical personnel.



## NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE STATIONS

Fire stations operate and are staffed by firefighters 24 hours a day, seven days a week. It is critical that our first responders are housed in safe and seismically sound facilities with the capacity to provide essential emergency response services to every San Francisco neighborhood.

Many of San Francisco's fire stations have structural and seismic deficiencies and require upgrades and other health and safety improvements. Without the necessary improvements, some may not be operational after a large earthquake or other disaster, threatening the ability of firefighters to respond to an emergency without delay.

In addition, the Fire Department operates necessary support facilities that augment the department's capacity to provide effective fire suppression, and these facilities also have significant safety and functional deficiencies that must be fixed.

Prior to the passage of ESER 2010, the majority of the City's fire stations and support facilities were assessed for their conditions to identify vulnerabilities and deficiencies that could compromise their essential role as operational deployment venues for first responders.

More recently, a 2017 seismic survey conducted by Public Works rated several fire stations at risk of potential collapse during a major earthquake. For instance, for one of the fire stations that was assessed the survey found seismic vulnerabilities in the frame, beams and columns that "could lead to building collapse, especially during a severe aftershock."

What's more, some of the City's fire stations were constructed decades ago – a few dating back to the 1930s and 1940s – and are not built to modern safety standards. In some cases, the electrical and IT infrastructure is not designed to support an indispensable facility that needs to be fully operational after a major earthquake.



## WHAT IF WE DO NOT SEISMICALLY REHABILITATE AND IMPROVE OUR FIRE STATIONS?

If left unaddressed, fire stations with serious structural deficiencies may impair our firefighters' ability to respond during and after a major disaster or even on a day-to-day basis.

The fire stations being considered for potential renovation serve as battalion headquarters, which means they oversee the administration and operations of multiple stations in their geographic areas.

Battalion headquarters stations provide command, control and communications for their geographic

areas in times of disaster. Fire Department disaster response operations could be severely hampered if command-and-control fire stations do not survive a severe earthquake.

Apart from the potential loss of response capability, postponing necessary upgrades or replacements of these facilities will lead to higher costs over time. Deferring this work will create increased yearly maintenance and repair costs for existing stations and divert funds from important Fire Department investments.



## CRITERIA FOR THE SELECTION OF NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE STATION UPGRADES AND IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

ESER-funded projects are carefully selected based on the operational and tactical importance of fire stations, ensuring the effective deployment of first responders in the event of a major earthquake or other disaster. The specific improvements and seismic upgrades to neighborhood fire stations are determined by the Fire Department before the design phase begins. This guarantees that bond funds are spent appropriately and on the highest-priority projects.

ESER 2026 bond funding would be used to potentially replace deficient fire stations that do not meet seismic and life-safety requirements, making them vulnerable to failure. Examples of these fire stations include:

- Fire Station No. 2, 1340 Powell St.
- Fire Station No. 7, 2300 Folsom St.
- Fire Station No. 8, 36 Bluxome St.
- Fire Station No. 40, 2155 18th Ave.

ESER 2026 projects are anticipated to be organized and delivered in the same manner as those currently funded by ESER 2010, 2014 and 2020 in accordance with the bond program's capital project planning procedures:

1. Project scope is identified and a cost estimate is prepared during the pre-design phase
2. Projects are characterized as seismic, comprehensive or focused scope
3. Project scope is prioritized, phased and scheduled for project delivery
4. The City's Capital Planning Committee and the independent Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee are informed prior to proceeding
5. Projects are designed, bid out and constructed according to the Neighborhood Fire Station master schedule



## **BUDGET AND SCHEDULE**

The development of the project scope and schedules for fire station improvements will be guided by the need to improve public safety. Work will be phased as required to maintain Fire Department service levels throughout San Francisco neighborhoods.

The number of stations that can be deactivated temporarily for construction at any given time will be limited.

Of the \$535 million proposed for the overall ESER 2026 bond, \$100 million will be allocated to strengthen, improve and rehabilitate neighborhood fire stations throughout the City.



# DISTRICT POLICE STATIONS AND SUPPORT FACILITIES

## BACKGROUND

There are 10 district police stations strategically located throughout the City. The district police stations are vital to the neighborhoods they serve. They support officers and tailor services to the specific needs of a neighborhood or community. Nearly all the patrol units and the responses to calls for service from the public are deployed to the field from these district stations.

Some police stations are more than a century old and at risk of failure during a major earthquake. Additionally, some Police Department stations and support facilities are outdated, inadequate and don't meet today's policing needs.

The San Francisco Police Department relies on its stations and support facilities to effectively deploy and buoy the work of its officers in the field.



## WHY DO WE NEED TO UPGRADE AND REHABILITATE DISTRICT POLICE STATIONS AND SUPPORT FACILITIES?

As San Francisco continues to build on its post-pandemic comeback, the City has begun to make small population gains in recent years. In-person events are back, local businesses have reopened and more employees are returning to an in-office work schedule.

As the City comes back to life, public safety remains front and center as a top priority. Part of that effort includes rebuilding police ranks and bolstering the department's capacity to better serve the community.

In an emergency, we count on police to arrive quickly and provide the help we need. Officers must be ready to jump into action and access their equipment, radios and uniforms without delay. In the event of a disaster, a functioning police station is essential – not only to effectively and efficiently

respond to emergency calls during and after the event, but to help manage a swift and safe recovery.

If building system deficiencies are not addressed, the Police Department will continue to operate in deteriorating and outdated facilities, which can impair timely officer deployment as they respond to calls for help. Seismically stable police stations will serve both as community-integrated public safety facilities and support the needs of officers who will be tasked with disaster response and public safety services during an emergency.

This bond measure will provide higher standards of facility performance to support police response capabilities that will be critical after a major earthquake or other disaster.



## ESER 2026 PROJECTS

1. Taraval Police Station: Built in 1915, this historic building has a high probability of collapsing after a major earthquake and would not be operational, potentially increasing response times and delaying service. A full seismic renovation and expansion of the westside station would create a facility that meets current life-safety codes and accommodates a growing police force.
2. The Property Control Division: Currently, SF-PD's Property Control Division, which stores evidence for criminal investigations, is housed at two sites – the former Hunters Point Shipyard and the Hall of Justice – both of which are seismically deficient. Relocating the facility to an earthquake-resilient building would safeguard evidence and ensure this key component of the criminal justice system can continue to function after an earthquake.

## BUDGET AND SCHEDULE

Of the \$535 million proposed for the overall ESER 2026 bond, \$72 million will be allocated for district police stations and support facilities. The City will prioritize the improvement projects that are the most necessary, beneficial and cost-effective to support Police Department emergency response.



Taraval Police Station


# POTRERO BUS YARD RESILIENCY UPGRADES

## BACKGROUND

After a major earthquake or other disaster, a speedy and full recovery for the City will hinge on a number of factors, including the ability for residents of all stripes and means to move about San Francisco safely and efficiently. The City's public transportation system and infrastructure – including its bus yards – play a pivotal role in ensuring this is possible.

Bus yards are an important part of San Francisco's

public transit system where Muni stores, repairs, cleans and maintains its vehicles that get San Franciscans where they need to go. The Potrero Yard provides bus service for more than 95,000 Muni riders each weekday, which is about a fifth of Muni's total ridership. All seven bus routes that run out of Potrero Yard (5 Fulton, 5 Fulton Rapid, 6 Haight/Parnassus, 14 Mission, 22 Fillmore, 30 Stockton and 49 Van Ness/Mission) serve Muni Service Equity neighborhoods.



SFMTA Potrero Yard

## WHY DO WE NEED TO UPGRADE AND REHABILITATE TRANSIT FACILITIES, SUCH AS BUS YARDS?

Muni provides an essential lifeline service for many San Franciscans in an emergency by linking them to life-sustaining medical care and other necessary services. Following a disaster, it is critical to keep Muni's transit infrastructure up and running to serve a variety of emergency needs, including the emergency movement of people or resources.

In the event of a large-scale disaster, Muni must be prepared to provide transit services to help evacuate residents, commuters and tourists. Additionally, Muni's bus fleet may be needed for disaster response, including transporting disaster service workers, emergency responders and emergency supplies to key deployment locations across San Francisco. Maintenance facilities like Potrero Yard, which was built in 1915 and is Muni's second oldest bus yard, are essential to repairing and keeping buses running during an emergency event.

The Potrero Yard is more than a century old and long past its lifespan. The facility doesn't meet current seismic safety standards. It is too small to accommodate Muni's fleet and too old to retrofit for new technologies needed to maintain and support electric buses. The yard needs to be modernized to provide a functional, safe and resilient facility for Muni – especially under threat of a major earthquake.

There are enormous safety issues if Potrero Yard partially or totally collapses during a significant earthquake, risking employee lives and the destruction of its fleet of 146 electric trolley buses. If such an unplanned event takes Potrero offline, major disruptions to Muni service operations and maintenance would occur. As a result, bus routes would be out of service or have greatly reduced service, indefinitely. This could hamper evacuation efforts, slow the City's recovery and impact the day-to-day lives of San Franciscans after a major earthquake.



SFMTA Potrero Yard

## ESER 2026 PROJECTS


A transit facility project that could be funded with ESER 2026 bond money is:

- Potrero Yard Modernization Project: Rebuild a 110-year-old, converted streetcar facility into a modern, four-story, efficient bus maintenance and storage facility. It would become Muni's trolley bus hub with room to accommodate 246 electric trolley buses, 100 more than the current capacity allows. Potrero Yard does not meet modern seismic standards. Bringing the yard to 21st-century design and safety standards would support the City's ability to continue providing transit service in an emergency or natural disaster.

A rebuilt Potrero Yard would ensure safety for staff, who provide an essential transportation service to the City, and ongoing performance in support of emergency response and transit service following an earthquake or other large-scale disaster.

## BUDGET AND SCHEDULE

Of the \$535 million proposed for the overall ESER 2026 bond, \$200 million will be allocated for transit facilities. The City will prioritize the improvement projects that are the most necessary, beneficial and cost-effective to support Muni's mission and its ability to aid the City's disaster response and recovery efforts following a major earthquake.



SFMTA Potrero Yard bus maintenance pit

## CRITICAL PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDING REPAIRS

### BACKGROUND

These state-of-good-repair projects would include building improvements, such as the repair or replacement of roofs and plumbing and electrical systems. These projects would focus on important public safety facilities, such as police and fire stations, the City's 9-1-1 Call Center and other buildings that support first responders.


### BUDGET AND SCHEDULE

Of the \$535 million proposed for the overall ESER 2026 bond, \$33 million will be allocated for high-need public safety building repairs. The City will prioritize the improvement projects that are the most necessary, beneficial and cost-effective.

# BUILDING ON PROGRESS: ACCOMPLISHMENTS TO DATE

## COMPLETED PROJECTS FUNDED BY PREVIOUS ESER FUNDS\*

- Neighborhood Fire Stations
- District Police Stations
- Public Safety Building
- Motorcycle Police and Crime Lab Facility
- Office of the Chief Medical Examiner
- 9-1-1 Call Center



\*Emergency Firefighting Water System can be found on page 33.

ESER 2026 continues the work of the Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response bonds that were overwhelmingly approved by voters in 2010, 2014 and 2020. Collectively, they have funded a wide range of projects to address deficiencies and seismically upgrade the City's aging public safety infrastructure – but there's more work to do.

The accomplishments of the previous three ESER bonds touch neighborhoods throughout San Francisco. Completed projects, and those underway, will safeguard our communities with resilient capital infrastructure built to be fully operational following an earthquake or other major disaster.



Traffic Company and Forensic Services Division: Motorcycle police unit headquarters



Traffic Company and Forensic Services Division: Crime lab

# FIRE DEPARTMENT FACILITIES

## NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE STATIONS

ESER 2010, 2014 and 2020 have identified much-needed improvements to every neighborhood fire station in San Francisco. To date, improvements have been made at neighborhood fire stations throughout San Francisco.


These upgrades include work in nine categories: apparatus bay doors; roofing; exterior envelope; emergency generators; shower replacements; heating, ventilation and air conditioning improvements; windows; sidewalks; and key card access.




Fire Station No. 35

ESER 2010 funded seismic replacements of two neighborhood fire stations and construction of one new neighborhood fire station:


- Fire Station No. 16, located in Cow Hollow, completed in January 2019
- Fire Station No. 5, located in the Western Addition, completed in April 2019
- Fire Station No. 4, a brand-new fire station in Mission Bay, was built as part of the Public Safety Building that opened in April 2015



Fire Station No. 16



Fire Station No. 5



Fire Station No. 4

ESER 2014 funded the replacement of the seismically deficient Fireboat Station 35 at Pier 22½. The 14,837-square-foot floating waterfront fire station is designed to meet the challenges of sea level rise. Located behind the existing historic Fire Station No. 35, it opened for operations in spring 2022.

ESER 2014 also funded the following seismic and comprehensive improvements:

- Completed seismic and modernization projects at Pier 26 Fire Boat Berthing and Fire Station 48 Treasure Island

Funds from ESER 2014 also paid for improving critical systems across multiple fire stations, including emergency generator installations, generator replacements, security fence enhancements, apparatus bay door replacements and railings installations.

ESER 2020 is funding the new San Francisco Fire Department Division of Training to replace outdated and inadequate facilities on Treasure Island and in the Mission District. The project, which is expected to break ground by the end of 2025, will include state-of-the-art training facilities, offices, classrooms, a 50,000-square-foot scenario district and more.

## **EMERGENCY FIREFIGHTING WATER SYSTEM**

Previous ESER funds paid for upgrades to the City's aging Emergency Firefighting Water System that improved its seismic reliability and range of coverage.

Completed work includes the following:

- Reliability upgrades at the system's primary water sources: Twin Peaks Reservoir, Ashbury Heights Tank; and Jones Street Tank
- Replacing engines and installing remote control capabilities at Pump Station No. 1
- Construction of 30 new cisterns (underground water storage tanks), 15 of which are located in the Sunset and Richmond districts
- Several pipeline projects including Irving Street pipeline, Ashbury Bypass pipeline, Candlestick Point pipeline, Columbus Avenue pipeline, Fillmore Street/Haight Street pipeline, Mission Street pipeline, Mariposa Street/Terry Francois Boulevard pipeline, Terry Francois Boulevard/Mission Rock Street pipeline, 19th Avenue pipeline, Clarendon Supply pipeline and tunnel projects
- Upgrades to Pump Station No. 2 were recently completed: Seismic upgrades at Pump Station No. 2 include a new steel roof, a rebuilt generator room and reinforced concrete walls with interior steel bracing. These are among multiple improvements completed to ensure the pump station can operate after a major earthquake.




Fire Station No. 35



Emergency Firefighting Water System: Twin Peaks Reservoir

## COMPLETED AND FUTURE EMERGENCY FIREFIGHTING WATER SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS

- PS** Pump Stations 1 and 2
- Storage** Jones, Ashbury, Twin Peaks, Clarendon (Sutro Res.)
- Fireboat Manifolds**
- Cisterns**
- Existing Conventional EFWS**
- PEFWS and Conventional (Completed and In Progress)**
- Future Conventional EFWS**
- Future PEFWS**
- Pipeline alignments are conceptual and may be revised during design
- Major ESER Bond Funded Improvements (Completed and In Progress)**



\* Presented to Board of Supervisors, Government Audit and Oversight Committee on June 1, 2023, and Capital Project Update to the Land Use and Transportation Committee on January 24, 2024.



Emergency Firefighting Water System cistern construction

# POLICE DEPARTMENT FACILITIES

## DISTRICT POLICE STATIONS

ESER 2014 identified 12 projects at 12 police stations and facilities; all 12 projects have been completed.

Completed work includes the following:

- Bayview and Tenderloin stations were completed in April 2019
  - » Accessibility, roof, mechanical, electrical and plumbing system upgrades
- Northern Station was completed in May 2018
  - » Accessibility upgrade; seismic strengthening; mechanical, electrical and plumbing improvements; roof replacement
- Taraval and Richmond stations were completed in May 2018
  - » Accessibility, roof, mechanical, electrical and plumbing system upgrades
- Park Station was completed in February 2020
  - » Accessibility, building exterior and site upgrades; seismic strengthening; mechanical, electrical and plumbing improvements
- Ingleside Station work was completed in February 2020
  - » Accessibility, building exterior, roof and site upgrades; mechanical, electrical and plumbing improvements
- Construction of a new firearms simulation training facility at Lake Merced Range
  - » Work completed in February 2018
- Accessibility and barrier removal projects at Mission and Central Stations were completed in September 2016 and October 2016, respectively; accessibility and barrier removal work at the Police Academy was completed in August 2017



New HVAC unit at Park Station



Roof and exhaust fan replacement at Northern Station

ESER 2020 funded structural improvements at Mission Station that were completed in 2023. It also is funding the Ingleside Police Station Replacement project.

The Ingleside District Police Station is located at 1 Sgt. John V. Young Lane, within Balboa Park. The existing station was built in 1910 and is a local historic resource within the Balboa Park Historic District. Recent analysis has determined that Ingleside Station could be vulnerable to damage from an earthquake.

The new facility will allow for continuous operations after a major earthquake – allowing the police department to serve its core mission with enhanced efficiencies. The project will preserve the historic building and will be LEED Gold-certified. The Community Room at the new building will provide a venue for the SFPD's Community Outreach program. The project is currently in the design phase.




Ingleside Police Station rendering



Ingleside Police Station exterior

## PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDING

ESER 2010 funded the design and construction of the Public Safety Building that opened in April 2015. The project relocated the police administrative headquarters and the Southern District Police Station from the seismically deficient Hall of Justice to a 290,000-square-foot facility, built from the ground up, in Mission Bay. The campus also houses the brand-new Fire Station No. 4. The new public safety campus allows first responders to better manage public safety services for major events and critical incidents.



Public Safety Building, Photo by Tim Griffith

## MOTORCYCLE POLICE AND CRIME LAB

ESER 2014 funded the relocation of the SFPD Traffic Company and Forensic Services Division into one facility that houses the motorcycle police unit and the crime lab in the Bayview neighborhood. The facility, which opened in 2021, is approximately 100,000 square feet. It is equipped with laboratory spaces, evidence storage, a firearm testing facility and conference and office spaces. There also is space allocated for all SFPD motorcycle parking. The building, if necessary, can remain fully operational for up to 96 hours after a major earthquake or other disaster, thanks to a sizable 7,200-gallon emergency diesel generator.



Traffic Company and Forensic Services Division, Photo by Bruce Damonte

# OFFICE OF THE CHIEF MEDICAL EXAMINER

ESER 2014 funded the construction of a new chief medical examiner's office which opened in October 2017. The 46,000-square-foot facility houses the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner's programmatic and first responder functions consisting of a medical complex, forensics laboratory, administration, field investigations, building support and public services.



# 9-1-1 CALL CENTER


Fielding an average of 3,200 calls a day, dispatchers at the City's 9-1-1 Call Center – located at 1011 Turk St. – relay time-sensitive information to San Francisco's first responders and public safety teams around the clock. But upgrades were in order to provide needed workspace improvements for the dispatch team and room for the center's expected expansion over the coming years. ESER 2020 funded the much-needed renovations. The improvements included upgrades to the technology and underlying IT infrastructure.



9-1-1 Call Center



9-1-1 Call Center roof work



9-1-1 Call Center

# ACCOUNTABILITY & TRANSPARENCY

---

---

The 2026 San Francisco Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response Bond will abide by established standards for accountability, fiscal responsibility and transparency. In addition to California state bond requirements, the City will carry out a comprehensive public oversight and accountability process. The City has not yet identified specific projects; transparent and responsible oversight procedures will be used for project selection and prioritization.



---

# THE FOLLOWING PRINCIPLES APPLY TO ALL COMPONENTS FUNDED THROUGH THE ESER BOND PROGRAM

---

## POLICY COMPLIANCE

San Francisco's policy is to issue new bonds after previously issued bonds are retired in order to maintain the property tax rate at or below Fiscal Year 2006 levels.

## BOND ACCOUNTABILITY REPORTS

Per the Administrative Code (Section 2.70 to 2.74), 60 days prior to the issuance of any portion of the bond authority, Public Works will submit an accountability report to the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, the Controller, the Treasurer, the Director of Public Finance and the Budget Analyst describing the current status and description of each project and whether it conforms to the express will of the voters.

## TRANSPARENCY

The City will hold periodic public hearings and reviews of the bond program and its implementation before the Capital Planning Committee, the Police Commission, Fire Commission and the General Citizens' Obligation Bond Oversight Committee. Individual projects will be defined through application of public safety principles and objective evaluation criteria described in the bond report.

## CGOBOC AUDITS

The City's Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee (CGOBOC) is responsible for auditing the implementation of the ESER Bond program per the Administrative Code (Section 5.30 to 5.36). Should CGOBOC determine that any funds were not spent in accordance with the express will of the voters, they are empowered to deny subsequent issuances of bond funds.

## PUBLIC APPROPRIATIONS OF CAPITAL PROJECT FUNDS

Public appropriation of bond funds shall be in accordance with the San Francisco Charter and Administrative Code, including review by the Capital Planning Committee to assure the projects are consistent with the City's Ten-Year Capital Plan; review and recommendation by the Budget and Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors; review and approval by the full Board of Supervisors and the mayor

## ANNUAL PUBLIC REVIEW

In accordance with the San Francisco Charter Administrative Code, the bond will be subject to annual public reviews before the Capital Planning Committee, the Controller's Office and the Board of Supervisors.

## PUBLIC UPDATES

Public Works maintains a dedicated ESER Bond Program website, describing the programs' progress, activity updates and bond budgets for the ESER 2010, ESER 2014 and ESER 2020 bonds. The ESER 2026 bond would be added to the website portfolio and include project names and estimated construction schedules for ESER 2026 once projects have been determined.

The website is [sfpublicworks.org/eser](http://sfpublicworks.org/eser)

# 10-YEAR CAPITAL PLAN

---

---

Adopted through legislation by the mayor and Board of Supervisors in 2005, the Capital Planning Committee was created to guide and prioritize capital needs citywide. The Capital Plan is developed by the committee and adopted annually by the Board of Supervisors prior to adoption of the City budget.

The City invests significant General Fund dollars into the repair and rehabilitation of our capital assets every year. However, the City cannot rely on these funds alone to address critical infrastructure needs. Where annual funds are not adequate to pay the costs of major capital improvements, the Plan recommends using one of two sources of long-term debt financing:

- General Obligation (G.O.) bonds backed by property taxes upon approval by voters
- General Fund debt programs backed by the City's General Fund upon approval by the Board of Supervisors and the mayor

General Obligation bonds and General Fund debt programs are appropriate means of funding capital improvements, as they

spread the costs over their long, useful lives and across the generations of San Franciscans that reap their benefits.


Since its inception, the top priorities of the Capital Plan have been the seismic improvement of essential City infrastructure, including the Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital, which voters approved in November 2008, and City public safety and emergency response facilities under the ESER Bond Program, which voters approved in 2010, 2014 and 2020. ESER 2026 builds on the City's formal commitment to long-term, strategic and fiscally responsible capital planning.

The Capital Plan General Obligation Bond Program chart below illustrates the relationship between the G.O. Bond Program and the local tax rate, including existing and outstanding issuance and voter-approved bonds. This demonstrates the City's policy objective that General Obligation bonds should not increase the property tax rate above 2006 levels.

For more information on the City's Capital Plan, please visit [onesanfrancisco.org](http://onesanfrancisco.org)

# FY2026-2035 CAPITAL PLAN GENERAL OBLIGATION DEBT PROGRAM

## \$535M JUNE 2026 ESER BOND SCENARIO



Adopted Capital Plan AV assumptions from Nov 2024

Assumes AAB reserves in FY26, and growth of 0.52% in FY27, 2.63% in FY28, 3.18% in FY29, 3.28% in FY30, and 3% per year thereafter

Revised 11-7-25

# CONCLUSION

---

---

Large earthquakes have struck San Francisco, resulting in death and destruction. Much of the property damage and loss of life was due to the collapse of buildings and the resulting fires. Responding rapidly and establishing a quick, safe and strategic recovery after an earthquake is crucial to our social and economic foundation.

ESER 2026 builds on the progress of the Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response bonds that San Francisco voters approved with strong support in 2010, 2014 and 2020. The ESER 2026 bond will make

important seismic upgrades to neighborhood fire houses, district police stations and transit facilities, and expand the City's Emergency Firefighting Water System.

The longer we delay making these improvements, the greater the risk to our public safety facilities – and the first responders and San Franciscans who depend on them – during and after a major earthquake or other disaster. Continued strategic investment through the Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response Bond Program is critical to safeguarding San Francisco.





**ONESF**  
Building Our Future



# San Francisco Planning

2024-0000007

FILED

SAN FRANCISCO County Clerk


FEB 14 2024

by: Mariedyne Nadonza  
Deputy County Clerk

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
628.652.7600  
www.sfplanning.org

## NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

FEIR Certification Date: January 11, 2024  
Final Approval Date: February 13, 2024  
Case No.: 2019-021884ENV  
State Clearinghouse No: 2020089022  
Project Title: Potrero Yard Modernization Project (2500 Mariposa Street)  
Zoning: Public (P) Zoning District  
65-X Height and Bulk District  
Block/Lot: 3971/001  
Lot Size: 192,000 square feet (4.4 acres)  
Lead Agency: San Francisco Planning Department  
Project Sponsor: Chris Lazaro, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA)  
(415) 549-6572  
Chris.Lazaro@sfmta.com  
Staff Contact: Jennifer McKellar  
(628) 652-7563  
[jennifer.mckellar@sfgov.org](mailto:jennifer.mckellar@sfgov.org)



To: County Clerk, City and County of San Francisco  
City Hall Room 168  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102

State of California  
Office of Planning and Research  
PO Box 3044  
Sacramento, CA 95812-3044

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the Guidelines of the Secretary for Resources, and San Francisco requirements, this Notice of Determination is transmitted to you for filing. At the end of the posting period, please return this Notice to the Staff Contact with a notation of the period it was posted.

Attached fee:

\$79 filing fee AND  \$4,051.25 EIR Fee OR  
 No Effect Determination (From CDFW)

### Project Description and Location

The project site is located at 2500 Mariposa Street on the block bounded by Mariposa Street to the south, Bryant Street to the west, 17th Street to the north, and Hampshire Street to the east in the Mission neighborhood of the City and County of San Francisco. The project would demolish the existing SFMTA Potrero Trolley Coach Division Facility (Potrero Yard), a California Register of Historic Resources-eligible historic resource, and replace it with an

expanded and modernized transit facility for up to 213 buses. The project includes SFMTA maintenance, operation, and administrative uses, and joint development (residential and commercial) uses as part of a joint development program between SFMTA and a private project co-sponsor. The approximately 1,250,000-gross-square-foot structure would rise to heights ranging from 70 to 150 feet across the site. It would contain a four-level (including mezzanine level), approximately 70-foot-tall replacement transit facility (700,000 gross square feet) plus a joint development with a mix of commercial (3,000 gross square feet) and residential uses (up to 530,000 gross square feet and 513 units). The majority of residential development would be atop the replacement transit facility on floors 7 through 13. A Paratransit Variant is also proposed, which would construct Bryant Street family housing (103 units) but replace the remainder of the podium housing with SFMTA's Paratransit Operations.

## Determination

The City and County of San Francisco decided to carry out or approve the project on January 11, 2024 when the Planning Commission certified the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) and approved a Conditional Use Authorization to allow the redevelopment of SFMTA's Potrero Yard and the construction of a joint development that includes commercial tenant spaces and residential dwelling units within a Public (P) Zoning District and 65-X Height and Bulk District. The project was officially approved on February 13, 2024, when no appeal of the FEIR or Conditional Use Authorization was filed. A copy of the document(s) may be examined at the Planning Department, 49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA, 94103, in case nos. 2019-021884ENV and 2019-021884CUA, and Board of Supervisors, City Hall, 1 Carlton B. Goodlett Place Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 in file no. 231256.

An Environmental Impact Report has been prepared pursuant to the provisions of CEQA. It is available to the public and may be examined at the Planning Department at the above address or online at:  
[https://bit.ly/SFPlanning\\_PotreroYard](https://bit.ly/SFPlanning_PotreroYard).

1. A determination has been made that the project in its approved form will have a significant effect on the environment and findings were made pursuant to Section 15091 and a statement of overriding considerations was adopted pursuant to Section 15093.
2. Mitigation measures were made a condition of project approval, and a mitigation and monitoring reporting program was adopted for the project.

*Debra Dwyer*

For Lisa Gibson  
Environmental Review Officer

February 13, 2024

Date

cc: Chris Lazaro, SFMTA  
Chris Jauregui, Plenary Americas  
Supervisor Hillary Ronen (District 9)  
Supervisor Shamann Walton (District 10)



State of California - Department of Fish and Wildlife  
2024 ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT FILING FEE  
CASH RECEIPT  
DFW 753.5a (REV. 01/01/24) Previously DFG 753.5a



RECEIPT NUMBER:

38-02/14/2024-013

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NUMBER (If applicable)

SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON REVERSE. TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY.

LEAD AGENCY SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT	LEAD AGENCY EMAIL pic@sfgov.org	DATE 02/14/2024
COUNTY/STATE AGENCY OF FILING SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY		DOCUMENT NUMBER 2024-0000007
PROJECT TITLE		

POTRERO YARD MODERNIZATION PROJECT (2500 MARIPOSA STREET)

PROJECT APPLICANT NAME JENNIFER MCKELLAR	PROJECT APPLICANT EMAIL jennifer.mckellar@sfgov.org	PHONE NUMBER (628) 652-7563
PROJECT APPLICANT ADDRESS 49 SOUTH VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 1400	CITY SAN FRANCISCO	STATE CA
ZIP CODE 94103		

PROJECT APPLICANT (Check appropriate box)

Local Public Agency  School District  Other Special District  State Agency  Private Entity

CHECK APPLICABLE FEES:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental Impact Report (EIR)	\$ 4,051.25	\$ 4,051.25
<input type="checkbox"/> Mitigated/Negative Declaration (MND)(ND)	\$ 2,916.75	\$ _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Certified Regulatory Program (CRP) document - payment due directly to CDFW	\$ 1,377.25	\$ _____

Exempt from fee

Notice of Exemption (attach)  
 CDFW No Effect Determination (attach)

Fee previously paid (attach previously issued cash receipt copy)

<input type="checkbox"/> Water Right Application or Petition Fee (State Water Resources Control Board only)	\$ 850.00	\$ _____
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> County documentary handling fee	\$ 79.00	\$ 79.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Other	\$ _____	\$ _____

PAYMENT METHOD:

Cash  Credit  Check  Other JE 611548

TOTAL RECEIVED \$ 4,130.25

SIGNATURE

X

AGENCY OF FILING PRINTED NAME AND TITLE

Mariedyne Nadonza Deputy Clerk



<http://www.sfplanning.org/>

## MEMORANDUM TO FILE

*Date:* October 25, 2024  
*To:* File  
*From:* Jennifer McKellar  
*Re:* Potrero Yard Modernization Project (2500 Mariposa Street)  
(Modification of Potrero Yard Modernization Project – Increase in  
Bus and Bus Operator Count Numbers)  
Case No. 2019-021884ENV

### INTRODUCTION

A final environmental impact report, file number 2019-021884ENV, for the subject project was certified on January 11, 2024. The project analyzed in the final environmental impact report (EIR project) would demolish the existing SFMTA Potrero Trolley Coach Division Facility, located at 2500 Mariposa Street, and replace it with an expanded and modernized transit facility that would also include residential and commercial uses. The project would construct a four level (including mezzanine level), approximately 70-foot-tall replacement transit facility (approximately 700,000 gross square feet accommodating up to 213 buses) plus a mix of commercial (approximately 3,000 gross square feet), childcare (approximately 2,000 gross square feet), and residential uses (approximately 530,000 gross square feet and 513 units). The approximately 1,240,000-gross-square-foot structure would rise to heights ranging from 70 to 150 feet across the site. Six floors of proposed residential development with ground-floor commercial uses would be located in a building constructed adjacent to the transit facility along Bryant Street. The remaining residential development would be atop the replacement transit facility on floors 7 through 13, with a retail use and a joint development residential lobby entrance for pedestrian access integrated with the replacement transit facility. Streetscape changes occurring as part of the project would include pedestrian and bicycle improvements, reconfigured parking and loading areas, installation of new seating areas and street lighting, landscaping, and utility work. The EIR project would be constructed over a period of 46 months.

The EIR also analyzed two additional phased construction scenarios for the EIR project, Scenario 1 and Scenario 2. Both scenarios divide construction into three phases: Phase 1 (new transit facility), Phase 2 (Bryant Street housing) with housing along Bryant Street up to the height of the replacement transit facility, and Phase 3 (family and workforce housing) with housing above the replacement transit facility and Bryant Street Housing. Under Scenario 1, the three construction phases would overlap resulting in periods of concurrent construction activities and operations/residential occupancies. Under Scenario 2, the three construction phases would be sequential with gaps in time (e.g., between Phase 2 and Phase 3) resulting in an overlap of construction activities and operations/residential occupancies, but to a lesser extent than under Scenario 1. Depending on which phased construction scenario is implemented, the construction duration for the EIR project could range between approximately 49 months (similar to the current timeline for the EIR project) and 96 months. This range does not cover options to extend the start date of Phase 3 as allowed under the 30-Year Project Agreement.

As a variant to the project (EIR project variant), the SFMTA would construct the housing along Bryant Street (103 units) but replace the remainder of the podium housing with SFMTA's Paratransit Operations. The proposed paratransit use would include circulation and storage space for 150 cutaway buses and 10 vans as well as space for vehicle service (maintenance bays, chassis wash bay, parts storage) and SFMTA administration.

### **PROPOSED REVISIONS TO PROJECT (MODIFIED PROJECT)**

SFMTA, the project sponsor, now proposes to increase the total number of electric trolley buses accommodated by the replacement transit facility using a different fleet mix of 40-foot and 60-foot buses. The EIR project and EIR project variant analyzed in the EIR proposed 213 electric trolley buses (53 40-foot and 160 60-foot buses). The modified project proposes 246 buses (153 40-foot and 93 60-foot buses), a net increase of 33 buses. To facilitate this change, the modified project would alter the proposed striping on the second level of the replacement transit facility to accommodate the 33 additional buses. Modified striping would include converting 67 of the 60-foot bus parking spaces proposed in the EIR project to 100 40-foot bus parking spaces. Associated with the change in number of buses, the modified project proposes adding 301 additional bus operators to the facility compared to the EIR project. No increase in the number of paratransit bus operators is proposed under EIR project variant conditions. Attachment A provides a detailed project description.

No additional changes to the EIR project or EIR project variant described and analyzed in the EIR are proposed under the modified project.

### **IMPACT ANALYSIS**

As described below, the modified project would not cause new significant impacts or result in a substantial increase in the severity of the impacts identified in the EIR, and no new or revised mitigation measures would be required. (See Public Resources Code section 21166; CEQA Guidelines sections 15162 and 15163.)

For context, following publication of the draft environmental impact report (DEIR), the project analyzed in the DEIR (DEIR project) was refined and a project variant and two phased construction scenarios added. These refinements and additions, collectively described above as the EIR project, EIR project variant and phased construction Scenario 1 and Scenario 2, were analyzed in the DEIR Responses to Comments (RTC) document. Thus, the below analysis includes references to both the DEIR and RTC, which together constitute the final EIR.

Note that the analysis below does not evaluate the modified project's impacts in the context of the EIR project variant being constructed instead of the EIR project. This is because the EIR project variant's impacts would be less severe than the EIR project's impacts. Compared to the EIR project, the EIR project variant would construct a smaller structure (230,000 gross square feet smaller) that would generate fewer operational vehicle trips (1,966 daily vehicle trips instead of 2,288 and 110 p.m. peak hour vehicle trips instead of 155). Therefore, analysis of the modified project compared to the EIR project represents the worst-case scenario.

## Transportation Impacts

### *Construction Impacts*

The modified project does not propose any changes to the project construction details analyzed in the EIR, including those related to phased construction Scenario 1 and Scenario 2. Construction-related transportation impacts would be the same as analyzed in the EIR because the modified project, like the EIR project, would be required to implement public works' Standard Construction Measure #4 (Traffic), Improvement Measure I-TR-A: Construction Management Plan–Additional Measures, and Improvement Measure I-TR-B: Driveway and Loading Operations Plan, which would include measures to accommodate onsite and on-street loading demand for completed phases of the project for the duration of buildout under the phased construction scenarios.

### *Operational Impacts*

Except for the 33 additional electric trolley buses that would be stored/maintained at and enter/leave the project site and the 301 additional bus operators arriving at/leaving the site, the modified project proposes no other design or operational changes compared to the EIR project. The additional 301 bus operators proposed by the modified project would increase daily vehicle trips by 612 employee trips and increase p.m. peak hour vehicle trips by 17 employee trips compared to the EIR project.<sup>1</sup> In total, the modified project would generate 2,900 daily vehicle trips and 173 new p.m. peak hour vehicle trips compared to the 2,288 daily and 155 p.m. peak hour vehicle trips generated by the EIR project. Table 1 provides a summary of these estimates.

Similar to existing conditions, the EIR project and modified project do not generate a substantial number of vehicle trips during the p.m. peak hour. This is because Muni buses generally leave the yard to access their route between 4 a.m. and 7 a.m. and return to the yard in the evening between 7 p.m. and 9 p.m. As such, most employees work non-standard shifts, with the majority of morning employee commute trips occurring before the traditional a.m. peak period, and the majority of evening commute trips occurring after the traditional p.m. peak period. In addition, while the modified project would increase p.m. peak hour vehicle trips to 173 trips compared to the EIR project's 155 trips, these trips would remain less than the screening criteria of 300 peak hour project vehicle trips used by the planning department to determine if transit routes traveling through the project study area are likely to be significantly delayed. Therefore, the modified project would not substantially increase p.m. peak hour vehicle trips, and its transit delay impacts would be similar to those analyzed in the EIR and less than significant.

The modified project's increased number of daily vehicle trips would also not substantially increase vehicle miles travelled or induce automobile travel, and therefore, like the EIR project, related impacts would remain less than significant. In addition, loading impacts, including those occurring under either phased construction scenario, would be similar to those analyzed in the EIR despite the increase in bus operator trips because the modified project would be required to implement public works' Standard Construction Measure #4 (Traffic), Improvement Measure I-TR-A: Construction Management Plan–Additional Measures, and Improvement Measure I-TR-B: Driveway and Loading Operations Plan, which would include measures to accommodate onsite and on-street loading demand for completed phases of the project for the duration of buildout under the phased construction scenarios.

<sup>1</sup> As described in the Draft EIR (p. 3.C33) and the Responses to Comments to the Draft EIR (Appendix C-1, Table 3, p. 11), Muni buses traveling to and from the facility were not included in person trip generation. However, bus driver trips to and from work at the facility were included in the bus maintenance and storage use.

<b>Table 1. Change in Vehicle Trips: Modified Project vs EIR Project<sup>a</sup></b>			
	<b>EIR Project (net new vehicle trips)<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Modified Project (added vehicle trips)<sup>c,d</sup></b>	<b>Modified Project (total vehicle trips)<sup>e</sup></b>
<b>Change in Daily Trips</b>			
Transit Facility	1,093	612 employee trips	1,705
Residential Development	1,195	0	1,195
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,288</b>	<b>+612</b>	<b>2,900</b>
<b>Change in P.M. Peak Hour Trips</b>			
Transit Facility	+58	17 employee trips	+75
Residential Development	+98	0	+98
<b>Total</b>	<b>+155</b>	<b>+17</b>	<b>+173</b>

Notes:

- a. Source: Potrero Yard Modernization Project, Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report, Volume 4a: Attachment C-1: Travel Demand Estimates for the Refined Potrero Yard Modernization Project (“RTC Appendix C-1”)
- b. EIR project vehicle trips net of existing transit facility vehicle trips. Source: RTC Appendix C-1, Table 6. Total does not sum precisely due to rounding.
- c. Vehicle trips (daily) generated by the 301 additional bus operators added by the modified project. Assumptions: Muni bus vehicle trip rate (daily) = 1.9 vehicle trips per bus, bus operator trip rate (daily) = 3.0 person trips per employee; auto mode split for bus operators (weighted by time period) = 83%; Taxi/TNC mode split for bus operators (weighted by time period) = 3%; average vehicle occupancy = 1.23. Vehicle trips include auto and Taxi/TNC trips. Source: RTC Appendix C-1, Table 2, Table 2, Table 4, and Table 2, respectively.
- d. Vehicle trips (p.m. peak period) generated by the 301 additional bus operators added by the modified project. Assumptions: Muni bus vehicle trip rate (p.m. peak hour) = 0.03 vehicle trips per bus, bus operator trip rate (p.m. peak hour) = 0.07 person trips per employee; auto mode split for bus operators (weighted by time period) = 83%; Taxi/TNC mode split for bus operators (weighted by time period) = 3%; average vehicle occupancy = 1.23. Vehicle trips include auto and Taxi/TNC trips. Source: RTC Appendix C-1, Table 2, Table 2, Table 4, and Table 2, respectively.
- e. Sum of EIR project (net new vehicle trips) and modified project (added vehicle trips). Total does not sum precisely due to rounding.

All other operation-related transportation impacts (i.e., potentially hazardous conditions and accessibility) would be the same as those analyzed in the EIR since the modified project would be identical to the EIR project other than the increases in buses and bus operators described above.

Therefore, the modified project would not result in any new significant transportation impacts not already identified in the EIR, nor any substantial increases in the severity of transportation impacts identified in the EIR.

## Noise and Vibration Impacts

### *Construction Impacts*

The modified project does not propose any changes to the project construction details analyzed in the EIR, including those related to phased construction Scenario 1 and Scenario 2. Therefore, like the EIR project, the modified project’s construction-related noise and vibration impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of public works’ Standard Construction Measure #5 (Noise), Mitigation Measure M-NO-1: Construction Noise Control, and Mitigation Measure M-NO-2: Vibration-Sensitive Equipment at 2601 Mariposa Street (KQED) Building.

### *Operational Impacts*

The 33 additional electric trolley buses proposed by the modified project would increase the number of buses moving within and maintained at the site. As with the EIR project, although the bus fleet would be expanded, most bus movement and all maintenance activities would occur within an enclosed space,

which would improve the noise levels at the project site compared to existing conditions (currently, some bus maintenance and all bus storage is outdoors).

The additional 301 bus operators proposed by the modified project would also generate about 17 additional p.m. peak hour vehicle trips traveling to or from the site compared to the EIR project (see Table 1). The EIR assessed traffic volumes along 22 roadway segments in the project vicinity during the p.m. peak hour and determined that the EIR project would increase traffic volumes the most (39 percent) along the roadway segment of Mariposa Street between Hampshire Street and Potrero Avenue (from 274 trips to 380 trips).<sup>2,3</sup> The EIR further determined that this 106-trip increase would increase traffic noise by about 1 dBA along this roadway segment. Because this is below the 3-dBA significance threshold for noise impacts, the EIR project-generated traffic noise increase along local area roadways was found to be less than significant. Similar to the EIR project, the modified project's vehicle trips would be distributed amongst the various roadways in the project vicinity. Therefore, the modified project would add less than 17 new p.m. peak hour vehicle trips along the Mariposa Street roadway segment identified above. Considering that the 106-trip increase analyzed under the EIR would produce about a 1 dBA increase along this road segment, it is unlikely that an additional 17 p.m. peak trips would increase traffic noise along this segment above 3 dBA. Therefore, the modified project's operational offsite traffic noise impact would be similar to the EIR project, although slightly increased, and less than significant (including under either phased construction scenario where onsite receptors are considered).

In addition, operational noise impacts from onsite sources such as HVAC systems, cooling towers, garbage trucks and delivery trucks, would be the same as those analyzed in the EIR because the modified project would be identical to the EIR project except for the additional buses and bus operators, and would be required to implement Mitigation Measure M-NO-3: Fixed Mechanical Equipment Noise Control for Building Operations.

Overall, like the EIR project, the modified project's noise and vibration impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of public works' Standard Construction Measure #5 (Noise), Mitigation Measure M-NO-1: Construction Noise Control, Mitigation Measure M-NO-2: Vibration-Sensitive Equipment at 2601 Mariposa Street (KQED) Building, and Mitigation Measure M-NO-3: Fixed Mechanical Equipment Noise Control for Building Operations. Therefore, the modified project would not result in any new significant air quality impacts not already identified in the EIR, nor any substantial increases in the severity of noise impacts identified in the EIR.

## Air Quality Impacts

### *Impacts Related to Construction, Clean Air Plan Consistency and Odors*

The modified project does not propose any changes to the project construction details analyzed in the EIR, therefore construction-related air quality impacts would be the same as analyzed in the EIR, except as described below for the phased construction scenarios. Impacts related to clean air plan consistency and odors would also remain the same as those analyzed in the EIR because the modified project would be identical to the EIR project, except for the change in the number of buses and bus operators, and would be required to implement public works' Standard Construction Measure #2 (Air Quality), Mitigation Measure

<sup>2</sup> Potrero Yard Modernization Project, Draft Environmental Impact Report, pp. 3.D.50-3.D.51.

<sup>3</sup> Potrero Yard Modernization Project, Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report, p. 8.85.

M-AQ-1: Off-Road Construction Equipment Emissions Minimization, and Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3: Emergency Diesel Generator Health Risk Reduction Plan.

*Criteria Air Pollutants*

Operationally, the 33 additional electric trolley buses proposed by the modified project would not increase emissions of air pollutants because they do not use fossil fuels. However, the proposed 301 additional bus operators would generate 612 additional daily vehicle trips to and from the site compared to what was analyzed in the EIR.

Although the EIR project made refinements to the DEIR project, average daily criteria air pollutant emissions were not recalculated for the EIR Project because they were qualitatively determined to be similar to or lower than those analyzed in the DEIR. This is because the EIR project proposes less excavation (and consequently less haul truck trips), a longer construction period, less total square footage (resulting in lower energy and area source emissions and fewer residential and commercial vehicle trips), and the same number of transit facility vehicle trips compared to the DEIR project. Therefore, for this analysis, EIR project emissions are conservatively assumed to be the same as those calculated for the DEIR project, and the modified project's criteria air pollutant emissions are compared to those of the DEIR project.

Compared to the DEIR project, the modified project's 612 additional vehicle trips represent an approximately 29 percent increase in transit facility vehicle trips, which would proportionally increase transit facility criteria air pollutant emissions from mobile sources by approximately 29 percent.<sup>4</sup> Overall, the 612 additional trips represent a smaller increase (16 percent) in total trips (transit facility + residential development) compared to the DEIR project.<sup>5</sup> Table 2 provides a summary of the change in net operational emissions (mobile sources) analyzed in the DEIR and those resulting from the modified project.

*(Continues on next page)*

<sup>4</sup> The DEIR analyzed 2,109 daily vehicle trips (total, not net) associated with transit facility operations, which included DEIR project office trips. As noted above, EIR project emissions are conservatively assumed to be the same as those calculated for the DEIR project for this analysis. Therefore, the 612 additional daily bus operator trips proposed by the modified project represents a 29 percent increase in transit facility vehicle trips (an increase from 2,109 to 2,721 trips). Associated emissions are assumed to increase proportionally by 29 percent.

<sup>5</sup> The DEIR analyzed 3,942 daily vehicle trips (total, not net) associated with total DEIR project operations (transit facility and residential/commercial development operations). As noted above, EIR project emissions are conservatively assumed to be the same as those calculated for the DEIR project for this analysis. Therefore, the 612 additional daily bus operator trips proposed by the modified project represent a 16 percent increase in total (operations) vehicle trips (an increase from 3,942 to 4,554 trips).

Table 2. Change in Operation (Net) Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions (Mobile Sources Only) <sup>a</sup>		Average Daily Emissions (lb/day)			
Emission Scenario		NOx	ROG	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Existing Emissions (No Project)	Transit Facility	5.8	0.5	5.9	1.0
	<i>Total</i>	5.8	0.5	5.9	1.0
DEIR/EIR Project Emissions <sup>b</sup>	Transit Facility	3.2	0.2	5.9	1.3
	Residential/Commercial Development	4.5	0.2	5.4	1.2
	<i>Total</i>	7.7	0.4	11.3	2.5
Modified Project Emissions	Transit Facility <sup>c</sup>	4.2	0.3	7.6	1.7
	Residential/Commercial Development	4.5	0.2	5.4	1.2
	<i>Total</i>	8.7	0.5	13.0	2.9
Net Project Emissions (EIR Project)		1.9	-0.1	5.4	1.5
Net Project Emissions (Modified Project)		2.9	0.0	7.1	1.9
<b>Change in mobile source emissions</b>		<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>0.4</b>

Notes:

- a. Adapted from Potrero Yard Modernization Project, Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), Table 3.E.8, p. 3.E.52 and Appendix G-3
- b. The EIR project made refinements to the DEIR project; however average daily criteria air pollutant emissions were not recalculated for the EIR Project because they were qualitatively determined to be similar to or lower than those analyzed in the DEIR. In addition, the EIR project proposes the same number of SFMTA employees as the EIR project, so related DEIR and EIR project worker vehicle trip emissions would be the same. Therefore, for this analysis, EIR project emissions are conservatively assumed to be the same as those calculated for the DEIR project, and the modified project's increased criteria air pollutant emissions are compared to those of the DEIR project.
- c. Modified project transit facility mobile emissions were calculated by increasing DEIR project transit facility mobile emissions by 29 percent (proportional to the 29 percent increase in vehicle trips with the modified project).

Table 3 compares the total estimated average daily criteria air pollutant emissions for the EIR and modified projects, including under phased construction Scenario 1. Scenario 1 represents the worst-case scenario because its criteria air pollutant impacts are more severe than Scenario 2's impacts due to more overlap between construction and operation phases.

While the modified project slightly increases net operational criteria air pollutant emissions compared to the EIR project, its emissions do not exceed any of the thresholds of significance.<sup>6</sup> Therefore, the modified project's criteria air pollutant impacts would be similar to those analyzed in the EIR (including under the phased construction scenarios) and remain less than significant with the implementation of public works' Standard Construction Measure #2 (Air Quality) and Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1: Off-Road Construction Equipment Emissions Minimization.

*(Continues on next page)*

<sup>6</sup> Emissions, when converted from lb/day to tons/year do not exceed the additional significance threshold of 10 tons/year. Modified project emissions (tons/year) are 2.3 (NO<sub>x</sub>), 4.4 (ROG), 1.4 (PM<sub>10</sub>) and 0.5 (PM<sub>2.5</sub>). Modified project (Scenario 1) emissions (tons/year) are 7.9 (NO<sub>x</sub>), 7.2 (ROG), 1.5 (PM<sub>10</sub>), and 0.5 (PM<sub>2.5</sub>)

Table 3. Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions: EIR and Modified Projects						
Project	Emission Scenario <sup>a</sup>	Average Daily Emissions (lb/day)				
		NOx	ROG	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>	
DEIR/EIR Project <sup>b</sup>	Mitigated Construction (M-AQ-1)	50	22	0.4	0.3	
	Operation (Net)	11.6	24	6.1	2.2	
EIR Project (Scenario 1) <sup>c,d</sup>	Mitigated Construction (M-AQ-1) <sup>e</sup>	30.5	15.5	0.2	0.2	
	Operation (Net) <sup>f</sup>	11.6	24	6.1	2.2	
	Combined Construction and Operation	42.0	39.4	6.3	2.4	
Modified Project	Mitigated Construction (M-AQ-1) <sup>g</sup>	50	22	0.4	0.3	
	Operation (Net) <sup>h</sup>	12.6	24.1	7.8	2.6	
Modified Project (Scenario 1)	Mitigated Construction (M-AQ-1) <sup>i</sup>	30.5	15.5	0.2	0.2	
	Operation (Net) <sup>j</sup>	12.6	24.1	7.8	2.6	
	Combined Construction and Operation	43.1	39.6	8.0	2.8	
Threshold of Significance (lb/day)		54	54	82	54	
Exceeds Threshold?		No	No	No	No	

Notes:

- a. The DEIR determined that the DEIR project's criteria air pollutant impacts would be less than significant with mitigated construction and unmitigated operations. Consistent with the EIR, all emissions scenarios noted here use this as the basis for comparison.
- b. Construction and operational emissions are taken from Potrero Yard Modernization Project, Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), Table 3.E.7, p. 3.E.47 and Table 3.E.8, p. 3.E.52, respectively. Although the EIR project was refined following publication of the DEIR, the EIR did not recalculate criteria air pollutant emissions. Instead, the EIR (see RTC pp. 8.99-8.103 and p. 8.106) qualitatively determined that the EIR project average daily mitigated construction emissions would be less than the average daily mitigated construction emissions estimated for the DEIR project due to the EIR project's fewer construction haul truck trips (18 percent reduction in emissions from on-road trucks) and extended construction duration (23 percent reduction in average daily emissions by 23 percent). Therefore, criteria air pollutant emissions reported for the EIR project are those estimated for the DEIR project.
- c. The EIR determined that phased construction Scenario 1 impacts were more severe than Scenario 2 impacts due to more overlap between construction and operation phases, therefore only Scenario 1 impacts are shown here.
- d. Construction and operation emissions are taken from Potrero Yard Modernization Project, Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (RTC): Volume 3: Table 8.7, p. 8.111.
- e. The EIR estimated EIR project average daily mitigated construction emissions under phased construction Scenario 1 based on the DEIR project's average daily mitigated construction emissions, taking into account the reduction from fewer construction haul truck trips (18 percent reduction in emissions from on-road trucks) and extended construction duration (28 percent reduction in average daily emissions).
- f. To be conservative, the EIR evaluated criteria air pollutant emissions during the overlapping periods under Scenario 1 based on average daily emissions from full construction of all three phases and full operation of all three phases simultaneously. In addition, the net operational emissions estimated for the DEIR Project, as reported on DEIR p. 3.E.52, are used in this analysis as operational emissions for the EIR project under scenario 1, which is conservative.
- g. The modified project proposes no construction changes; therefore, its construction impacts are equal to those analyzed for the EIR project.
- h. Modified project net operation emissions = EIR Project net operation emissions plus change in net operation emissions from Table 2 of this document.
- i. The modified project proposes no construction changes; therefore, its construction impacts are equal to those analyzed for the EIR Project under Scenario 1.
- j. Modified project net operation emissions = EIR project net operational emissions plus change in net operational emissions from Table 2 of this document.

#### Cancer Risk and PM<sub>2.5</sub> Exposure

Although the EIR project made refinements to the DEIR project, excess cancer risk and PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations at the maximally exposed individual resident (MEIR) were not recalculated for the EIR Project because they were qualitatively determined to be less severe than those analyzed in the DEIR.<sup>7</sup> This

<sup>7</sup> The EIR did however update the DEIR health risk analysis to include: 1) the contribution of construction fugitive dust to fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) concentrations at nearby receptors (residential and worker); and 2) the evaluation of excess lifetime cancer risk and chronic hazard indices (HIs) for offsite worker receptors. See Potrero Yard Modernization Project, Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (RTC): Volume 4a, Attachment E-1.

is because the EIR project proposes less excavation (and consequently less haul truck trips), a longer construction period, fewer residential and commercial vehicle trips, and the same number of transit facility vehicle trips compared to the DEIR project. Therefore, for this analysis, EIR project health risks are conservatively assumed to be the same as those calculated for the DEIR project, and the modified project's health risks are compared to those of the DEIR project.

Conservatively, the 612 additional bus operator vehicle trips would increase excess cancer risk by about 0.284 per million and PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration by about 0.016 µg/m<sup>3</sup> at the MEIR.<sup>8</sup> Table 4 compares the excess cancer risk and PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration contributions of the DEIR/EIR project and modified project at the MEIR.

**Table 4. Excess Cancer Risk and PM2.5 Concentration at Maximally Exposed Individual Resident for EIR and Modified Projects**

Project	Emission Scenario: Mitigated Emissions (M-AQ-1 and M-AQ-3)	Health Risks at MEIR	
		Excess Cancer Risk (per million)	PM2.5 (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )
DEIR/EIR Project <sup>a</sup>	Off-Road Construction Equipment	6.22	0.08
	On-Road Construction Vehicles	0.10	0.002
	On-Road Operational Vehicles	0.18	0.008
	Emergency Generators	0.37	0.001
	<i>EIR Project Health Risks Contribution</i>	6.87	<i>0.085 (construction phase) 0.009 (operation phase)</i>
Modified Project	Off-Road Construction Equipment	6.22	0.08
	On-Road Construction Vehicles	0.10	0.002
	On-Road Operational Vehicles <sup>b</sup>	0.464	0.025
	Emergency Generators	0.37	0.001
	<i>Modified Project Health Risks Contribution</i>	7.154	<i>0.085 (construction phase) 0.025 (operation phase)</i>
<i>Threshold of Significance</i>		7.0	0.2
<i>Exceeds Threshold?</i>		Yes <sup>c</sup>	No

Notes:

- Emissions and health risks are taken from Potrero Yard Modernization Project, Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (RTC): Volume 3: (Revised) Table 3.E.9, p. 11.30. Although the EIR project was refined following publication of the DEIR, the EIR did not recalculate health risks for the EIR project. Instead, the EIR qualitatively determined that EIR project health risk impacts would be less severe than those of the DEIR project but would conservatively remain significant and unavoidable with the implementation of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1 and Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3 (see RTC pp. 8.103-8.106). Therefore, emissions and health risks reported for the EIR project in Table 4 are those estimated for the DEIR project.
- Compared to the EIR project, the Modified project would increase excess cancer risk by about 0.284 per million and PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration by about 0.016 µg/m<sup>3</sup> at the maximally exposed individual resident (MEIR). Note that these are conservative estimates based on a screening tool described in the planning department's [Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Guidelines, July 2024](#), Appendix C: Technical Support Documentation of a Health Risk Screening Method for On-Road Vehicular Emissions in City and County of San Francisco, accessed September 30, 2024.
- Despite this exceedance, the modified project would not result in a new impact because the EIR determined that the EIR project's health risk impacts would be significant and unavoidable with the implementation of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1 and Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3.

The modified project's contribution to health risks at the MEIR would not exceed the significance threshold for PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration but would slightly exceed the significance threshold for excess cancer risk. However,

<sup>8</sup> Equations for estimating the additional excess cancer risk and PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration at the maximally exposed individual resident (MEISR) resulting from the modified project's increased bus operator vehicle trips are based on a conservative screening tool found in the planning department's [Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Guidelines, July 2024](#), Appendix C: Technical Support Documentation of a Health Risk Screening Method for On-Road Vehicular Emissions in City and County of San Francisco, accessed September 30, 2024.

the modified project's health risk impacts would remain similar to the EIR project's health risk impacts, which the EIR conservatively determined to be significant and unavoidable with the implementation of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1 and Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3.

The EIR determined that the EIR project under either phased construction Scenario 1 or Scenario 2 would result in health risk impacts that are similar to or less severe than those of the EIR project. Therefore, if the modified project was constructed under either Scenario 1 or Scenario 2, its contribution to health risks would be similar to or less severe than those described above, and would remain significant and unavoidable with the implementation of public works' Standard Construction Measure #2 (Air Quality), Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1: Off-Road Construction Equipment Emissions Minimization, and Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3: Emergency Diesel Generator Health Risk Reduction Plan.

Therefore, overall, the modified project would not result in any new significant air quality impacts not already identified in the EIR, nor any substantial increases in the severity of air quality impacts identified in the EIR.

### **Remaining Environmental Topics**

The modified project would have the same environmental impacts as the EIR project related to land use and planning; population and housing; cultural resources, tribal cultural resources, greenhouse gas emissions, wind, shadow, recreation, utilities and service systems, public services, biological resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, hazards and hazardous materials, mineral resources, energy resources, agriculture and forestry resources, and wildfire. This is because the modified project's increased number of buses and bus operators, and associated increased number of vehicle trips, would not change the analyses conducted for these environmental topics in the EIR.

### **CONCLUSION**

San Francisco Administrative Code Section 31.19(c)(1) states that a revised project must be reevaluated and that, "If, on the basis of such reevaluation, the Environmental Review Officer determines, based on the requirements of CEQA, that no additional environmental review is necessary, this determination and the reasons therefore shall be noted in writing in the case record, and no further evaluation shall be required by this Chapter." Thus, for the reasons outlined above, this note to file provides sufficient documentation that the revised project does not warrant additional environmental review.

### **ATTACHMENT A**

Project Description Memo: Modification of Potrero Yard Modernization Project – Increase in Bus and Bus Operator Count Numbers

CC: Wade Wietgrefe, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency  
Liz Nagle, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency  
Gabriela Pantoja, San Francisco Planning Department

Date: October 25, 2024  
To: Jennifer McKellar San Francisco Planning Department  
From: Wade Wietgrefe, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency  
Through: Liz Nagle, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency  
Re: **Potrero Yard Modernization Project** (Modification of Potrero Yard Modernization Project – Increase in Bus and Bus Operator Count Numbers)  
Case Number: 2019-021884ENV

## **SUMMARY**

The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) proposes a minor modification to the Potrero Yard Modernization Project, which received California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) clearance on January 11, 2024 (Planning case no. 2019-021884ENV). As with the original project, the project, herein referred to as the modified project, would demolish the existing SFMTA Potrero Trolley Coach Division Facility and replace it with an expanded and modernized transit facility that would also include residential and commercial uses. Similar to the original project, the modified project would contain a four level (including mezzanine level), approximately 70-foot-tall replacement transit facility (approximately 700,000 gross square feet) plus a mix of commercial (approximately 3,000 gross square feet), childcare (approximately 2,000 gross square feet), and residential uses (approximately 530,000 gross square feet and 513 units).<sup>1</sup> The approximately 1,240,000-gross-square-foot structure would rise to heights ranging from 70 to 150 feet across the site. Six floors of proposed residential development with ground-floor commercial would be located in a building constructed adjacent to the transit facility along Bryant Street. The remaining residential development would be atop the replacement transit facility on floors 7 through 13, with a retail use and a joint development residential lobby entrance for pedestrian access integrated with the replacement transit facility. Streetscape changes occurring as part of the modified project would include the same pedestrian and bicycle improvements, parking and loading reconfigurations, and installations of seating areas and street lighting, landscaping, and utility work as the original project. The modified project would not make any changes to the project construction details described in the EIR, including those described for the two phased construction options identified as Scenario 1 and Scenario 2.

---

<sup>1</sup> The numbers herein generally reflect the maximum amount of anticipated development. Actual amounts may be less.

As a variant to the project, the SFMTA would construct the housing along Bryant Street (103 units) but replace the remainder of the podium housing with SFMTA's Paratransit Operations. The proposed paratransit use would include circulation and storage space for 150 cutaway buses and 10 vans as well as space for vehicle service (maintenance bays, chassis wash bay, parts storage) and SFMTA administration.

The modified project is limited to an increase in the total number of proposed electric trolley buses (including a different fleet mix of the 40-foot and 60-foot buses) and an associated increase in the proposed number of bus operators. This change to the transit facility component of the project is also applicable to the project variant. Under the EIR, the original project proposed accommodation of 213 buses and 829 SFMTA employees. Under the modified project, 246 buses (an increase of 33 buses) and 1,130 employees (an increase of 301 bus operators) are proposed. Differences in the composition of the bus fleet mix under the modified project include 100 additional 40-foot buses and 67 less 60-foot buses. The change in total bus length from the modified project versus the EIR project is an overall decrease of 20 feet due to the utilization of more 40-foot buses and less 60-foot buses under the modified project. See Table 1 for details.

Category <sup>a</sup>	Existing	EIR Project	Modified Project	Δ EIR Project & Modified
<i>Total # of Buses</i>	158	213	246	+33
40' Buses	65	53	153	+100
60' Buses	93	160	93	-67
<i>Total Length of Buses</i>	8,180'	11,720'	11,700'	-20'

a. All buses under existing, EIR, and modified project conditions are electric-trolley, and most buses would enter and exit the new facility outside of AM and PM peak hours.

Table 1: Total Number of Buses – Existing, EIR and Modified Project Conditions

## EXISTING CONDITIONS

The project is located on the 4.4-acre site owned by the SFMTA. It is bounded by Mariposa Street to the south, Bryant Street to the west, 17th Street to the north, and Hampshire Street to the east in the Mission neighborhood of the City and County of San Francisco. The project site is across the street from a public park, Franklin Square. The location of the project site/existing facility is shown in **Figure 1 in Attachment A**.

The western half of the existing Potrero Yard facility is occupied by the asphalt-paved bus storage yard. The eastern half of the site is occupied by the predominantly single-story maintenance and operations building, with a second story located along Mariposa and Hampshire Streets.

## MODIFIED PROJECT

The modified project would alter the proposed striping on the second level of the replacement transit facility to accommodate the 33 additional buses. Modified striping would include converting 67 60-foot bus parking spaces in the EIR project to 100 40-foot bus parking spaces in the modified project. **See Figure 2a and Figure 2b in Attachment A.** It is anticipated that the increase in 33 buses under the modified project would also include an increase in SFMTA employees to operate the buses. It is estimated that the modified project would require 301 additional operators compared to the EIR project.<sup>2</sup> See Table 2 for details.

Category	Existing	EIR Project	Modified Project <sup>a</sup>	Δ EIR Project & Modified Project
<i>Preferred Project: Total SFMTA Employees</i>	400	829	1,130	+301
Operators	295	383	684	+301
Other	105	446	446	0

a. Operator estimates for the Modified Project were developed using the following assumptions: 20% vehicle spare ratio, 2.57 operator shifts per in-service vehicles, and 30% operator extraboard. Prior Operators estimates were too low as they would have conflicted with the Federal Transit Administration's vehicle spare ratio policy of 20% or required the SFMTA to miss bus service to meet the policy even if every operator showed up to work every day. Vehicle spare ratio is the total number of spare vehicles available for fixed-route service divided by the total number of fixed-route vehicles required for annual maximum service. For example, if SFMTA has 100 vehicles in fixed-route service, SFMTA would need 20 additional spare vehicles, for a total of 120 vehicles ( $20/100 = 20\%$ ). Extraboard refers to backup operators to account for unexpected operator absences.

Table 2: Total Number of SFMTA Employees – Existing, EIR and Modified Project Conditions

No additional changes to the project described and analyzed in the EIR are proposed as a result of the modified project.

## CONCLUSION

Planning department staff reviewed the modified project and determined that due to the minor increase of buses proposed, it fits within the scope analyzed for the original project and the potential environmental impacts are very similar to those identified in the EIR. This determination, documented in a memorandum to file, October 25, 2024, is available in case no. 2019-021884ENV.


## ATTACHMENT A

Figure 1: Project Location

Figure 2a: EIR Project – Transit Level 2

Figure 2b: Modified Project – Transit Level 2

<sup>2</sup> The modified project would increase the number of buses and employees for the replacement transit facility but would not increase the number of buses or employees for paratransit operations. San Francisco, CA 94103 SFMTA.com



Source: SWCA, 2020

## POTRERO YARD MODERNIZATION PROJECT

**FIGURE 1: PROJECT LOCATION**





Figure 2a: EIR Project - Transit Level 2

POTTERYARD MODERNIZATION PROJECT

---

Source: SFMTA and IBI GROUP, 2023



Source: SFMTA and Laura Blake, 2024.

POTRERO YARD MODERNIZATION PROJECT

Figure 2b: Modified Project - Transit Level 2



# PLANNING COMMISSION MOTION NO. 21482

**HEARING DATE: JANUARY 11, 2024**

<b>Record No.:</b>	<b>2019-021884ENV</b>
<b>Project Title:</b>	<b>2500 Mariposa Street (SFMTA Potrero Yard Modernization Project)</b>
<b>Zoning:</b>	Public (P) Use District 65-X Height and Bulk Districts
<b>Block/Lot:</b>	3971/001
<b>Project Sponsor:</b>	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Chris Lazaro – (415) 549-6572 <a href="mailto:Chris.Lazaro@sfmta.com">Chris.Lazaro@sfmta.com</a>
<b>Property Owner:</b>	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (City and County of San Francisco) 1 S. Van Ness Ave, 7 <sup>th</sup> Floor San Francisco, CA 94103
<b>Staff Contact:</b>	Jennifer McKellar – (628) 652-7563 <a href="mailto:Jennifer.Mckellar@sfgov.org">Jennifer.Mckellar@sfgov.org</a>

ADOPTING FINDINGS UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT RELATED TO THE CERTIFICATION OF A FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR A PROPOSED PROJECT AND A PROPOSED PROJECT VARIANT AT 2500 MARIPOSA STREET. THE PROJECT WOULD INCLUDE SFMTA BUS PARKING AND CIRCULATION (UP TO 213 BUSES); SFMTA MAINTENANCE, OPERATION, AND ADMINISTRATIVE USES; AND JOINT DEVELOPMENT (RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL) USES AS PART OF A JOINT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM BETWEEN SFMTA AND A PRIVATE PROJECT CO-SPONSOR. THE APPROXIMATELY 1,250,000 GROSS-SQUARE-FOOT STRUCTURE WOULD RISE TO HEIGHTS RANGING FROM 70 TO 150 FEET ACROSS THE SITE. IT WOULD CONTAIN A FOUR-LEVEL (INCLUDING MEZZANINE LEVEL), APPROXIMATELY 70-FOOT-TALL REPLACEMENT TRANSIT FACILITY (700,000 GROSS SQUARE FEET) PLUS A JOINT DEVELOPMENT WITH A MIX OF COMMERCIAL (3,000 GROSS SQUARE FEET) AND RESIDENTIAL USES (UP TO 530,000 GROSS SQUARE FEET AND 513 UNITS). THE MAJORITY OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT WOULD BE ATOP THE REPLACEMENT TRANSIT FACILITY ON FLOORS 7 THROUGH 13. A PROJECT VARIANT (PARATRANSIT VARIANT) IS ALSO PROPOSED, WHICH WOULD CONSTRUCT BRYANT STREET FAMILY HOUSING (103 UNITS) BUT REPLACE THE REMAINDER OF THE PODIUM HOUSING WITH SFMTA'S PARATRANSIT OPERATIONS.

## PREAMBLE

On January 11, 2024, the San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting regarding the final Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act for Record No. 2019-021884ENV.

The Project EIR files have been made available for review by the Commission and the public. The Commission Secretary is the Custodian of Records; the file for Record No. 2019-021884ENV is located at 49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, California. The project EIR has also been made available for public review online at [https://bit.ly/SFPlanning\\_PotreroYard](https://bit.ly/SFPlanning_PotreroYard).

The Commission has heard and considered the testimony presented to it at the public hearing and has further considered written materials and oral testimony presented on behalf of the applicant, Department staff, and other interested parties.

**MOVED**, that the Commission hereby CERTIFIES the Final Environmental Impact Report identified as Case No. 2019-021884ENV, for the Potrero Yard Modernization Project at 2500 Mariposa Street (hereinafter “Project”), including the project variant (hereinafter “Project Variant”) based on the following findings:

1. The City and County of San Francisco, acting through the Planning Department (hereinafter “Department”) fulfilled all procedural requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Cal. Pub. Res. Code Section 21000 et seq., hereinafter “CEQA”), the State CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Admin. Code Title 14, Section 15000 et seq., hereinafter “CEQA Guidelines”) and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code (hereinafter “Chapter 31”).
  - A. The Department determined that an environmental impact report (hereinafter “EIR”) was required and provided public notice of that determination by publication in a newspaper of general circulation on August 19, 2020. On the same date, the Department submitted the notice of preparation of an EIR and notice of public scoping meeting to the state Office of Planning and Research electronically, and emailed or mailed the notice to the Department’s list of persons requesting such notice, and to owners and occupants of properties within 300 feet of the project site on August 19, 2020.
  - B. On September 2, 2020, the Department held a virtual public scoping meeting by Zoom conference and telephone to receive public comments on the scope of the environmental analysis in the EIR for the project.
  - C. On June 30, 2021, the Department published the draft EIR (hereinafter “DEIR”) and provided public notice in a newspaper of general circulation of the availability of the DEIR for public review and comment and of the date and time of the Planning Commission public hearing on the DEIR; the Department emailed or mailed the notice to the Department’s list of persons requesting such notice, and to property owners and occupants within a 300-foot radius of the site on June 30, 2021.
  - D. Electronic copies of the notice of availability of the DEIR and the DEIR were posted to the Planning Department’s environmental review documents web page and available for download. The notice of availability of the DEIR was also posted on the website of the San Francisco County Clerk’s Office.
  - E. The notice of availability of the DEIR and of the date and time of the public hearing at the Planning Commission were posted at and near the project site on June 30, 2021.
  - F. On June 30, 2021, the DEIR was emailed or otherwise delivered to government agencies and was submitted to the State Clearinghouse electronically for delivery to responsible or trustee state agencies.

G. A notice of completion of an EIR was filed with the State Secretary of Resources via the State Clearinghouse on June 30, 2021.

2. The Commission held a duly advertised public hearing on said DEIR on August 26, 2021, at which opportunity for public comment was given and public comment was received on the DEIR. The period for acceptance of written comments ended on August 31, 2021.

3. The Department prepared responses to comments on environmental issues received at the public hearing and in writing during the 62-day public review period for the DEIR, prepared revisions to the text of the DEIR in response to comments received or based on additional information that became available during the public review period, and corrected errors in the DEIR. This material was presented in a Responses to Comments document, published on December 13, 2023, posted to the Planning Department's environmental review documents web page, distributed to the Commission, other decisionmakers, and all parties who commented on the DEIR, and made available to others upon request at the Department.

4. A final environmental impact report (hereinafter "FEIR") has been prepared by the Department, consisting of the DEIR, 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.

5. The Planning Department Commission Secretary is the Custodian of Records; all pertinent documents are located in the File for Case No. 2019-021884ENV, at 49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, California.

6. The Commission, in certifying the completion of said FEIR, hereby does find that none of the factors that would necessitate recirculation of the FEIR under CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 are present. The FEIR contains no information revealing (1) any new significant environmental impact that would result from the Project (or Project Variant) or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented, (2) any substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified environmental impact, (3) any feasible Project (or Project Variant) alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed that would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the Project (or Project Variant), but that was rejected by the Project's proponents, or (4) that the Draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

7. The Commission finds that the Project and Project Variant proposed for approval are within the scope of the Project and Project Variant analyzed in the FEIR, and the FEIR fully analyzed the Project and Project Variant proposed for approval. No new impacts have been identified that were not analyzed in the FEIR.

8. On January 11, 2024, the Commission reviewed and considered the information contained in the FEIR and hereby does find that the contents of said report and the procedures through which the FEIR was prepared, publicized, and reviewed comply with the provisions of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

9. The Commission hereby does find that the FEIR concerning File No. 2019-021884ENV reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the City and County of San Francisco, is adequate, accurate and objective, and that the Responses to Comments document contains no significant revisions to the DEIR, and hereby does

CERTIFY THE COMPLETION of said FEIR in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

**10.** The Commission, in certifying the completion of said FEIR, hereby does find that the Project and Project Variant described in the EIR:

- A. Would have a significant unavoidable project-specific impact on cultural resources: historical architectural resources;
- B. Would have a significant unavoidable project-specific impact on air quality for construction- and operation-related health risk; and
- C. Would make a considerable contribution to significant unavoidable cumulative impacts on air quality: construction- and operation-related health risk.

**11.** The Commission reviewed and considered the information contained in the FEIR prior to approving the Project and Project Variant.

I hereby certify that the Planning Commission ADOPTED the foregoing Motion on January 11, 2024.

  
Jonas P. Ionin  
Commission Secretary

**Jonas P Ionin**

Digital signature of Jonas P Ionin  
Date: 2024.01.17 15:08:06  
-08'00'

AYES: Braun, Ruiz, Diamond, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner  
NAYS: None  
ABSENT: None  
ADOPTED: January 11, 2024



# PLANNING COMMISSION MOTION NO. 21483

**HEARING DATE: JANUARY 11, 2024**

**Record No.:** 2019-021884ENV  
**Project Address:** 2500 MARIPOSA STREET (SFMTA's Potrero Modernization Project)  
**Zoning:** P (Public) Zoning District  
65-X Height and Bulk District  
**Block/Lot:** 3971 / 001  
**Project Sponsor:** Chris Jauregui  
**Company:** Plenary Americas, Potrero Neighborhood Collective LLC  
**Address:** 555 W. Fifth St., Suite 3150  
**City, State:** Los Angeles, CA  
**Property Owner/**  
**Sponsor:** City and County of San Francisco, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA)  
**Address:** 1 S. Van Ness Ave, 7th Floor  
**City, State:** San Francisco, CA 94103  
**Staff Contact:** Gabriela Pantoja, Senior Planner  
[\(Gabriela.Pantoja@sfgov.org\)](mailto:Gabriela.Pantoja@sfgov.org), (628) 652-7380  
Jennifer McKellar, Senior Environmental Planner  
[\(Jennifer.Mckellar@sfgov.org\)](mailto:Jennifer.Mckellar@sfgov.org), (628) 652-7380

ADOPTING FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT, INCLUDING FINDINGS OF FACT, FINDINGS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS, EVALUATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES AND ALTERNATIVES, AND A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS RELATED TO APPROVALS FOR SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY (SFMTA) POTRERO YARD MODERNIZATION PROJECT LOCATED AT 2500 MARIPOSA STREET, LOT 001 ON ASSESSOR'S BLOCK 3971, WITHIN THE P (PUBLIC) ZONING DISTRICT AND 65-X HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICT.

## PREAMBLE

The SFMTA Potrero Modernization Project (hereinafter “Project”) refers to either the Refined Project or the Paratransit Variant as described below at 2500 Mariposa Street, Assessor’s Parcel Block 3971 Lot 001 (hereinafter “Project Site”), in the northeast portion of San Francisco’s Mission District near the South of Market and Potrero Hill neighborhoods.

The Refined Project will replace SFMTA's Potrero Trolley Coach Division Facility at 2500 Mariposa St. to accommodate the expansion of the SFMTA's transit vehicle fleet, the modernization of bus maintenance, operation, and administrative services, expand and consolidate training operations at one site; and joint development uses including residential uses. The new, approximately 1,250,000 gross-square-foot, mixed-use building will occupy the 4.4-acre site and be 70 to 150 feet in height. It will contain a four-level, approximately 70-foot-tall transit facility (Transit Facility Component) plus a mix of commercial and residential uses in the remainder of the Project (Housing Component) as part of a joint development program between SFMTA and the Potrero Neighborhood Collective (PNC).

- a) **Transit Facility Component.** The Transit Facility Component will occupy the basement to fourth floor levels and include vehicular and bus circulation areas (ramps, drive aisles), mechanical rooms, bus storage locations, bus wash stations, administrative and office spaces, lockers and showers, community rooms, and outdoor open space. A limited portion of the joint development will be located within the Transit Facility Component specifically the ground floor and include residential lobbies along Hampshire and Bryant Streets and retail spaces at the corners of 17th and Hampshire Street, and 17th and Bryant Streets.
- b) **Housing Component.** The Housing Component will include the construction of a total of 513 dwelling units (117 Studios, 184 one-bedroom, 144 two-bedroom, 68 three-bedroom) along Bryant and Hampshire Streets. Along Bryant Street, the proposed housing component will run from the ground floor to the top floor and provide dwelling units that are intended for families and will be offered at a below market rate. Along Hampshire Street, the proposed housing component with the exception of a lobby at the ground floor will commence at the podium level and provide dwelling units intended for workforce and will be offered at a below market rate.
- c) **Phasing.** The Project is proposed to be constructed in three distinct phases, which may or may not overlap. The first phase will include the construction of the Transit Facility Component and is expected to last three years. According to the Project Sponsor team, construction is expected to begin in late 2024 and finish in late 2027. The second phase will include the construction of the Housing Component along Bryant St. up to the fourth level, podium level. Construction for the second phase is expected span two years and start one to two years after the start of construction on the first phase. Lastly, the third phase will construct the remaining Housing Component atop the podium level (both the remaining housing along Bryant St. and workforce housing along Hampshire St.) and is expected to span two years and start no sooner than two years after the start of the first phase. Phases 2 and 3 may also be constructed after the completion of SFMTA's facility.

The Paratransit Variant in lieu of constructing portion of the Housing Component atop of the bus facility, the bus facility will expand to include portions of one additional level at the podium for the use of SFMTA's Paratransit Division. In such a case, the proposal would still construct that portion of the Housing Component along Bryant St. for a total of 103 dwelling units and retail spaces at the corners of 17th and Hampshire Street, and 17th and Bryant Streets. The additional square footage for the bus facility would replace the western-most portion of the Housing Component and include additional building massing for administrative and operation spaces, and paratransit storage, operation, and circulation areas including a covered ramp for SFMTA's Paratransit division.

On November 20, 2019, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) (hereinafter "Property Owner") filed an Environmental Evaluation Application No. 2019-021884ENV (hereinafter "Application") and applicable supplemental materials in related records with the Planning Department (hereinafter "Department").

The Department is the Lead Agency responsible for the implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq. ("CEQA"), the Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, 14 California Code of Regulations Sections 15000 et seq. ("CEQA Guidelines"), and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code ("Chapter 31").

Pursuant to and in accordance with the requirements of Section 21094 of CEQA and Sections 15063 and 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, on August 19, 2020, the Department published a Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report and Notice of Public Scoping Meeting] ("NOP") and initiated a 30-day public comment period.

On September 2, 2020, the Department held an advertised public meeting on the scope of the environmental analysis for the EIR, at which public comment was received. The period for commenting on the NOP ended on September 18, 2020.

On June 30, 2021, the Planning Department published a Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR") for the project. The Department provided public notice in a newspaper of general circulation of the availability of the Draft EIR, including an initial study, for public review and comment, and provided the date and time of the San Francisco Planning Commission ("Planning Commission") public hearing on the DEIR; this notice was mailed or emailed to the Department's lists of persons requesting such notice and of owners and occupants of sites within 300-foot radius of the project site, and decision-makers. This notice was also posted at and near the Project site by the Project Sponsor or consultant on June 30, 2021.

On August 26, 2021, the Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing on the Draft EIR, at which opportunity for public comment was given, and public comment was received on the Draft EIR. The period for commenting on the DEIR ended on August 31, 2021.

The Department prepared responses to comments on environmental issues received during the public review period for the Draft EIR, prepared revisions to the text of the Draft EIR in response to comments received or based on additional information that became available during the public comment period, and corrected errors in the Draft EIR.

On December 13, 2023, the Planning Department published a Responses to Comments document (RTC) that was posted to the Planning Department's environmental review documents web page, distributed to the Commission, other decisionmakers, and all parties who commented on the DEIR, and made available to others upon request at the Department.

The Department prepared a final environmental impact report (hereinafter "Final EIR"), consisting of the Draft EIR, any consultations and comments received during the Draft EIR review process, any additional information that became available, and the RTC, all as required by law.

On January 11, 2024, the Planning Commission reviewed and considered the Final EIR and found that the contents of said report and the procedures through which the Final EIR was prepared, publicized, and reviewed comply

with the provisions of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31. The Final EIR was certified by the Commission on January 11, 2024, by adoption of Motion No. 21482.

**WHEREAS**, the Commission has heard and considered the testimony presented to it at the public hearing and has further considered written materials and oral testimony presented on behalf of the applicant, Department staff, and other interested parties.


**WHEREAS**, the Commission reviewed and considered the Final EIR for the Project and Paratransit Variant and found the Final EIR to be adequate, accurate, and objective, thus reflecting the independent analysis and judgment of the Department and the Commission, and that the RTC presented no new environmental issues not addressed in the Draft EIR, and approved the Final EIR for the Project and Paratransit Variant in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31.

**WHEREAS**, the Department prepared the CEQA Findings, attached to this Motion as Attachment A and incorporated fully by this reference, regarding the alternatives, mitigation measures, improvement measures, and environmental impacts analyzed in the FEIR, the overriding considerations for approving the Project and Paratransit Variant, and the proposed mitigation monitoring and reporting program (“MMRP”) attached as Attachment B and incorporated fully by this reference, which includes both mitigation measures and improvement and public works standard construction measures. The Commission has reviewed the entire record, including Attachments A and B, which material was also made available to the public.

**MOVED**, that the Commission hereby adopts findings under the California Environmental Quality Act, including findings rejecting alternatives as infeasible and setting forth a Statement of Overriding Considerations, attached to this Motion as Attachment A, and adopts the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, attached as Attachment B, both fully incorporated into this Motion by reference, based on substantial evidence in the entire record of this proceeding.

The Department Commission Secretary is the Custodian of Records; all pertinent documents are located in the File for Case No. 2019-021884ENV, at the Planning Department, 49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, California.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Motion was ADOPTED by the Commission at its regular meeting on January 11, 2024.



Jonas P. Ionin  
Commission Secretary

AYES: Braun, Ruiz, Diamond, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner  
NAYS: None  
ABSENT: None  
ADOPTED: January 11, 2024



## ATTACHMENT A

### Potrero Yard Modernization Project

2500 Mariposa Street

### California Environmental Quality Act Findings:

### Findings of Fact, Evaluation of Mitigation Measures and Alternatives, and Statement of Overriding Considerations

**SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION**

#### PREAMBLE

In determining to approve the Project, which refers to either the Refined Project or the Paratransit Variant described in Section I, below, 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, as well as improvement measures and Public Works Standard Construction 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, separate and apart from the Commission's certification of the Project's Final EIR, which the Commission certified prior to adopting these CEQA findings.

These findings are organized as follows:

**Section I** provides a description of the 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 or cumulative impacts that do not require mitigation.

**Section III** identifies potentially significant impacts or cumulative 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 avoided 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 identified mitigation measures to address 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. The Draft Environmental Impact Report (“Draft EIR”) and the Responses to Comments document (“RTC”) together comprise the “Final EIR,” or “FEIR.” Attachment B to the Planning Commission Motion contains the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program: Mitigation, Improvement and Public Works Standard Construction Measures (“MMRP”), which provides a table setting forth the full text of each mitigation measure listed in the Final Environmental Impact Report that is required to reduce a significant adverse impact.

**Section V** identifies the Project alternatives that were analyzed in the Final EIR and discusses the reasons for their rejection.

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

The MMRP (Attachment B) is required by CEQA Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091. The MMRP also specifies the party responsible for implementation of each mitigation measure and establishes monitoring actions and a monitoring schedule. For this project, the MMRP includes separate tables for other project requirements and design elements such as Standard Construction Measures and Improvement Measures agreed to by the project sponsor team, which consists of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), San Francisco Public Works (public works) and the Potrero Neighborhood Collective (PNC), a private development consortium.

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 EIR or the RTC, which together comprise the Final EIR, are for ease of reference and are not intended to provide an exhaustive list of the evidence relied upon for these findings.

## **Section I. Procedural Background and Project Description**

### **A. Procedural Background**

In April 2021, prior to publication and circulation of the Project Draft EIR on June 30, 2021, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) and San Francisco Public Works (Public Works) released a Request for Proposals (RFP) to procure and select a private development consortium to design, build, finance, and maintain the joint development for Potrero Yard. The proposed development consisted of a replacement transit facility component and a mixed-use component with residential, commercial, and childcare uses.

In October 2022, the City and County of San Francisco (City) awarded a contract to a private development consortium to enter into negotiations to refine the conceptual plans, obtain project approvals, construct the approved project, and manage the mixed-use component. During the procurement period, which ended in October 2022, the project sponsor team (SFMTA, public works, and the Potrero Neighborhood Collective (PNC)) developed a refined version of the Draft EIR Project incorporating various elements of the project variants described in the Draft EIR Project and analyzed for CEQA compliance, and presented it to the City Planning Department (Planning Department). Subsequently, the project sponsor team further refined the

proposed building design and program in response to feedback from the Planning Department's current Planning staff and through interdepartmental urban design and streetscape design review processes, resulting in the 50 Percent Schematic Design, the Refined Project. The project sponsor team also introduced a Paratransit Variant. These are described below (Project Description).

## B. Project Description

### A. Refined Project

The Refined Project will replace SFMTA's Potrero Trolley Coach Division Facility at 2500 Mariposa Street (Potrero Yard), in the northeast portion of San Francisco's Mission District near the South of Market and Potrero Hill neighborhoods. The Project will accommodate the expansion of the SFMTA's transit vehicle fleet, the modernization of bus maintenance, operation, and administrative services, expand and consolidate training operations at one site; and joint development uses including residential uses. The new, approximately 1,250,000 gross-square-foot, mixed-use building will occupy the 4.4-acre site and be 70 to 150 feet in height. It will contain a four-level, approximately 70-foot-tall transit facility (Transit Facility Component) plus a mix of commercial and residential uses in the remainder of the Project (Housing Component) as part of a joint development program between SFMTA and the Potrero Neighborhood Collective (PNC).

- a) Transit Facility Component.** The Transit Facility Component will occupy the basement to fourth floor levels and include vehicular and bus circulation areas (ramps, drive aisles), mechanical rooms, bus storage locations, bus wash stations, administrative and office spaces, lockers and showers, community rooms, and outdoor open space. A limited portion of the joint development will be located within the Transit Facility Component specifically the ground floor and include residential lobbies along Hampshire and Bryant Streets and retail spaces at the corners of 17th and Hampshire Street, and 17th and Bryant Streets.
- b) Housing Component.** The Housing Component will include the construction of a total of 513 dwelling units (117 Studios, 184 one-bedroom, 144 two-bedroom, 68 three-bedroom) along Bryant and Hampshire Streets. Along Bryant Street, the proposed housing component will run from the ground floor to the top floor and provide dwelling units that are intended for families and will be offered at a below market rate. Along Hampshire Street, the proposed housing component with the exception of a lobby at the ground floor will commence at the podium level and provide dwelling units intended for workforce and will be offered at a below market rate.
- c) Phasing.** The Project is proposed to be constructed in three distinct phases, which may or may not overlap. The first phase will include the construction of the Transit Facility Component and is expected to last three years. According to the Project Sponsor team, construction is expected to begin in late 2024 and finish in late 2027. The second phase will include the construction of the Housing Component along Bryant St. up to the fourth level, podium level. Construction for the second phase is expected span two years and start one to two years after the start of construction on the first phase. Lastly, the third phase will construct the remaining Housing Component atop the podium level (both the remaining housing along Bryant St. and

workforce housing along Hampshire St.) and is expected to span two years and start no sooner than two years after the start of the first phase. Phases 2 and 3 may also be constructed after the completion of SFMTA’s facility.

#### B. Paratransit Variant

In lieu of constructing a portion of the Housing Component atop of the bus facility, the bus facility will expand to include portions of one additional level at the podium for the use of SFMTA’s Paratransit Division. In such a case, the proposal would still construct that portion of the Housing Component along Bryant St. for a total of 103 dwelling units and retail spaces at the corners of 17th and Hampshire Street, and 17th and Bryant Streets. The additional square footage for the bus facility would replace the western-most portion of the Housing Component and include additional building massing for administrative and operation spaces, and paratransit storage, operation, and circulation areas including a covered ramp for SFMTA’s Paratransit Division.

As noted above, in the Preamble section, the Project is defined as being either the Refined Project or the Paratransit Variant.

#### C. Project Objectives

The project sponsor team seeks to achieve the following objectives by undertaking the Project:

##### **Basic Objectives**

1. Rebuild, expand, and modernize the SFMTA’s Potrero Bus Yard by 2027 to efficiently maintain and store a growing Muni bus fleet according to the SFMTA Fleet Plan and Facilities Framework schedule.
2. Construct the first SFMTA transit facility with infrastructure for battery electric buses to facilitate Muni’s transition to an all-electric fleet, in accordance with San Francisco and California policy.
3. Construct a new public asset that is resilient to earthquakes and projected climate change effects, and provides a safe, secure environment for the SFMTA’s employees and assets.
4. Improve working conditions for the SFMTA’s workforce of transit operators, mechanics, and front-line administrative staff through a new facility at Potrero Yard.
5. Achieve systemwide master plan priorities by consolidating two currently scattered transit support functions at Potrero Yard: (a) improve and streamline transit operator hiring by consolidating SFMTA’s operator training function in a new, state-of-the-art facility; and (b) support efficient Muni operations by consolidating the Street Operations division in a modern, convenient facility.
6. Implement inclusive and transparent stakeholder engagement in designing this project and completing the CEQA process.

7. Create a development that is financially feasible, meaning that the public asset can be funded by public means and public transportation funds are used only for the bus yard component.

### **Additional Objectives**

8. Enhance safety and reduce conflicts between transit, commercial vehicles, bicyclists, drivers, and pedestrians in the project site vicinity.
9. Improve the architectural and urban design character of the project site by replacing the existing fences and blank walls with more active, transparent street walls, to the extent feasible.
10. Maximize the reuse of the 4.4-acre site in a central, mixed-use neighborhood by creating a mixed-use development and providing dense housing and striving to maximize the number of affordable units on the site.
11. Increase the City's supply of housing by contributing to the Mayor's Public Lands for Housing goals, the San Francisco General Plan Housing Element goals, and the Association of Bay Area Governments' Regional Housing Needs Allocation for the City by optimizing the number of dwelling units, including affordable housing, particularly near transit.
12. Support transit-oriented development and promote the use of public transportation through an innovative and comprehensive transportation demand management program.
13. Ensure that joint development is able to fund its own construction and ongoing management without reliance on City subsidy other than what is originally assumed as part of the project budget while ensuring that SFMTA's transportation funds are only allocated for the transit use.
14. Demonstrate the City's leadership in sustainable development by constructing an environmentally low-impact facility intended to increase the site's resource efficiency.

### **D. Project Approvals**

The Project requires the following approvals:

#### Actions by the City Planning Commission

- Recommendation of approval of a General Plan Amendment which would amend the Urban Design Element by amending Urban Design Element Map 4 (“Urban Design Guidelines for the Height of Buildings”) and Urban Design Element Map 5 (“Urban Design Guidelines for the Bulk of Buildings”). Urban Design Element Map 4 would be amended to state that Lot 001 in Assessor’s Block 3971 has a height designation of 89-160 feet. Urban Design Element Map 5 would be amended to modify the bulk limits at the site to accommodate the Project’s massing.
- Recommendation of approval of a proposed Planning Code Amendment which would add a new Special Use District—the Potrero Yard Special Use District—to the Planning Code permitting the Project’s proposed uses at the site and imposing certain development standards upon the Project.

- Recommendation of approval of a proposed Zoning Map Amendment which would amend the City Zoning Map to reflect the new Potrero Yard Special Use District.
- Approval of Conditional Use Authorization for a Planned Unit Development for the Project's Residential Uses.
- Adoption of Findings of Fact, Evaluation of Mitigation Measures and Alternatives, and Statement of Overriding Considerations under CEQA.
- Adoption of Shadow Findings that net new shadow on Franklin Square Park by the Project would not be adverse to the use of Franklin Square Park.

#### Actions by the City and County Board of Supervisors

- Approval of a General Plan Amendment which would amend the Urban Design Element by amending Urban Design Element Map 4 (“Urban Design Guidelines for the Height of Buildings”) and Urban Design Element Map 5 (“Urban Design Guidelines for the Bulk of Buildings”). Urban Design Element Map 4 would be amended to state that Lot 001 in Assessor’s Block 3971 has a height designation of 89-160 feet. Urban Design Element Map 5 would be amended to modify the bulk limits at the site to accommodate the Project’s massing.
- Approval of a proposed Planning Code Amendment which would add a new Special Use District—the Potrero Yard Special Use District—to the Planning Code permitting the Project’s proposed uses at the site and imposing certain development standards upon the Project.
- Approval of a proposed Zoning Map Amendment which would amend the City Zoning Map to reflect the new Potrero Yard Special Use District.

#### Actions by City Public Works

- If sidewalks are used for construction staging and pedestrian walkways are constructed in the curb lanes, approval of a street space permit from the Bureau of Street Use and Mapping.
- Approval of an encroachment permit or a street improvement permit for signage and streetscape improvements.
- Approval of a new curb cut and removal of existing curb cuts.

#### Approvals by City Recreation and Parks Commission

- Review and comment to Planning Commission regarding shadowing of Franklin Square Park.

#### Approvals by City Department of Building Inspection

- Approval of demolition, grading, site/building permits, sign permits, and other ministerial approvals as needed.

## E. Environmental Review

On November 20, 2019, SFMTA submitted an Environmental Evaluation Application for the Project to the Planning Department, initiating the environmental review process. The EIR process includes an opportunity for the public to review and comment on the Project’s potential environmental effects and to further inform the environmental analysis.

On August 19, 2020, the Planning Department published a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR and Notice of Public Scoping Meeting (EIR Appendix A, Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report and Notice of Public Scoping Meeting, August 19, 2020), announcing its intent to solicit public comments on the scope of the environmental analysis and to prepare and distribute an EIR on the Project. The Planning Department distributed the Notice of Availability of an NOP and Notice of Public Scoping Meeting to the State Clearinghouse and relevant state and regional agencies; occupants of the site and adjacent properties; property owners within 300 feet of the project site; and other potentially interested parties, including neighborhood organizations that have requested such notice. A legal notice was published in the newspaper on Wednesday, August 19, 2020. Publication of the NOP initiated a 30-day public review and comment period that ended on September 18, 2020. Pursuant to CEQA section 21083.9 and CEQA Guidelines section 15206, the Planning Department held a public scoping meeting on September 2, 2020, to receive input on the scope of the environmental review for this Project. During the NOP review and comment period, eight comments were received. One speaker provided oral comments at the scoping meeting and seven comment letters and emails were submitted to the Planning Department. The comment letters received in response to the NOP and a copy of the transcript from the public scoping meeting are available for review at the Planning Department offices as part of Case File No. 2019-021884ENV. The Planning Department considered the comments made by the public in preparation of the Draft EIR for the project and project variants.

The Planning Department published the Draft EIR, including the Initial Study, on June 30, 2021. The Draft EIR identified a 62-day public comment period—from July 1, 2021 through August 31, 2021—to solicit public comment on the Draft EIR. A public hearing on the draft EIR was held before the San Francisco Planning Commission on August 26, 2021. Five public comments on the draft EIR were made in written form during the public comment period and four comments were made as oral testimony at the public hearing.

Additionally, there was a public hearing before the San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission on Wednesday, August 4, 2021. This hearing allowed the Historic Preservation Commissioners to provide comments on the Draft EIR, including the Initial Study, to the Planning Commission.

As described in Section I above, the Draft EIR project was refined (Refined Project) and a new variant added (Paratransit Variant) after publication of the Draft EIR. The Planning Department analyzed the Refined Project and the Paratransit Variant and determined that neither would result in the new significant environmental impacts or substantially increase the severity of the impacts presented in the Draft EIR. Nor do they add any new mitigation measures or alternatives that the project sponsor team has declined to implement.

Under section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, recirculation of an EIR is required when “significant new information” is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the Draft EIR for public review but prior to certification of the Final EIR. The term “information” can include changes in the project or environmental setting, as well as additional data or other information. New information added to an EIR is not

“significant” unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project’s proponents have declined to implement. “Significant new information” requiring recirculation includes, for example, a disclosure showing that:

- (1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.
- (2) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.
- (3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but the project’s proponents decline to adopt it.
- (4) The Draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

(CEQA Guidelines, § 15088.5, subd. (a).)

Recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR.

On December 13, 2023, the Planning Department distributed a Responses to Comments (RTC) on the Draft EIR document for review to the Planning Commission as well as to the other public agencies and commissions, non-governmental organizations including neighborhood associations, and individuals who commented on the Draft EIR. The RTC document provides a complete description of the Refined Project and Paratransit Variant, an analysis of the physical environmental impacts of each compared to the Draft EIR Project, responds to the comments made on the Draft EIR during the 62-day review period, and revises Draft EIR text based on additional information and minor errata that became available or known subsequent to Draft EIR publication.

The Commission finds that none of the changes and revisions presented in the RTC substantially affects the analysis or conclusions presented in the Draft EIR; therefore, recirculation of the Draft EIR for additional public comments is not required.

## **F. Content and Location of Record**

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

- The Final EIR, consisting of the Draft EIR, the RTC document, and all documents referenced in or relied upon by the Final EIR;
- All information (including written evidence and testimony) provided by city staff members to the Planning Commission related to the Final EIR, the Project, the project approvals and entitlements, and the alternatives set forth in the Final EIR;

- All information (including written evidence and testimony) presented to the Planning Commission, or incorporated into reports presented by the Planning Department, by the environmental consultant and subconsultants who prepared the Final EIR;
- All information (including written evidence and testimony) presented to the city from other public agencies relating to the Project or the final EIR;
- All applications, letters, testimony, and presentations provided to the city by the Department 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 Final EIR;
- The MMRP; and
- All other documents composing 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 Final EIR received during the public review period, the administrative record, and background documentation for the Final EIR are located at the San Francisco Planning Department, 49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco. The San Francisco Planning Commission Secretary is the custodian of these documents and materials.

## **G. Findings about Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

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

In making these findings, the Planning Commission has considered the opinions of the Department and other city staff members and experts, other agencies, and members of the public. The Planning Commission finds that (i) the determination of significance thresholds is a judgment decision within the discretion of the city; (ii) the significance thresholds used in the Final EIR are supported by substantial evidence in the record, including the expert opinion of the Final EIR preparers and city staff members; and (iii) the significance thresholds used in the Final EIR provide reasonable and appropriate means of assessing the significance of the adverse environmental effects of the Project. Thus, although, as a legal matter, the Planning Commission is not bound by the significance determinations in the Final EIR (see Public Resources Code section 21082.2, subdivision [e]), the Planning 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 Final EIR. Instead, a full explanation of these environmental findings and conclusions can be found in the Final EIR, and these findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in the Final EIR supporting the determination regarding the Project's impacts and mitigation measures designed to address those impacts. In making these findings, the Planning Commission ratifies, adopts, and incorporates in these findings the determinations and conclusions of the Final EIR relating to environmental impacts and mitigation measures,

except to the extent any such determinations and conclusions are specifically and expressly modified by these findings, and relies upon them as substantial evidence supporting these findings.

As set forth below, the Planning Commission adopts and incorporates the mitigation measures for the Project set forth in the Final EIR, which are set forth in the attached MMRP, to reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project. The Planning Commission intends to adopt the mitigation measures proposed in the Final EIR that are within its jurisdiction and urges other city agencies and departments that have jurisdiction over other mitigation measures proposed in the Final EIR, and set forth in the MMRP, to adopt those mitigation measures. Accordingly, in the event a mitigation measure recommended in the Final EIR 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 Final EIR due to a clerical error, the language of the policies and implementation measures as set forth in the Final EIR shall control. The impact numbers and mitigation measure numbers used in these findings reflect the information contained in the Final EIR.

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 or responses to comments in the Final EIR are for ease of reference and are not intended to provide an exhaustive list of the evidence relied upon for these findings.

## **SECTION II. IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT FOUND TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT AND THUS NOT REQUIRING MITIGATION**

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant (Public Resources Code section 21002; CEQA Guidelines sections 15126.4, subdivision [a][3], 15091). Based on the evidence in the entire record of this proceeding, the Planning Commission finds that the Project will not result in any significant impacts in the following areas and that these impact areas therefore do not require mitigation.

### **Cultural Resources**

- CR-2: Construction of the Project would not materially alter, in an adverse manner, the physical characteristics of any off-site historical resource that justifies its inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources.
- C-CR-1: The Project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not materially alter, in an adverse manner, the physical characteristics of historical resources that justify their eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources, resulting in a cumulative impact.

### **Transportation and Circulation**

- TR-1: Construction of the Project would not require a substantially extended duration or intense activity and the secondary effects would not create potentially hazardous conditions for people walking, bicycling, or driving; or interfere with accessibility for people walking or bicycling; or substantially delay public transit.

- TR-2: Operation of the Project would not create potentially hazardous conditions for people walking, bicycling, or driving or public transit operations.
- TR-3: Operation of the Project would not interfere with accessibility of people walking or bicycling to and from the project site, and adjoining areas, or result in inadequate emergency access.
- TR-4: Operation of the Project would not substantially delay public transit.
- TR-5: Operation of the Project would not cause substantial additional VMT or substantially induce automobile travel.
- TR-6: Operation of the Project would not result in a loading deficit.
- C-TR-1: The Project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in significant construction-related transportation impacts.
- C-TR-2: The Project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not create potentially hazardous conditions.
- C-TR-3: The Project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not interfere with accessibility.
- C-TR-4: The Project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not substantially delay public transit.
- C-TR-5: The Project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not cause substantial additional VMT or substantially induce automobile travel.
- C-TR-6: The Project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in significant loading impacts.

### **Noise and Vibration**

- C-NO-2: Construction vibration as a result of the Project, combined with construction vibration from cumulative projects in the vicinity, would not generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.
- C-NO-3: Operation of the Project, combined with operation noise from cumulative projects in the vicinity, would not cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity.

### **Air Quality**

- AQ-2: During operation, the Project would generate criteria air pollutant emissions at levels that would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants for which the region is in nonattainment.
- AQ-4: The Project would not conflict with implementation of the 2017 Bay Area Clean Air Plan.

- AQ-5: The Project would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people.

### **Shadow**

- SH-1: The Project would not create new shadow that substantially and adversely affects the use and enjoyment of publicly accessible open spaces.
- C-SH-1: The Project in combination with cumulative projects in the vicinity would not create new shadow in a manner that substantially and adversely affects the use and enjoyment of publicly accessible open spaces. The Project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative shadow impact.

### **SECTION III. FINDINGS OF POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT THAT CAN BE AVOIDED OR REDUCED TO A LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT LEVEL THROUGH MITIGATION**

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 III concern mitigation measures set forth in the EIR to mitigate the potentially significant impacts of the Project. These mitigation measures are included in the MMRP, which is included as Attachment B to the Planning Commission motion adopting these findings.

The project sponsor team has agreed to implement the mitigation measures identified below to address the potential impacts identified in the EIR. As authorized by CEQA section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines sections 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 EIR into the Project to mitigate or avoid significant or potentially significant environmental impacts. These mitigation measures will reduce or avoid the potentially significant impacts described in the EIR, and the Planning Commission finds that these mitigation measures are feasible to implement and are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the city to implement or enforce. In addition, the required mitigation measures are fully enforceable and will be included as conditions of approval for project approvals under the Project, as applicable, and also will be enforced through conditions of approval in building permits issued for the Project by the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection, as applicable. With the required mitigation measures, these Project impacts would be avoided or reduced to a less-than-significant level.

### **Noise and Vibration**

- NO-1: Construction of the Project would generate a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the San Francisco Noise Ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies.

The Planning Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR, implementing Mitigation Measure M-NO-1 (Construction Noise Control) would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

- NO-2: Construction of the Project would generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

The Planning Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR, implementing Mitigation Measure M-NO-2 (Vibration-Sensitive Equipment at 2601 Mariposa Street (KQED Building)) would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

- NO-3: Operation of the Project would generate a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan, or applicable standards of other agencies.

The Planning Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR, implementing Mitigation Measure M-NO-3 (Fixed Mechanical Equipment Noise Control for Building Operations) would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

- C-NO-1: Construction noise as a result of the Project, combined with construction noise from cumulative projects in the vicinity, would cause a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels.

The Planning Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR, implementing Mitigation Measure M-NO-1 (Construction Noise Control) would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

## Air Quality

- AQ-1: During construction, the Project would not generate significant fugitive dust emissions, but would generate criteria air pollutant emissions at levels which would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants for which the region is in nonattainment.

The Planning Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR, implementing Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1 (Off-Road Construction Equipment Emissions Minimization) would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

## Wind

- WI-1: The Project would create wind hazards in publicly accessible areas of substantial pedestrian use in the vicinity of the project site.

The Planning Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR, implementing Mitigation Measure M-WI-1 (Design Measures to Reduce Project-Specific Wind Impacts) would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

- C-WI-1: The Project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not alter wind in a manner that would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative wind impact.

The Planning Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR, implementing Mitigation Measure M-WI-1 (Design Measures to Reduce Project-Specific Wind Impacts) would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

### **Tribal Cultural Resources**

- TCR-1: Construction of the Project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code section 21074.

The Planning Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR, implementing Mitigation Measure M-TCR-1 (Tribal Cultural Resources Preservation and/or Interpretive Program) would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

- C-TCR-1: The Project, in combination with cumulative projects in the vicinity, would not result in significant cumulative tribal cultural resources impacts.

The Planning Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR, implementing Mitigation Measure M-TCR-1 (Tribal Cultural Resources Preservation and/or Interpretive Program) would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

### **Geology and Soils**

- GE-6: The Project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site.

The Planning Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR, implementing Mitigation Measure M-GE-6a (Inadvertent Discovery of Paleontological Resources) would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

## **SECTION IV. SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT 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 Final EIR identifies significant impacts in two significant impact topic areas—Cultural Resources and Air Quality—that would remain significant and unavoidable, even with implementation of mitigation measures; those impacts topics and the mitigation measures that reduce the impacts, although not to a less-than-significant level, are listed below.

The Planning Commission further finds based on the analysis contained within the Final EIR, other considerations in the record, and the significance criteria identified in the Final EIR, 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 Planning Commission also finds that, although measures were considered in the Final EIR that could reduce some significant impacts, certain measures, as described below, are infeasible for reasons set forth below; therefore, those impacts remain significant and unavoidable or potentially significant and unavoidable.

The following significant impacts on the environment, as reflected in the Final EIR, are unavoidable. But, as more fully explained in Section VII, below, under Public Resources Code section 21081(a)(3) and (b) and CEQA Guidelines sections 15091(a)(3), 15092(b)(2)(B), and 15093, the Planning Commission finds that these impacts are acceptable in light of 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.

#### A. Impacts That Remain Significant and Unavoidable After Implementation of Mitigation Measures

##### **Cultural Resources**

- CR-1: The Project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.

The Project would demolish the entire bus yard and building and redevelop the whole site with an approximately 1,250,000-gross-square-foot building that rises between 70 to 150 feet in height, including a partial basement level. The demolition under the Project would eliminate all the character-defining features that contribute to and convey the historic and architectural significance of the project site as a post-Earthquake reinforced concrete car barn designed by master Michael M. O'Shaughnessy.

For these reasons, the Project would materially alter the physical characteristics of the Potrero Trolley Coach Division Facility that convey its historic significance and that justify its inclusion in the California Register. As such, the Project would cause a substantial adverse impact on the Potrero Trolley Coach Division Facility, a historical resource, and this would be a significant impact.

Mitigation measures M-CR-1a (Documentation of Historical Resource), M-CR-1b (Salvage Plan), M-CR-1c (Interpretation of the Historical Resource), and M-CR-1d (Oral Histories) would document and present the complex history of the site and subject building. These mitigation measures would reduce the cultural resource impact but not to a less-than-significant level. The impact is significant and unavoidable with mitigation. Because identified mitigation measures M-CR-1a, M-CR-1b, M-CR-1c and M-CR-1d would not reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level, a full and a partial preservation alternatives to the Project have been identified.

##### **Air Quality**

- AQ-3: Construction and operation of the Project would generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, at levels which would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Construction of the Project would generate the following local air pollutants of concern: running exhaust DPM and PM2.5 from off-road equipment and on-road trucks, fugitive PM2.5 dust from on-road truck tire wear, brake wear, and resuspension of entrained roadway dust. Operation of the Project would also generate the following local air pollutants of concern: running exhaust DPM, PM2.5, and/or TOG from on-road vehicles and emergency diesel generators, and fugitive PM2.5 dust from on-road vehicle tire wear, brake wear, and resuspension of entrained roadway dust. The emissions of DPM, PM2.5, and TOG during Project construction and operation could pose a health risk to nearby

sensitive receptors.

As explained in the Final EIR, with implementation of Mitigation Measures M-AQ-1 (Off-Road Construction Equipment Emissions Minimization) and M-AQ-3 (Emergency Diesel Generator Health Risk) the excess cancer health risk exposure would be reduced to just below the threshold of significance of 7.0 in a million (i.e., 6.87 in a million overall with 6.22 in a million attributable to off-road construction equipment after mitigation). The 38.5 percent reduction to the overall cancer risk at the maximally exposed individual resident attributable to Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1 would not be assured because of potential increases to the off-road construction equipment roster and intensity of average daily use. As a result, the efficacy of the combination of Mitigation Measures M-AQ-1 and M-AQ-3 would also not be assured. Although a reasonable worst-case construction scenario for the construction air quality emissions modeling was employed and long-term operational benefits associated with the Project's TDM program were not calculated, construction and operation of the Project could result in a substantial increase in the exposure of sensitive receptors to DPM, TOG, and PM2.5 and the impact on local air quality is determined to be significant. No additional mitigation measures have been identified and therefore this impact is significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

C-AQ-1: The Project, in combination with cumulative projects in the vicinity, would contribute considerably to cumulative health risk impacts on sensitive receptors. As discussed in the Final EIR, cumulative projects within 1,000 feet of the offsite maximally exposed individual resident are not expected to substantially increase the existing background health risks at the maximally exposed individual resident. However, as discussed under Impact AQ-3, the Project would result in a substantial increase in the existing background health risks at the maximally exposed individual resident. Even with Mitigation Measures M-AQ-1 and M-AQ-3 required as conditions of approval for the Project, construction and/or operation of the Project would result in a substantial increase in the exposure of sensitive receptors to DPM, TOG, and PM2.5 and the Project's contribution to cumulatively significant health risk impacts would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

## **SECTION V. Evaluation of Project Alternatives**

This section describes the EIR alternatives 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 would feasibly attain most of the project's basic objectives, but that would avoid or substantially lessen any identified significant adverse environmental effects of the project. An EIR is not required to consider every conceivable alternative to a Project. Rather, it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision-making and public participation. 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.

### **A. Alternatives Analyzed in the Final EIR**

The Department considered a range of alternatives in draft EIR Chapter 5, Alternatives. The Final EIR analyzed the Project compared to four CEQA alternatives:

- Alternative A (No Project Alternative)
- Alternative B (Full Preservation Alternative)
- Alternative C (Partial Preservation Alternative)
- Alternative D (Transit Facility Plus Commercial Only Alternative)

#### B. 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 section 15091[a][3]). The Planning Commission has reviewed each of the alternatives to the Project as described in the Final EIR 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 Planning 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.

The following Project alternatives and Project were fully considered and compared in the Final EIR.

- **Alternative A (No Project Alternative):** Under Alternative A, existing land use controls on the Project site would continue to govern site development and the existing site would continue to function as a transit facility, which would not constitute a change from existing conditions. Under Alternative A, the existing maintenance and operations building would be retained in its current configuration, including its flat roof (parking deck) and second-story additions constructed in 1924 along Mariposa and Hampshire streets for offices and maintenance shops, respectively. The overall height and massing (approximately 45-foot height at Mariposa and Hampshire streets) would be preserved. The paved bus storage yard on the western portion of the site with access from Mariposa Street would also be retained in its current condition.

If Alternative A were to proceed, no changes would be implemented, and none of the impacts associated with the Project, as described in the Final EIR, would occur. With no change to existing site conditions under the no Project alternative, land use activity on the Project site would not contribute to significant cumulative impacts beyond existing levels.

Alternative A is hereby rejected as infeasible. Although it would eliminate the significant and unavoidable impacts to cultural resources and air quality, it would fail to meet the basic objectives of

the Project. In particular, Alternative A would fail to: (i) rebuild, expand, and modernize the SFMTA’s Potrero Bus Yard by 2027 to efficiently maintain and store a growing Muni bus fleet according to the SFMTA Fleet Plan and Facilities Framework schedule; (ii) construct the first SFMTA transit facility with infrastructure for battery electric buses to facilitate Muni’s transition to an all-electric fleet, in accordance with San Francisco and California policy; (iii) construct a new public asset that is resilient to earthquakes and projected climate change effects, and provides a safe, secure environment for the SFMTA’s employees and assets; (iv) improve working conditions of SFMTA’s workforce of transit operators, mechanics, and front-line administrative staff through a new facility at Potrero Yard; (v) achieve systemwide master plan priorities by consolidating scattered transit support functions at Potrero Yard; or (vi) create a development that is financially feasible in that the public asset can be funded by public means and public transportation funds are used only for the bus yard component.

- **Alternative B (Full Preservation Alternative):** The two preservation alternatives are the culmination of a screening process that considered various site plans, building retention programs, building heights, views of the character-defining features, and feedback from the City Historic Preservation Commission. Under the Full Preservation Alternative, the existing, approximately 45-foot-tall, office wing along Mariposa Street would be retained and the remainder of the maintenance and operations building would be demolished, including the shops wing along Hampshire Street north of the office wing. The replacement transit facility would cover the remainder of the site, including the bus yard on the west portion of the site.

Under Alternative B, the building’s three transit levels would rise to a height of 75 feet, with multi-family residential floors above rising to 150 feet (inclusive of the 75-foot-tall transit facility podium). The office wing would be retained and preserved in its entirety with no new construction built on top of it. The shops wing along Hampshire Street would be demolished; however, new construction would feature setbacks that reference the wing’s original form and massing. Under this alternative, residential uses within the new transit facility would be developed along Mariposa and Bryant streets, and on floors above the new transit facility podium. However, the footprint for residential development would be limited under Alternative B due to the retention of the office wing, the transit facility podium setbacks from the retained office wing, and the residential floor setbacks from the transit facility podium. Ground-floor commercial uses would be developed along Bryant Street. Most of the character-defining features of the historical resource would be retained and reused.

Overall, Alternative B would have approximately 176,000 fewer gross square feet of space compared to the Refined Project and about 53,000 more gross square feet of space than the Paratransit Variant. Compared to the Project (both the Refined Project and the Paratransit Variant), the replacement transit facility would be reduced in size by approximately 122,000 gross square feet—from approximately 700,000 to 578,000 gross square feet.

Alternative B is hereby rejected as infeasible because it would fail to meet the basic objectives of the Project. In particular, Alternative B would not fully satisfy the Project’s basic objectives to: (i) rebuild, expand, and modernize the SFMTA’s Potrero Bus Yard by 2027 to efficiently maintain and store a growing Muni bus fleet according to the SFMTA Fleet Plan and Facilities Framework schedule; (ii) construct the first SFMTA transit facility with infrastructure for battery electric buses to facilitate Muni’s

transition to an all-electric fleet, in accordance with San Francisco and California policy; and (iii) achieve systemwide master plan priorities by consolidating scattered transit support functions at Potrero Yard. Reductions to the transit facility under Alternative B could result in less space for operator training, operator and administration areas, transit street operations, and electric bus battery infrastructure, as well as displacement of maintenance bays and bus parking, limiting SFMTA's ability to meet the fleet plan mix, and loss of non-revenue vehicle parking spaces, limiting SFMTA's ability to consolidate transit street operations and other functions at Potrero Yard.

- **Alternative C (Partial Preservation Alternative):** Under the Partial Preservation Alternative, the office wing along Mariposa and Hampshire streets on the southeast portion of the site would be retained and reused. The remainder of the building would be demolished, including the shops wing along Hampshire Street north of the office wing. New construction (i.e., the three-level transit facility, with residential and ground-floor commercial uses plus residential uses atop the transit facility podium) would cover the remainder of the site as it does in Alternative B.

Similar to the Project, the building's three transit levels would rise to a height of 75 feet, with multi-family residential floors above rising to 150 feet (inclusive of the 75-foot-tall transit facility podium). The office wing would be retained and preserved in its entirety, with no new construction built on top of it. The remainder of the building would be demolished but the new building would feature some setbacks and notches to differentiate the new construction from the retained office wing. Residential uses within the new transit facility under this alternative would be developed along Mariposa and Bryant streets and on floors above the transit facility podium. However, the footprint for residential development would be limited under Alternative C due to the retention of the office wing and the residential floor setbacks from the transit facility podium and retained office wing. Ground-floor commercial uses would be developed along Bryant Street as under the Project. Most of the character-defining features of the historical resource would be retained and reused, although to a lesser degree than in Alternative B. A portion of the existing structure would be retained; however, spatial relationships with the site and environment would be altered to a greater extent in Alternative C as compared to Alternative B.

Overall, Alternative C would have approximately 166,000 fewer gross square feet of space compared to the Refined Project and 63,000 more gross square feet of space than the Paratransit Variant. Compared to the Project (Refined Project and Paratransit Variant), the replacement transit facility would be reduced in size by 103,000 gross square feet—from approximately 700,000 to 597,000 gross square feet. Although the interior of the retained office wing of the maintenance and operations building would be renovated to serve the SFMTA's programmatic needs, reductions to the SFMTA program could result in similar land use program reductions as with the Full Preservation Alternative.

Alternative C is hereby rejected as infeasible because it would fail to meet the basic objectives of the Project. In particular, like Alternative B, Alternative C would not fully satisfy the Project's basic objectives to: (i) rebuild, expand, and modernize the SFMTA's Potrero Bus Yard by 2027 to efficiently maintain and store a growing Muni bus fleet according to the SFMTA Fleet Plan and Facilities Framework schedule; (ii) construct the first SFMTA transit facility with infrastructure for battery electric buses to facilitate Muni's transition to an all-electric fleet, in accordance with San Francisco and California policy; and (iii) achieve systemwide master plan priorities by consolidating scattered transit

support functions at Potrero Yard. Reductions to the transit facility under Alternative C could result in less space for operator training, operator and administration areas, transit street operations, and electric bus battery infrastructure, as well as displacement of maintenance bays and bus parking, limiting SFMTA's ability to meet the fleet plan mix, and loss of non-revenue vehicle parking spaces, limiting SFMTA's ability to consolidate transit street operations and other functions at Potrero Yard.

- **Alternative D (Transit Facility Plus Commercial Only Alternative):** Under the Transit Facility Plus Commercial Only Alternative, the 4.4-acre site would be redeveloped to provide a modern transit facility with commercial uses in a 75-foot-tall structure with three transit levels. However, Alternative D, unlike the Project, would not include residential uses within the transit facility (along Mariposa and Bryant streets) or proposed residential development atop the transit facility podium. All joint development space within the transit facility would be repurposed for SFMTA maintenance and circulation space, electric bus battery infrastructure, and staff amenities with the exception of ground-floor commercial space. The approximately 3,000 gross square feet of ground-floor commercial uses under the Project (Refined Project and Paratransit Variant) would be approximately 30,000 gross square feet less than under Alternative D, which would include 33,000 gross square feet of commercial uses along Bryant Street.

Streetscape improvements would be limited to a loading facility on Bryant Street for commercial use, and the off-street loading at the basement level would be dedicated to the SFMTA. There would be no passenger loading space on Hampshire or Bryant streets north of Mariposa Street; thus, fewer parking spaces adjacent to the project site would be lost compared to Project (Refined Project and Paratransit Variant). Alternative D would require 107,000 cubic yards more excavation than the Project (Refined Project and Paratransit Variant) for the foundation and structural work and the below-grade basement. However, due to the smaller construction program for the transit facility and commercial space only, Alternative D could be constructed in 2.5 to 3 years, less than the approximately four years expected for the Project (Refined Project and Paratransit Variant)..

Alternative D is hereby rejected as infeasible. Overall, Alternative D would meet fewer of the additional project objectives than Alternatives B or C because there would be no residential component to the joint development. Without the residential component, the Alternative D project would deliver zero housing units and would fail to maximize reuse of a site located in a central, mixed-use neighborhood by creating a mixed-use development and providing dense housing and striving to maximize the number of affordable units on the site.

## SECTION VI. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The Planning Commission finds that, notwithstanding the imposition of all feasible mitigation measures, a total of three significant impacts related to cultural resources and air quality would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation, as described in more detail above.

Pursuant to CEQA section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines section 15093, the Planning Commission hereby finds, after consideration of the Final EIR and the evidence in the record, that each of the specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the Project – including, as noted above, either the Refined Project or the Paratransit Variant – independently and collectively outweighs these significant and unavoidable impacts and is an overriding consideration warranting approval of the Project, as further

discussed below. 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 Planning Commission will stand by its determination that each individual reason is sufficient. The substantial evidence supporting the various benefits can be found below, and in the record of proceedings.

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 Planning Commission further finds that, as part of the process of obtaining Project approvals, significant effects on the environment from implementation of the Project have been eliminated or substantially lessened, where feasible. All mitigation measures and improvement measures identified in the Final EIR and MMRP are adopted as part of the Approval Actions described in Section I, above.

Furthermore, the Planning 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 would meet all of the objectives, as described in the Draft EIR.

The Project would have the following benefits:

- The Project would advance SFMTA's Building Progress Program, which has a goal of repairing, renovating, and modernizing SFMTA's aging facilities and facilitating improvement of the overall transportation service delivery system in the City.
- The Project would replace an aging facility a new multilevel bus facility that will not only improve maintenance and storage capabilities, but also contribute to a greener, more sustainable, and reliable transportation system for the City.
- The Project would ensure resiliency to climate change and natural disasters and improve transit service by reducing vehicle breakdowns, increasing on-time performance, and reducing passenger overcrowding. Relatedly, the Project will provide a safer, more secure environment for SFMTA's employees and physical assets.
- The Project would directly address and support the City's housing goals—memorialized in its General Plan Housing Element and the Mayor's Public Lands for Housing Goals—by constructing a range of new housing units (up to 513) on the site.
- The Project would enhance safety and reduce conflicts between transit, commercial vehicles, bicyclists, drivers, and pedestrians in the project site vicinity.
- The Project would support transit-oriented development and promote the use of public transportation through an innovative and comprehensive transportation demand management program.
- The Project would demonstrate the City's leadership in sustainable development by constructing an environmentally low-impact facility intended to increase the site's resource efficiency.

Having considered the above, and in light of evidence contained in the FEIR and in the record, the Planning Commission finds that the benefits of the Project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects identified in the FEIR and/or Initial Study, and that those adverse environmental effects are therefore acceptable.

**ATTACHMENT B – AGREEMENT TO IMPLEMENT MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM:  
MITIGATION, IMPROVEMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS STANDARD CONSTRUCTION MEASURES (MMRP) and  
MMRP**

## **Attachment B**

# MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM:

## MITIGATION, IMPROVEMENT & PUBLIC WORKS STANDARD CONSTRUCTION MEASURES

Record No.:	Case No. 2019-021884ENV	Block/Lot:	3971/001
Project Title:	SFMTA Potrero Yard Modernization Project	Lot Size:	4.4 acres
BPA Nos:	Submittal pending	Project Sponsor:	Chris Lazaro, SFMTA, (415) 549-6572
Zoning:	Public (P) Use District 65-X Height and Bulk District	Lead Agency:	San Francisco Planning Department
		Staff Contact:	Jennifer McKellar, Planning – (628) 652-7563

Tables 1 and 3 below indicate when compliance with each mitigation and improvement measure must occur. Some mitigation and improvement measures span multiple phases. Substantive descriptions of each mitigation measure's requirements are provided on the following pages in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) is the project sponsor and property owner of the project site at 2500 Mariposa Street (Potrero Yard). Together the SFMTA and a private project co-sponsor (developer) are referenced below as the project sponsor team. In addition, pursuant to the May 11, 2023, memorandum regarding Public Works' Authority for project delivery of the Potrero Yard Project and the May 31, 2020, attachment referenced therein, San Francisco Public Works assumes responsibility for environmental compliance, including applicable Standard Construction Measures in Tables 2 and 6 below.

### Period of Compliance

Table 1: Adopted Mitigation Measure	Prior to the start of Construction*	During Construction**	Post-Construction or Operational	Compliance with MM completed?
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1a: Documentation of Historical Resource	X			
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1b: Salvage Plan	X			
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1c: Interpretation of the Historical Resource	X			
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1d: Oral Histories	X			
Mitigation Measure M-TCR-1: Tribal Cultural Resources Preservation and/or Interpretive Program	X	X	X	
Mitigation Measure M-NO-1: Construction Noise Control	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-NO-2: Vibration-Sensitive Equipment at 2601 Mariposa Street (KQED Building)	X	X		
Mitigation Measure NO-3: Fixed Mechanical Equipment Noise Control for Building Operations	X		X	

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1: Off-Road Construction Equipment Emissions Minimization	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3: Emergency Diesel Generator Health Risk Reduction Plan	X		X	
Mitigation Measure M-WI-1: Design Measures to Reduce Project-Specific Wind Impacts	X			
Mitigation Measure M-GE-6a: Inadvertent Discovery of Paleontological Resources	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-GE-6b: Preconstruction Paleontological Evaluation for Class 3 (Moderate) Paleontological Sensitivity Sediments during Construction	X	X		

\*Prior to any ground disturbing activities at the project site.

\*\*Construction is broadly defined to include any physical activities associated with construction of a development project including, but not limited to: site preparation, clearing, demolition, excavation, shoring, foundation installation, and building construction.

Period of Compliance				
Table 2: Adopted Public Works Standard Construction Measure	Prior to the start of Construction*	During Construction**	Post-Construction or Operational	Compliance with SCM completed?
SCM #1: SEISMIC AND GEOTECHNICAL STUDIES	X	X		
SCM #2: AIR QUALITY	X	X		
SCM #3: WATER QUALITY	X	X		
SCM #4: TRAFFIC	X	X		
SCM #5: NOISE	X	X		
SCM #6: HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	X	X		
SCM #7: BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	X	X		
SCM #8: VISUAL AND AESTHETIC CONSIDERATIONS, PROJECT SITE	X	X		
SCM #9: CULTURAL RESOURCES	X	X		

\*Prior to any ground disturbing activities at the project site.

\*\*Construction is broadly defined to include any physical activities associated with construction of a development project including, but not limited to: site preparation, clearing, demolition, excavation, shoring, foundation installation, and building construction.


(Continues on next page)

Period of Compliance				
Table 3: Adopted Improvement Measure	Prior to the start of Construction*	During Construction**	Post-Construction or Operational	Compliance with Improvement Measure completed?
Improvement Measure I-TR-A: Construction Management Plan – Additional Measures	X	X		
Improvement Measure I-TR-B: Driveway and Loading Operations Plan (DLOP)			X	

\* Prior to any ground disturbing activities at the project site.

\*\* Construction is broadly defined to include any physical activities associated with construction of a development project including, but not limited to: site preparation, clearing, demolition, excavation, shoring, foundation installation, and building construction.

#### Signatures:

Private Project Co-Sponsor (Developer)

December 22, 2023

Date

Note to project sponsor team: Please contact [CPC.EnvironmentalMonitoring@sfgov.org](mailto:CPC.EnvironmentalMonitoring@sfgov.org) to begin the environmental monitoring process prior to the submittal of your building permits to the San Francisco Department Building Inspection.

(Continues on next page)

# MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Table 4: MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE POTRERO YARD MODERNIZATION PROJECT

## MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM<sup>1</sup>

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria
<b>MITIGATION MEASURES AGREED TO BY PROJECT SPONSOR TEAM</b>				
<b>HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL/CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>				
<p><b>Mitigation Measure M-CR-1a: Documentation of Historical Resource (HRER Part II, Mitigation Measure 1)</b></p> <p>Prior to issuance of a demolition permit, the project sponsor team shall undertake Historic American Building/Historic American Landscape Survey-like (HABS/HALS-like) documentation of the building features. The documentation shall be undertaken by a professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Architectural History, History, or Architecture (as appropriate) to prepare written and photographic documentation of the Potrero Trolley Coach Division Facility. The specific scope of the documentation shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department but shall include the following elements:</p> <p><b>Measured Drawings</b> – A set of measured drawings shall be prepared that depict the existing size, scale, and dimension of the historic resource. Planning Department staff will accept the original architectural drawings or an as-built set of architectural drawings (e.g., plans, sections, elevations). Planning Department staff will assist the consultant in determining the appropriate level of measured drawings.</p> <p><b>Historic American Buildings/Historic American Landscape Survey-Level Photographs</b> – Either Historic American Buildings/Historic American Landscape Survey (HABS/HALS) standard large-format or digital photography shall be used. The scope of the digital photographs shall be reviewed by Planning Department staff for concurrence, and all digital photography shall be conducted according to the latest National Park Service (NPS) standards. The</p>	Project Sponsor Team and qualified consultant, at the direction of the ERO	Prior to issuance of excavation permit or commencement of construction	Planning Department preservation staff shall review and approve the documentation package	Considered complete upon completion of the Planning Department approved documentation provided to the repositories in their preferred format and the print-on-demand booklet is made available to the public, upon request

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM<sup>1</sup>**

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria
<p>photography shall be undertaken by a qualified professional with demonstrated experience in HABS/HALS photography. Photograph views for the data set shall include contextual views; views of each side of the building and interior views, including any original interior features, where possible; oblique views of the building; and detail views of character-defining features. All views shall be referenced on a photographic key. This photographic key shall be on a map of the property and shall show the photograph number with an arrow to indicate the direction of the view. Historic photographs shall also be collected, reproduced, and included in the data set.</p> <p><b>HABS/HALS Historical Report</b> – A written historical narrative and report shall be provided in accordance with the HABS/HALS Historical Report Guidelines. The written history shall follow an outline format that begins with a statement of significance supported by the development of the architectural and historical context in which the structure was built and subsequently evolved. The report shall also include architectural description and bibliographic information.</p> <p><b>Video Recordation (HRER Part II, Mitigation Measure 3)</b> – Video recordation shall be undertaken before demolition or site permits are issued. The project sponsor team shall undertake video documentation of the affected historical resource and its setting. The documentation shall be conducted by a professional videographer, one with experience recording architectural resources. The documentation shall be narrated by a qualified professional who meets the standards for history, architectural history, or architecture (as appropriate) set forth by the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (36 Code of Federal Regulations Part 61). The documentation shall include as much information as possible—using visuals in combination with narration—about the materials, construction methods, current condition, historic use, and historic context of the historical resource. This mitigation measure would supplement the</p>				

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Adopted Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Implementation Responsibility</b>	<b>Mitigation Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria</b>
<p>traditional HABS/HALS documentation, and would enhance the collection of reference materials that would be available to the public and inform future research.</p> <p><b>Softcover Book</b> – A Print-on-Demand softcover book shall be produced that includes the content from the historical report, historical photographs, HABS/HALS photography, measured drawings, and field notes. The Print-on-Demand book shall be made available to the public for distribution. The project sponsor team shall transmit such documentation to the History Room of the San Francisco Public Library, San Francisco Architectural Heritage, the Planning Department, and the Northwest Information Center. The HABS/HALS documentation scope will determine the requested documentation type for each facility, and the project sponsor team will conduct outreach to identify other interested groups. All documentation will be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department's staff before any demolition or site permit is granted for the affected historical resource.</p>				
<b>Mitigation Measure M-CR-1b: Salvage Plan (HRER Part II, Mitigation Measure 2)</b>				
<p>Prior to any demolition that would remove character-defining features, the project sponsor team shall consult with the planning department as to whether any such features may be salvaged, in whole or in part, during demolition/alteration. The project sponsor team shall make a good faith effort to salvage materials of historical interest to be utilized as part of the interpretive program.</p>	Project Sponsor Team/qualified preservation consultant at the direction of the ERO	Prior to issuance of construction permits	Planning Department	Considered complete after salvage occur and interpretive program is complete
<b>Mitigation Measure M-CR-1c: Interpretation of the Historical Resource (HRER Part II, Mitigation Measure 4)</b>				
<p>The project sponsor team shall facilitate the development of an interpretive program focused on the history of the project site. The interpretive program should be developed and implemented by a qualified professional with demonstrated experience in displaying information and graphics to the public in a visually interesting</p>	Project Sponsor Team, construction contractors, and qualified consultant, at the	Prior to issuance of excavation permit or commencement of construction	Planning Department preservation staff shall review and approve the interpretive program plan	Considered complete upon the Planning Department's approval and the Project Sponsor Team's implementation of the interpretive program plan

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Adopted Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Implementation Responsibility</b>	<b>Mitigation Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria</b>
<p>manner, such as a museum or exhibit curator. This program shall be initially outlined in a proposal for an interpretive plan subject to review and approval by Planning Department staff. The proposal shall include the proposed format and the publicly-accessible location of the interpretive content, as well as high-quality graphics and written narratives. The proposal prepared by the qualified consultant describing the general parameters of the interpretive program shall be approved by Planning Department staff prior to issuance of the architectural addendum to the site permit. The detailed content, media, and other characteristics of such an interpretive program shall be approved by Planning Department staff prior to issuance of a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy.</p> <p>The interpretive program shall include but not be limited to the installation of permanent on-site interpretive displays or screens in publicly accessible locations. Historical photographs, including some of the large-format photographs required by Mitigation Measure M-CR-1a, may be used to illustrate the site's history. The oral history program required by Mitigation Measure M-CR-1d will also inform the interpretive program.</p> <p>The primary goal is to educate visitors and future residents about the property's historical themes, associations, and lost contributing features within broader historical, social, and physical landscape contexts. These themes would include but not be limited to the subject property's historic significance for its association with the earliest years of San Francisco's Municipal Railway, the United States' first publicly owned street railway and for its distinctive characteristics as a car barn, for its post-Earthquake period of construction, and as the work of master Michael M. O'Shaughnessy.</p>	direction of the ERO			
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1d: Oral Histories (HRER Part II, Mitigation Measure 5)				

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Adopted Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Implementation Responsibility</b>	<b>Mitigation Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria</b>
<p>The project sponsor team shall undertake an oral history project on the resource that may include interviews of people such as former SFMTA employees, or other community members who may offer informative historic perspectives on the history and significance of the resource. The project shall be conducted by a professional historian in conformance with the Oral History Association's Principles and Best Practices (<a href="https://www.oralhistory.org/principles-and-best-practices-revised-2018/">https://www.oralhistory.org/principles-and-best-practices-revised-2018/</a>). In addition to transcripts of the interviews, the oral history project shall include a narrative project summary report containing an introduction to the project, a methodology description, and brief summaries of each conducted interview. Copies of the completed oral history project shall be submitted to the San Francisco Public Library, Planning Department, and other interested historical institutions. The oral history project shall also be incorporated into the interpretative program.</p>	<p>Project Sponsor Team and qualified consultant, at the direction of the ERO</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of excavation permit or commencement of construction</p>	<p>Planning Department preservation staff shall review and approve the documentation package</p>	<p>Considered complete upon the Planning Department's approval and the Project Sponsor Team's implementation of the interpretive program plan</p>
<p><b>Mitigation Measure M-TCR-1: Tribal Cultural Resources Preservation and/or Interpretive Program</b></p>				
<p>During ground-disturbing activities that encounter archeological resources, if the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) determines that a significant archeological resource is present, and if in consultation with the affiliated Native American tribal representatives, the ERO determines that the resource constitutes a tribal cultural resource (TCR) and that the resource could be adversely affected by the proposed project, the proposed project shall be redesigned so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant tribal cultural resource, if feasible.</p> <p>If the ERO, in consultation with the project sponsor, determines that preservation-in-place of the TCR would be both feasible and effective, then the archeological consultant shall prepare an archeological resource preservation plan (ARPP). Implementation of</p>	<p>Project Sponsor Team, construction contractors, and qualified consultant, at the direction of the ERO</p>	<p>Consultation and planning starting upon discovery of a potential TCR during archeological testing or during construction excavations; interpretive program to be implemented prior to issuance of building occupancy permit</p>	<p>Environmental Review Officer (ERO) or designee</p>	<p>In the event of the discovery of a TCR, considered complete after implementation of the Planning Department approved interpretation program</p>

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Adopted Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Implementation Responsibility</b>	<b>Mitigation Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria</b>
<p>the approved ARPP by the archeological consultant shall be required when feasible.</p> <p>If the ERO, in consultation with the affiliated Native American tribal representatives and the project sponsor, determines that preservation-in-place of the TCR is not a sufficient or feasible option, then the project sponsor shall implement an interpretive program of the TCR in consultation with affiliated Native American tribal representatives. An interpretive plan produced in consultation with affiliated Native American tribal representatives, at a minimum, and approved by the ERO, would be required to guide the interpretive program. The plan shall identify proposed locations for installations or displays, the proposed content and materials of those displays or installation, the producers or artists of the displays or installation, and a long-term maintenance program. The interpretive program may include artist installations, preferably by local Native American artists, oral histories with local Native Americans, artifacts displays and interpretation, and educational panels or other informational displays.</p>				
<b>NOISE</b>				
Mitigation Measure M-NO-1: Construction Noise Control				
<p>The SFMTA and private project co-sponsor and/or its contractors on SFMTA's behalf (referred to below as project sponsor team) shall prepare construction noise control documentation as detailed below. Prior to issuance of any demolition or building permit, the project sponsor team shall submit a project-specific construction noise control plan to the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) or the ERO's designee for approval. The construction noise control plan shall be prepared by a qualified acoustical engineer, with input from the construction contractor, and include all feasible measures to reduce construction noise. The construction noise control plan shall identify noise control measures to meet a performance target of</p>	<p>Project Sponsor Team, construction contractors, acoustical engineer</p>	<p>Prior to the issuance of construction permits; prior to the commencement of each construction stage; implementation of monitoring ongoing during construction</p>	<p>Environmental review officer or designee in Planning Department, Project Sponsor Team</p>	<p>Noise control plan approved by ERO/Planning Department prior to construction and considered complete upon submission of a noise monitoring report after each construction phase and completion of construction activities</p>

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM<sup>1</sup>

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria
<p>construction activities not resulting in a noise level greater than 90 dBA at noise-sensitive receptors and 10 dBA above the ambient noise level at noise-sensitive receptors. The project sponsor team shall ensure that requirements of the construction noise control plan are included in contract specifications. If nighttime construction is required, the plan shall include specific measures to reduce nighttime construction noise. The plan shall also include measures for notifying the public of construction activities, complaint procedures, and a plan for monitoring construction noise levels in the event complaints are received. The construction noise control plan shall include the following measures to the degree feasible, or other effective measures, to reduce construction noise levels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use construction equipment that is in good working order, and inspect mufflers for proper functionality;</li> <li>• Select “quiet” construction methods and equipment (e.g., improved mufflers, use of intake silencers, engine enclosures);</li> <li>• Use construction equipment with lower noise emission ratings whenever possible, particularly for air compressors;</li> <li>• Prohibit the idling of inactive construction equipment for more than five minutes;</li> <li>• Locate stationary noise sources (such as compressors) as far from nearby noise-sensitive receptors as possible (including future onsite noise-sensitive receptors at the Phase 2 Bryant Street Housing under the phased construction scenarios for the Refined Project), muffle such noise sources, and construct barriers around such sources and/or the construction site.</li> <li>• Avoid placing stationary noise-generating equipment (e.g., generators, compressors) within noise-sensitive buffer areas (as determined by the acoustical engineer) immediately adjacent to neighbors (including future onsite noise-</li> </ul>				

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM<sup>1</sup>

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria
<p>sensitive receptors at the Phase 2 Bryant Street Housing under the phased construction scenarios for the Refined Project).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enclose or shield stationary noise sources from neighboring noise-sensitive properties (including the future onsite noise-sensitive receptors at the Phase 2 Bryant Street Housing under the phased construction scenarios for the Refined Project) with noise barriers to the extent feasible. To further reduce noise, locate stationary equipment in pit areas or excavated areas, if feasible; and</li> <li>• Install temporary barriers, barrier-backed sound curtains and/or acoustical panels around working powered impact equipment and, if necessary, around the perimeter of active construction areas or phases. When temporary barrier units are joined together, the mating surfaces shall be flush with each other. Gaps between barrier units, and between the bottom edge of the barrier panels and the ground, shall be closed with material that completely closes the gaps, and dense enough to attenuate noise.</li> <li>• Under the phased construction scenarios for the Refined Project, develop strategies to reduce exposure to construction noise in coordination with future onsite noise-sensitive receptors at the Phase 2 Bryant Street Housing. Some options to reduce noise include limiting noise to Phase 2 Bryant Street receptors by delaying or limiting occupancy in units closest to the construction zone or notifying receptors of loud construction periods. These options should be explored as part of the noise control plan prepared by a qualified noise consultant and the construction contractor.</li> </ul> <p>The construction noise control plan shall include the following measures for notifying the public of construction activities, complaint procedures, and monitoring construction noise levels:</p>				

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM<sup>1</sup>**

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Designate an on-site construction noise manager for the project;</li> <li>Notify neighboring noise-sensitive receptors within 300 feet of the project construction area at least 30 days in advance of high-intensity noise-generating activities (e.g., pier drilling, pile driving, and other activities that may generate noise levels greater than 90 dBA at noise-sensitive receptors) about the estimated duration of the activity (including future onsite noise-sensitive receptors at the Phase 2 Bryant Street Housing under the phased construction scenarios for the Refined Project);</li> <li>Post a sign onsite describing noise complaint procedures and a complaint hotline number that shall always be answered during construction;</li> <li>Implement a procedure for notifying the planning department of any noise complaints within one week of receiving a complaint;</li> <li>Establish a list of measures for responding to and tracking complaints pertaining to construction noise. Such measures may include the evaluation and implementation of additional noise controls at sensitive receptors (residences, hospitals, convalescent homes, schools, churches, hotels and motels, and sensitive wildlife habitat); and</li> <li>Conduct noise monitoring (measurements) at the beginning of major construction phases (e.g., demolition, grading, excavation) and during high-intensity construction activities to determine the effectiveness of noise attenuation measures and, if necessary, implement additional noise control measures.</li> </ul> <p>The construction noise control plan shall include the following additional measures in the event of pile-driving activities:</p>				

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM<sup>1</sup>**

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When pile driving is to occur within 600 feet of a noise-sensitive receptor, implement “quiet” pile-driving technology (such as pre-drilling of piles, sonic pile drivers, auger cast-in-place, or drilled-displacement, or the use of more than one pile driver to shorten the total pile-driving duration [only if such measure is preferable to reduce impacts to sensitive receptors]) where feasible, in consideration of geotechnical and structural requirements and conditions;</li> <li>Where the use of driven impact piles cannot be avoided, properly fit impact pile driving equipment with an intake and exhaust muffler and a sound-attenuating shroud, as specified by the manufacturer; and</li> <li>Conduct noise monitoring (measurements) before, during, and after the pile-driving activity.</li> </ul>				
Mitigation Measure M-NO-2: Vibration-Sensitive Equipment at 2601 Mariposa Street (KQED Building)				
<p>Prior to construction, the SFMTA and private project co-sponsor and/or its contractors on SFMTA's behalf (referred to below as project sponsor team) shall designate and make available a community liaison to respond to vibration complaints from building occupants at the KQED building, located at 2601 Mariposa Street. Contact information for the community liaison shall be posted in a conspicuous location so that it is clearly visible to building occupants most likely to be disturbed. Through the community liaison, the project sponsor team shall provide notification to property owners and occupants of 2601 Mariposa Street at least 10 days prior to construction activities involving equipment that can generate vibration capable of interfering with vibration-sensitive equipment, informing them of the estimated start date and duration of vibration-generating construction activities. Equipment types capable of generating such vibration include an impact pile</p>	<p>Project Sponsor Team, and qualified consultant, at the direction of the ERO</p>	<p>Prior to the issuance building and construction permits</p>	<p>Project sponsor, project acoustical engineer and Planning Department</p>	<p>Considered complete after construction activities are completed and after buildings and/or structures are remediated to their pre-construction condition at the conclusion of vibration-generating activity on the site, should any damage occur</p>

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM<sup>1</sup>

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria
<p>driver, or similar equipment, operating within 250 feet of the building or a vibratory roller, or similar equipment, operating within 125 feet of the building. If feasible, the project sponsor team shall identify potential alternative equipment and techniques that could reduce construction vibration levels. Alternative equipment and techniques may include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• pre-drilled piles,</li> <li>• caisson drilling,</li> <li>• oscillating or rotating pile installation,</li> <li>• jetting piles into place using a water injection at the tip of the pile could be substituted for driven piles, if feasible, based on soil conditions,</li> <li>• static rollers could be substituted for vibratory rollers in some cases.</li> </ul> <p>If concerns prior to construction or complaints during construction related to equipment interference are identified, the community liaison shall work with the project sponsor team and the affected building occupants to resolve the concerns such that the vibration control measures would meet a performance target of the 65 VdB vibration level threshold for vibration sensitive equipment, as set forth by Federal Transit Authority (FTA). To resolve concerns raised by building occupants, the community liaison shall convey the details of the complaint(s) to the project sponsor team, such as who shall implement specific measures to ensure that the project construction meets the performance target of 65 VdB vibration level for vibration sensitive equipment. These measures may include evaluation by a qualified noise and vibration consultant, scheduling certain construction activities outside the hours of operation or recording periods of specific vibration-sensitive equipment if feasible, and/or conducting ground-borne vibration monitoring to document that the project can meet the performance target of 65 VdB at specific distances and/or locations. Ground-borne</p>				

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Adopted Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Implementation Responsibility</b>	<b>Mitigation Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria</b>
vibration monitoring, if appropriate to resolve concerns, shall be conducted by a qualified noise and vibration consultant.				
<b>Mitigation Measure NO-3: Fixed Mechanical Equipment Noise Control for Building Operations</b>				
<p>The SFMTA and a private project co-sponsor and/or its contractors on SFMTA's behalf (referred to below as project sponsor team) shall prepare operational noise control documentation as detailed below. Prior to approval of a building permit, the project sponsor team shall submit documentation to the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) or the officer's designee, demonstrating with reasonable certainty that the building's fixed mechanical equipment (such as heating, ventilation and air conditioning [HVAC] equipment) meets the noise limits specified in sections 2909 (b) and 2909 (d) of the noise ordinance (i.e., an 8-dB increase above the ambient noise level at the property plane for commercial or mixed-use properties; and interior noise limits of 55 dBA and 45 dBA for daytime and nighttime hours inside any sleeping or living room in a nearby dwelling unit on a residential property assuming windows open, respectively). Acoustical treatments required to meet the noise ordinance may include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enclosing noise-generating mechanical equipment;</li> <li>• Installing relatively quiet models of air handlers, exhaust fans, and other mechanical equipment;</li> <li>• Using mufflers or silencers on equipment exhaust fans;</li> <li>• Orienting or shielding equipment to protect noise-sensitive receptors (residences, hospitals, convalescent homes, schools, churches, hotels and motels, and sensitive wildlife habitat) to the greatest extent feasible;</li> <li>• Increasing the distance between noise-generating equipment and noise-sensitive receptors; and/or</li> </ul>	Project Sponsor Team and qualified consultant, at the direction of the ERO	Prior to the issuance building permit	Environmental Review Officer (ERO) or designee	Considered complete after receipt and acceptance of the appropriate documentation to the ERO

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM<sup>1</sup>**

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Placing barriers around the equipment to facilitate the attenuation of noise.</li> </ul> <p>Compliance with this fixed-mechanical equipment noise control for building operations standard requirement does not obviate the need for the equipment to demonstrate compliance with the noise ordinance throughout the lifetime of the project.</p>				
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>				
<b>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1: Off-Road Construction Equipment Emissions Minimization</b>				
<p>The SFMTA and private project co-sponsor and/or its contractors on SFMTA's behalf (referred to below as project sponsor team) shall comply with the following:</p> <p>A. Engine Requirements.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All off-road equipment greater than or equal to 25 horsepower shall have engines that meet U.S. EPA or California Air Resources Board Tier 4 Final off-road emission standards.</li> <li>Where access to alternative sources of power is available, portable diesel engines shall be prohibited. If access to alternative sources of power is infeasible, portable diesel engines shall meet the requirements of Subsection (A)(1).</li> <li>Diesel engines, whether for off-road or on-road equipment, shall not be left idling for more than two minutes, at any location, except as provided in exceptions to the applicable state regulations regarding idling for off-road and on-road equipment (e.g., traffic conditions, safe operating conditions). The project sponsor team shall post legible and visible signs in English, Spanish, and Chinese, in designated queuing</li> </ol>	Project Sponsor Team, construction contractors	Prior to issuance of a construction permit; implementation ongoing during construction	Environmental Review Officer (ERO) or designee/ project sponsor	Considered complete upon Planning Department review and approval of Construction Emissions Minimization Plan, ongoing review and approval of biannual reports, and review and approval of final construction report

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM<sup>1</sup>

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria
<p>areas and at the construction site to remind operators of the two-minute idling limit.</p> <p>4. The project sponsor team shall instruct construction workers and equipment operators on the maintenance and tuning of construction equipment and require that such workers and operators properly maintain and tune equipment in accordance with manufacturer specifications.</p> <p>B. Waivers.</p> <p>1. The San Francisco Planning Department Environmental Review Officer (ERO) may waive the equipment requirements of Subsection (A)(1) if: a particular piece of off-road Tier 4 Final equipment is not regionally available, not technically feasible, or would not produce desired emissions reduction due to expected operating modes. In granting the waiver, the project sponsor team must demonstrate with substantial evidence that the project construction does not exceed the BAAQMD threshold for NOx (54 lbs/day) by resulting in a net increase of average daily NOx emissions greater than 4 pounds per day. The project sponsor team must also demonstrate with substantial evidence that the overall combined construction and operational excess cancer risk does not exceed 7 per 1 million persons exposed at nearby sensitive receptors.</p> <p>C. Construction Emissions Minimization Plan.</p> <p>1. Before starting onsite construction activities, the project sponsor team shall submit a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan (Plan) to the ERO for review and approval. The Plan shall state, in reasonable detail, how the project sponsor team will meet the requirements of Section A.</p>				

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM<sup>1</sup>**

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria
<p>2. The Plan shall include estimates of the construction timeline by phase, with a description of each piece of off-road equipment required for every construction phase. The description may include, but is not limited to: equipment type, equipment manufacturer, equipment identification number, engine model year, engine certification (Tier rating), horsepower, engine serial number, and expected fuel use and hours of operation.</p> <p>3. The project sponsor team shall ensure that all applicable requirements of the Plan have been incorporated into the contract specifications. The Plan shall include a certification statement that the project sponsor team agrees to comply fully with the Plan.</p> <p>4. The project sponsor team shall make the Plan available to the public for review onsite during working hours. The project sponsor team shall post at the construction site a legible and visible sign summarizing the Plan. The sign shall also state that the public may ask to inspect the Plan for the project at any time during working hours and shall explain how to request to inspect the Plan. The project sponsor team shall post at least one copy of the sign in a visible location on each side of the construction site facing a public right-of-way.</p> <p>D. Monitoring</p> <p>1. After start of construction activities, the project sponsor team shall submit biannual reports to the ERO documenting compliance with the Plan. After completion of construction activities and prior to receiving a final certificate of occupancy, the project sponsor team shall submit to the ERO a final report summarizing construction activities, including the start and end dates and duration of each construction phase, and the specific information required in the Plan.</p>				

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Adopted Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Implementation Responsibility</b>	<b>Mitigation Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria</b>
<p><b>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3: Emergency Diesel Generator Health Risk Reduction Plan</b></p> <p>The SFMTA and private project co-sponsor and/or its contractors on SFMTA's behalf (referred to below as the project sponsor team) shall comply with the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Require all emergency diesel generators to meet Tier 4 Final emission standards and reduce annual testing limit to 20 hours per year for each generator; or</li> <li>2. Require all emergency generators to be battery-powered; or</li> <li>3. The project sponsor team shall retain a qualified air quality consultant to develop an Emergency Diesel Generator Health Risk Reduction Plan. The project sponsor team shall submit the plan to the San Francisco Planning Department Environmental Review Officer (ERO) for review and approval prior to issuance of a permit for emergency diesel generators from the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection or the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. The plan must include, for each emergency diesel generator, a description of the anticipated venting location, engine specifications, and annual maintenance testing procedures. The plan must demonstrate with substantial evidence that annual maintenance testing will not result in the project's overall construction and operational cancer risk exceeding 7 per one million persons exposed at nearby offsite sensitive receptors.</li> </ol> <p>Additionally, the operator of the facility at which the generators are located (including the private project co-sponsor as applicable) shall be required to maintain records of the testing schedule for each emergency diesel generator for the life of that generator and to</p>	<p>Project Sponsor Team and construction contractor</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of a permit for emergency diesel generator</p>	<p>Project Sponsor Team, facility maintenance contractor, and the Planning Department</p>	<p>Considered complete upon Planning Department review and approval of Emergency Diesel Generator Health Risk Reduction Plan</p>

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Adopted Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Implementation Responsibility</b>	<b>Mitigation Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria</b>
provide this information for review to the planning department within three months of requesting such information.				
<b>WIND</b>				
Mitigation Measure M-WI-1(a): Design Measures to Reduce Project-Specific Wind Impacts				
<p>The project sponsor team shall retain a qualified wind consultant to prepare, in consultation with the San Francisco Planning Department (planning department), a wind impact mitigation report that identifies design measures to reduce the project's wind impacts in the project scenario. Prior to certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report, the project sponsor team shall submit the wind impact mitigation report to the planning department for its final review and approval. The wind impact mitigation report shall incorporate updated information on the building design based on a list of potential wind reduction measures identified below, along with the estimated effectiveness of each measure to reduce the identified off-site wind hazards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Porous façades on portions of the north, east and west sides for natural ventilation as part of the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning strategy for the new transit facility at the second and third levels</li> <li>• Recessed building corner up to 12 feet in height at the southwest corner of proposed building near Bryant/Mariposa intersection</li> <li>• Vertical elevated screens on portions of the second and third levels of the west façade (Bryant Street)</li> <li>• Vertical wind screens at grade level on the adjacent Bryant Street sidewalk near the Bryant/Mariposa intersection</li> </ul> <p>Such wind reduction design measures may include additional on-site landscaping, or equivalent wind-reducing features; and off-site wind reduction measures such as landscaping, streetscape</p>	Project Sponsor Team/qualified consultant	Prior to completion of the environmental review	Project Sponsor Team, and the Planning Department	Completion of and acceptance of the wind impact mitigation report by the Planning Department

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Adopted Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Implementation Responsibility</b>	<b>Mitigation Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria</b>
<p>improvements or other wind-reducing features, such as wind screens.</p> <p>The project sponsor team shall implement as many of the design measures identified in the wind impact mitigation report as needed to reduce the proposed project's or project variants' potential to create a new wind hazard or exacerbate an existing wind hazard in publicly accessible areas of substantial pedestrian use to less-than-significant levels. The final wind impact mitigation report should not find that the project produces a net increase of the already identified wind hazard exceedances. The planning department shall approve the final list of wind reduction measures that the project sponsor team shall implement.</p>				
<b>Mitigation Measure M-WI-1(b): Additional Wind Testing</b>				
<p>If changes to the building design or massing are proposed after certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report, additional wind analysis may be required to confirm the modified design does not result in any 9-hour wind hazard exceedances and to minimize 1-hour wind hazard exceedances.</p> <p>If the planning department determines that the modified design could result in wind hazard criterion exceedances (for example, due to the removal of one or more wind reducing features), the project sponsor team shall retain a qualified wind consultant to prepare a wind analysis under the direction of the planning department. The wind analysis may require a wind tunnel test and shall identify wind reduction measures needed to avoid 9-hour wind hazard exceedances and to minimize 1-hour wind hazard exceedances.</p>	Project Sponsor Team /qualified consultant	Prior to completion of the environmental review	Project Sponsor Team, and the Planning Department	Completion of and acceptance of the wind impact mitigation report by the Planning Department
<b>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b>				
<b>Mitigation Measure M-GE-6a: Inadvertent Discovery of Paleontological Resources</b>				

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Adopted Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Implementation Responsibility</b>	<b>Mitigation Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria</b>
<p>Worker Awareness Training - Prior to commencing construction, and ongoing throughout ground disturbing activities (e.g., excavation, utility installation, the project sponsor and/or their designee shall ensure that all project construction workers are trained on the contents of the Paleontological Resources Alert Sheet, as provided by the Planning Department. The Paleontological Resources Alert Sheet shall be prominently displayed at the construction site during ground disturbing activities for reference regarding potential paleontological resources.</p> <p>In addition, the project sponsor shall inform the contractor and construction personnel of the immediate stop work procedures and other procedures to be followed if bones or other potential fossils are unearthed at the project site. Should new workers that will be involved in ground disturbing construction activities begin employment after the initial training has occurred, the construction supervisor shall ensure that they receive the worker awareness training as described above.</p> <p>The project sponsor shall complete the standard form/affidavit confirming the timing of the worker awareness training to the Environmental Review Officer (ERO). The affidavit shall confirm the project's location, the date of training, the location of the informational handout display, and the number of participants. The affidavit shall be transmitted to the ERO within five (5) business days of conducting the training.</p> <p>Paleontological Resource Discoveries - In the event of the discovery of an unanticipated paleontological resource during project construction, ground disturbing activities shall temporarily be halted within 25 feet of the find until the discovery is examined by a qualified paleontologist as recommended by the Society of</p>	Project Sponsor Team, construction contractors, at the direction of the ERO	Prior to construction commencement	Project Sponsor Team and the Planning Department	Submission of evidence of worker awareness training and distribution of alert sheet to the satisfaction of the Planning Department, including proper adherence to procedures if a resource is encountered

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM<sup>1</sup>**

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria
<p>Vertebrate Paleontology standards (SVP 2010) and Best Practices in Mitigation Paleontology (Murphey et al. 2019). Work within the sensitive area shall resume only when deemed appropriate by the qualified paleontologist in consultation with the ERO.</p> <p>The qualified paleontologist shall determine: 1) if the discovery is scientifically significant; 2) the necessity for involving other responsible or resource agencies and stakeholders, if required or determined applicable; and 3) methods for resource recovery. If a paleontological resource assessment results in a determination that the resource is not scientifically important, this conclusion shall be documented in a Paleontological Evaluation Letter to demonstrate compliance with applicable statutory requirements (e.g., Federal Antiquities Act of 1906, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, California Public Resources Code Chapter 17, Section 5097.5, Paleontological Resources Preservation Act 2009). The Paleontological Evaluation Letter shall be submitted to the ERO for review within 30 days of the discovery.</p> <p>If the qualified paleontologist determines that a paleontological resource is of scientific importance, and there are no feasible measures to avoid disturbing this paleontological resource, the qualified paleontologist shall prepare a Paleontological Mitigation Program. The mitigation program shall include measures to fully document and recover the resource of scientific importance. The qualified paleontologist shall submit the mitigation program to the ERO for review and approval within 10 business days of the discovery. Upon approval by the ERO, ground disturbing activities in the project area shall resume and be monitored as determined by the qualified paleontologist for the duration of such activities.</p> <p>The mitigation program shall include: 1) procedures for construction monitoring at the project site; 2) fossil preparation and</p>				

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM<sup>1</sup>**

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria
<p>identification procedures; 3) curation of paleontological resources of scientific importance into an appropriate repository; and 4) preparation of a Paleontological Resources Report (report or paleontology report) at the conclusion of ground disturbing activities. The report shall include dates of field work, results of monitoring, fossil identifications to the lowest possible taxonomic level, analysis of the fossil collection, a discussion of the scientific significance of the fossil collection, conclusions, locality forms, an itemized list of specimens, and a repository receipt from the curation facility. The project sponsor shall be responsible for the preparation and implementation of the mitigation program, in addition to any costs necessary to prepare and identify collected fossils, and for any curation fees charged by the paleontological repository. The paleontology report shall be submitted to the ERO for review within 30 business days from conclusion of ground disturbing activities, or as negotiated following consultation with the ERO.</p>				
<b>Mitigation Measure M-GE-6b: Preconstruction Paleontological Evaluation and Monitoring Plan during Construction</b>				
<p>The project sponsor shall engage a qualified paleontologist to develop a site-specific monitoring plan prior to commencing soil-disturbing activities at the project site. The Preconstruction Paleontological Monitoring Plan would determine project construction activities requiring paleontological monitoring based on those that may affect sediments with moderate sensitivity for paleontological resources. Prior to issuance of any demolition permit, the project sponsor shall submit the Preconstruction Paleontological Monitoring Plan to the ERO for approval.</p> <p>At a minimum, the plan shall include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Project Description</li> <li>2. Regulatory Environment – outline applicable federal, state and local regulations</li> </ol>	Project Sponsor Team, construction contractors, and qualified consultant, at the direction of the ERO	Prior to construction commencement	Project Sponsor Team and the Planning Department	Completion of and acceptance of the Preconstruction Paleontological Evaluation by the Planning Department

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM<sup>1</sup>

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria
<p>3. Summary of Sensitivity Classification(s)</p> <p>4. Research Methods, including but not limited to:</p> <p>4.a. Field studies conducted by the approved paleontologist to check for fossils at the surface and assess the exposed sediments.</p> <p>4.b. Literature Review to include an examination of geologic maps and a review of relevant geological and paleontological literature to determine the nature of geologic units in the project area.</p> <p>4.c. Locality Search to include outreach to the University of California Museum of Paleontology in Berkeley.</p> <p>5. Results: to include a summary of literature review and finding of potential site sensitivity for paleontological resources; and depth of potential resources if known.</p> <p>6. Recommendations for any additional measures that could be necessary to avoid or reduce any adverse impacts to recorded and/or inadvertently discovered paleontological resources of scientific importance. Such measures could include:</p> <p>6.a. Avoidance: If a known fossil locality appears to contain critical scientific information that should be left undisturbed for subsequent scientific evaluation.</p> <p>6.b. Fossil Recovery: If isolated small, medium- or large-sized fossils are discovered during field surveys or construction monitoring, and they are determined to be scientifically significant, they should be recovered. Fossil recovery may involve collecting a fully exposed fossil from the ground surface, or may involve a systematic excavation, depending upon the size and complexity of the fossil discovery.</p> <p>6.c. Monitoring: Monitoring involves systematic inspections of graded cut slopes, trench sidewalls, spoils piles, and other types of construction</p>				

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM<sup>1</sup>

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria
<p>excavations for the presence of fossils, and the fossil recovery and documentation of these fossils before they are destroyed by further ground disturbing actions. Standard monitoring is typically used in the most paleontologically sensitive geographic areas/geologic units (moderate, high and very high potential); while spot-check monitoring is typically used in geographic areas/geologic units of moderate or unknown paleontological sensitivity (moderate or unknown potential).</p> <p>6.d. Data recovery and reporting: Fossil and associated data discovered during soils disturbing activities should be treated according to professional paleontological standards and documented in a data recovery report. The plan should define the scope of the data recovery report.</p> <p>The consultant shall document the monitoring conducted according to the monitoring plan and any data recovery completed for significant paleontological resource finds discovered, if any. Plans and reports prepared by the consultant shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. The final monitoring report and any data recovery report shall be submitted to the ERO prior to the certificate of occupancy.</p>				

*Continues on the next page.*

Table 5: IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE POTRERO YARD MODERNIZATION PROJECT

 MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM<sup>1</sup>

Adopted Improvement Measures	Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria
<b>IMPROVEMENT MEASURES AGREED TO BY PROJECT SPONSOR TEAM</b>				
<b>TRANSPORTATION</b>  <b>Improvement Measure I-TR-A: Construction Management Plan – Additional Measures</b>  As part of the project's construction management plan, the SFMTA and a private project co-sponsor and/or its contractors on SFMTA's behalf (referred to as project sponsor team) will require additional measures to further minimize disruptions to people walking and bicycling, transit, and emergency vehicles during project construction: The additional measures include:  <b>Carpool, Bicycle, Walk, and Transit Access for Construction Workers</b> —Carpool, Bicycle, Walk, and Transit Access for Construction Workers—To minimize parking demand and vehicle trips associated with construction workers, the construction contractor will include as part of the Construction Management Plan methods to encourage carpooling, bicycle, walk, and transit access to the project site by construction workers. These methods could include providing secure bicycle parking spaces, participating in free-to-employee and employer ride matching program from <a href="http://www.511.org">www.511.org</a> , participating in emergency ride home program through the City of San Francisco ( <a href="http://www.sferh.org">www.sferh.org</a> ), and providing transit information to construction workers.  <b>Project Construction Updates for Adjacent Businesses and Residents</b> — To minimize construction impacts on access to nearby residences and businesses, the project sponsor team will provide nearby residences and adjacent businesses with regularly updated information regarding project construction, including construction activities, peak construction vehicle activities, travel lane closures,	Project Sponsor Team, including SFMTA regulatory teams, and construction contractor	Prior to the issuance of construction permits; implementation ongoing during construction with construction updates provided weekly; Active Monitoring of Detours as needed	Project Sponsor Team, SFMTA (in its regulatory capacity)	Considered complete upon the submittal and approval of the Construction Management Plan to the SFMTA (in its regulatory capacity)

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM<sup>1</sup>

Adopted Improvement Measures	Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria
and parking lane and sidewalk closures (e.g., via the project's website). At regular intervals to be defined in the construction management plan, a regular email notice will be distributed by the project sponsor team that would provide current construction information of interest to neighbors, as well as contact information for specific construction inquiries or concerns.				
Improvement Measure I-TR-B: Driveway and Loading Operations Plan (DLOP)				
<p>The project sponsor team (including joint development project sponsor as applicable) will be required to prepare and implement a Driveway and Loading Operations Plan (DLOP). The DLOP will be prepared by the private project co-sponsor, in coordination with the SFMTA, and submitted as part of the application for the first temporary occupancy permit. The DLOP will include provisions to manage loading activities and driveway operations associated with the below-grade onsite loading spaces; provisions for assessing on-street commercial and passenger loading supply and protocol for expanding on-street supply, if needed; provisions for trash/recycling/compost truck access and collection operations; provisions for residential move-in and move-out operations; provisions for scheduling Muni deliveries using the onsite loading facilities; and provisions for accommodating recurring deliveries such as UPS, Federal Express, and USPS within the onsite loading facilities.</p> <p>The intent of the DLOP is to reduce potential conflicts between passenger and freight loading and transit operations, and between passenger and freight loading activities and people walking and bicycling, and other vehicles in the project vicinity, as well as to maximize reliance on onsite facilities to accommodate freight loading demand.</p>	Project Sponsor Team	Project Sponsor Team to submit Loading Management Plan to ERO prior to the issuance of any certificate of occupancy for the proposed project.	ERO, Project Sponsor Team or successor owner/ manager of residential building	Considered complete upon ERO approval of Loading Management Plan; Ongoing monitoring to continue indefinitely

**Table 6: PUBLIC WORKS STANDARD CONSTRUCTION MEASURES FOR THE POTRERO YARD MODERNIZATION PROJECT**

Public Works' Regulatory Affairs division will ensure the Standard Construction Measures are included in construction specifications and contracts. The planning department environmental monitoring team will confirm the public works standard construction measures have been incorporated into the final project agreement with the project sponsor team.

<b>Adopted Public Works Standard Construction Measure</b>	<b>MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM<sup>1</sup></b>			
	<b>Implementation Responsibility</b>	<b>Mitigation Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria</b>
<b>PUBLIC WORKS STANDARD CONSTRUCTION MEASURES AGREED TO BY PROJECT SPONSOR TEAM</b>				
<b>Public Works Standard Construction Measure #1, Seismic and Geotechnical Studies (Geology and Soils)</b>				
The project manager shall ensure that projects that may potentially be affected by existing soil, slope and/or geologic conditions at the project site will be screened for liquefaction, subsidence, landslide, fault displacement, and other geological hazards at the project site, and will be engineered and designed as necessary to minimize risks to safety and reliability due to such hazards. As necessary, geotechnical investigations will be performed.	Project Sponsor Team, construction contractors	Prior to construction	Project Sponsor Team, Planning Department, Public Works Regulatory Affairs	Considered complete upon submission of geotechnical investigations, if applicable
<b>Public Works Standard Construction Measure #2, Air Quality</b>				
All projects will comply with the Construction Dust Control Ordinance. Major construction projects that are estimated to require 20 or more days of cumulative work within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone must comply with the additional clean construction requirements of the Clean Construction Ordinance.	Project Sponsor Team, construction contractors	Ongoing during construction	Project Sponsor Team, Planning Department, Public Works Regulatory Affairs	Considered complete upon submission of a Site-Specific Dust Control Plan for the review and approval of the Department of Public Health
<b>Public Works Standard Construction Measure #3, Water Quality</b>				
All projects will implement erosion and sedimentation controls to be tailored to the project site, such as fiber rolls and/or gravel bags around storm drain inlets, installation of silt fences, and other such measures sufficient-to prevent discharges of sediment and other pollutants to storm drains and all surface waterways, such as San Francisco Bay, the Pacific Ocean, water supply reservoirs, wetlands, swales, and streams. As required based on project location and size,	Project Sponsor Team, construction contractors	Ongoing during construction	Project Sponsor Team, Planning Department, Public Works Regulatory Affairs	Considered complete upon Project Sponsor Team's enforcement of water quality considerations

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Adopted Public Works Standard Construction Measure</b>	<b>Implementation Responsibility</b>	<b>Mitigation Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria</b>
a Stormwater Control Plan (in most areas of San Francisco) or a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) (in certain areas of San Francisco) will be prepared. If uncontaminated groundwater is encountered during excavation activities, it will be discharged in compliance with applicable water quality standards and discharge permit requirements.				
<b>Public Works Standard Construction Measure #4, Traffic</b>				
All projects will implement traffic control measures sufficient to maintain traffic and pedestrian circulation on streets affected by construction of the project. The measures will also, at a minimum, be consistent with the requirements of San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA)'s Blue Book. Traffic control measures may include, but not be limited to, flaggers and/or construction warning sign age of work ahead; scheduling truck trips during non-peak hours to the extent feasible; maintaining access to driveways, private roads, and off-street commercial loading facilities by using steel trench plates or other such method; and coordination with local emergency responders to maintain emergency access. Any temporary rerouting of transit vehicles or relocation of transit facilities would be coordinated with SFMTA Muni Operations.	Project Sponsor Team, construction contractors	Ongoing during construction	Project Sponsor Team; SFMTA Muni Operations, Public Works Regulatory Affairs	Considered complete upon the submittal and approval of the Construction Management Plan to the SFMTA
<b>Public Works Standard Construction Measure #5, Noise</b>				
All projects will comply with local noise ordinances resulting from construction noise. Public Works shall undertake measures to minimize noise disruption to nearby neighbors and sensitive receptors during construction. These efforts could include using best available noise control technologies on equipment (i.e., mufflers, ducts, and acoustically attenuating shields), locating stationary noise sources (i.e., pumps and generators) away from sensitive receptors, erecting temporary noise barriers, and other such means.	Project Sponsor Team, construction contractors	Ongoing during construction	Project Sponsor Team, Planning Department, Public Works Regulatory Affairs	Considered complete upon Project Sponsor enforcement of local noise ordinances

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Adopted Public Works Standard Construction Measure</b>	<b>Implementation Responsibility</b>	<b>Mitigation Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria</b>
Public Works Standard Construction Measure #6, Hazardous Materials				
Projects that involve excavation of 50 cubic yards of soil in the Maher Zone will comply with the Maher Ordinance. Projects on sites that are not currently located in the Maher Zone but have the potential to contain hazardous materials in soil and/or groundwater will be referred to the Department of Public Health as newly identified Maher sites.	Project Sponsor Team, construction contractors	Ongoing during construction	Project Sponsor Team, Planning Department, Public Works Regulatory Affairs	Considered complete upon Project Sponsor enforcement of Maher ordinance
Public Works Standard Construction Measure #7, Biological Resources				
Projects will comply with all local, state, and federal requirements for surveys, analysis, and protection of biological resources (e.g., Migratory Bird Treaty Act, Federal and State Endangered Species Acts, etc.). The project site and the immediately surrounding area will be screened to determine whether biological resources may be affected by construction. If biological resources are present, a qualified biologist will carry out a survey of the project site to note the presence of general biological resources and to identify whether habitat for special-status species and/or migratory birds is present. If necessary, measures will be implemented to protect biological resources, such as installing wildlife exclusion fencing, establishing work buffer zones, installing bird deterrents, having a qualified biologist conduct monitoring, and other such applicable measures. Tree removal will also comply with any applicable tree protection ordinance.	Project Sponsor Team, construction contractors	Ongoing during construction	Project Sponsor Team, Planning Department, Public Works Regulatory Affairs	Considered complete upon Project Sponsor enforcement of biological considerations
Public Works Standard Construction Measure #8, Visual and Aesthetic Considerations, Project Site				
All project sites will be maintained in a clean and orderly state. Construction staging areas will be sited away from public view, and on currently paved or previously disturbed areas, where possible.	Project Sponsor Team, construction contractors	Ongoing during construction	Project Sponsor Team, Planning Department, Public Works Regulatory Affairs	Considered complete upon Project Sponsor Team's enforcement of visual considerations

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Adopted Public Works Standard Construction Measure</b>	<b>Implementation Responsibility</b>	<b>Mitigation Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria</b>
<p>Nighttime lighting will be directed away from residential areas and have shields to prevent light spillover effects. Upon project completion, project sites on City-owned lands will be returned to their general pre-project condition, including re-grading of the site and re-vegetation or re-paving of disturbed areas to the extent this is consistent with Public Works Bureau of Urban Forestry Policy and San Francisco Code. Project sites on non-City land will be restored to their general pre-project condition so that the owner may return them to their prior use, unless otherwise arranged with the property owner.</p>				
<p><b>Public Works Standard Construction Measure #9, Cultural Resources</b></p>				
<p>All projects that will alter a building or structure, produce vibrations, or include soil disturbance will be screened to assess whether cultural resources are or may be present and could be affected, as detailed below.</p> <p>Soil is defined as native earthen deposits or introduced earthen fill. Soil does not include materials that were previously introduced as part of roadway pavement section including asphalt concrete wearing roadway base and subbase.</p> <p><i>Archeological Resources.</i> The EP Archeologist has determined that Standard Archeological Measure III (Testing/Data Recovery) shall be implemented by Public Works to protect and/or treat significant archeological resources identified as being present within the site and potentially affected by the project (see Attachment H: Public Works Archeological Measure III (Testing / Data Recovery)).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Public Works shall implement the EP Archeologist's recommendations prior to and/or during project construction consistent with Standard Archeological Measure III and shall consult with the EP Archeologist in</li> </ol>	<p>Project Sponsor Team, construction contractors</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of a construction permit</p>	<p>Project Sponsor Team, the EP Archeologist staff, Public Works and the ERO</p>	<p>Considered complete upon compliance with Standard Archeological Measure III (Testing/Data Recovery) requirements</p>

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Adopted Public Works Standard Construction Measure</b>	<b>Implementation Responsibility</b>	<b>Mitigation Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria</b>
<p>selecting a qualified archeological consultant from the EP Archeological Resources Consultant Pool, as needed, to implement these measures.</p> <p>2. Soil-disturbing activities in archeologically sensitive areas, as identified through the above process, will not begin until preconstruction archeological measures required by the EP Archeologist (e.g., preparation of an Archeological Testing Plan, Archeological Treatment Plan, and/or an Archeological Data Recovery Plan) have been implemented.</p>				
<b>Public Works Standard Construction Measure #9, Cultural Resources</b>				
<p>All projects that will alter a building or structure, produce vibrations, or include soil will be screened to assess whether cultural resources are or may be present disturbance and could be affected, as detailed below.</p> <p><i>Historic (Built Environment) Resources.</i> Where construction will take place in proximity to a building or structure identified as a significant historical resource but would not otherwise directly affect it, Public Works will implement protective measures, such as but not limited to, the erection of temporary construction barriers to ensure that inadvertent impacts to such buildings or structures are avoided. These measures shall require the development of a Construction Best Practices for Historical Resources Plan and a plan outlining the Construction Monitoring for Historical Resources Program to be reviewed and approved by CCSF Planning Department Preservation staff.</p> <p>If a project includes or is directly adjacent to historic buildings or structures susceptible to vibration (such as but not limited to unreinforced masonry, earthen construction, lathe and plaster, or fragile architectural ornamentation) as determined in consultation with CCSF Planning Department Preservation staff, Public Works will determine if vibrations associated with proposed construction</p>	<p>Project Sponsor Team, construction contractors</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of a construction permit</p>	<p>Project Sponsor Team, the EP Preservation staff, Public Works and the ERO</p>	<p>Considered complete upon compliance with requirements</p>

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM<sup>1</sup>

Adopted Public Works Standard Construction Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria
<p>activities has the potential to cause damage to such buildings or structures. Generally, vibration below 0.12 inches per second peak particle velocity does not have the potential to damage sensitive buildings or structures. A vibration study may be necessary to determine if such vibration levels will occur. If Public Works determines in consultation with CCSF Planning Department Preservation staff that vibration damage may occur, Public Works will engage a qualified historic architect or historic preservation professional to document and photograph the preconstruction condition of the building and prepare a plan for monitoring the building during construction. The monitoring plan will be submitted to and approved by CCSF Planning Department Preservation Planner prior to the beginning of construction and will be implemented during construction. The monitoring plan will identify how often monitoring will occur, who will undertake the monitoring, reporting requirements on vibration levels, reporting requirements on damage to adjacent historical resources during construction, reporting procedures to follow if such damage occurs, and the scope of the preconstruction survey and post-construction conditions assessment.</p> <p>If any damage to a historic building or structure occurs, Public Works will modify activities to minimize further vibration. If any damage occurs, the building will be repaired following the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties under the guidance of a qualified historic architect or historic preservation professional in consultation with CCSF Department Preservation Planner.</p>				

<sup>1</sup> Definitions of MMRP Column Headings:

Adopted Mitigation, Improvement or Public Works Standard Construction Measures: Full text of the mitigation measures, improvement measures or Public Works Standard Construction Measures copied verbatim from the final CEQA document.

Implementation Responsibility: Entity who is responsible for implementing the mitigation measures, improvement measures or Public Works Standard Construction Measures. In most cases this is the project sponsor and/or project's sponsor's contractor/consultant and at times under the direction of the planning department.

Mitigation Schedule: Identifies milestones for when the actions in the mitigation measure, improvement measure or Public Works Standard Construction Measure need to be implemented.

Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility: Identifies who is responsible for monitoring compliance with the mitigation measure, improvement measure or Public Works Standard Construction Measure and any reporting responsibilities. In most cases it is the Planning Department who is responsible for monitoring compliance. If a department or agency other than the planning department is identified as responsible for monitoring, there should be an expressed agreement between the planning department and that other department/agency. In most cases the project sponsor, their contractor, or consultant are responsible for any reporting requirements.

Monitoring Actions/Completion Criteria: Identifies the milestone at which the mitigation measure, improvement measure or Public Works Standard Construction Measure is considered complete. This may also identify requirements for verifying compliance.



# GENERAL PLAN REFERRAL

December 9, 2025

**Case No.:** 2025-011186GPR  
**Address:** various  
**Block/Lot No.:** various  
**Project Sponsor:** San Francisco Public Works  
**Applicant:** Bruce Robertson – (415) 601-3423  
bruce.robertson@sfdpw.org  
San Francisco Public Works  
49 South Van Ness Ave., Suite 1600  
San Francisco, CA 94115  
**Staff Contact:** Amnon Ben-Pazi – (628) 652-7428  
[Amnon.Ben-Pazi@sfgov.org](mailto:Amnon.Ben-Pazi@sfgov.org)

**Recommended By:**

Joshua Switzky, Deputy Director of Citywide Planning for  
Sarah Dennis Phillips, Director of Planning

**Recommendation:** Finding the project, on balance, is **in conformity** with the General Plan

Please note that a General Plan Referral is a determination regarding the project's consistency with the Eight Priority Policies of Planning Code Section 101.1 and conformity with the Objectives and Policies of the General Plan. This General Plan Referral is not a permit to commence any work or change occupancy. Permits from appropriate Departments must be secured before work is started or occupancy is changed.

## Project Description

The City and County of San Francisco is proposing a \$525 million Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response (ESER) Bond for the June 2026 ballot to fund seismic upgrades and much-needed improvements to aging first responder facilities and capital infrastructure (Project). These improvements will increase San Francisco's capacity to quickly respond to a major earthquake or other disaster and recover from the aftermath. The ability to respond quickly in an emergency will have a direct impact on how well San Francisco recovers after the next big earthquake.

The ESER 2026 Bond, a \$525 million General Obligation Bond for the June 2026 ballot to fund investments in public safety facilities, emergency firefighting water system, a modern bus maintenance facility, deteriorating and seismically unsafe neighborhood fire stations and police stations. Investments may include:

- 1) Renovate, expand and seismically upgrade the City's aging Emergency Firefighting Water System (EFWS). The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission will likely expand capacity to include a separate component that uses drinking water. This extension of the system can supply water for both fighting fires and for drinking. This expanded system will extend high-pressure water pipelines, hydrants and key connection points into the City's western neighborhoods, allowing firefighters to use the network as a reliable secondary defense against large-scale fires, particularly after a major earthquake when the domestic system may be damaged and service interrupted.
- 2) Repair and replace deteriorating and seismically unsafe neighborhood fire stations. ESER 2026 bond funding would be used to potentially replace deficient fire stations that do not meet seismic and life-safety requirements, making them vulnerable to failure. Examples of these fire stations may include:
  - Fire Station No. 2, 1340 Powell St.
  - Fire Station No. 7, 2300 Folsom St.
  - Fire Station No. 8, 36 Bluxome St.
  - Fire Station No. 40, 2155 18th Ave.
- 3) Make seismic, safety and operational improvements to district police stations and support facilities. One potential project could be the Taraval Police Station, which was built in 1915. This historic building has a high probability of collapsing after a major earthquake and would not be operational, potentially increasing response times and delaying service. A full seismic renovation and expansion of the westside station would create a facility that meets current life-safety codes and accommodates a growing police force.
- 4) Critical building repairs and improvements at public safety facilities. These state-of-good-repair projects would include building improvements, such as the repair or replacement of roofs and plumbing and electrical systems. These projects would focus on important public safety facilities, such as police and fire stations and other buildings that support first responders.
- 5) Replace a 110-year-old, seismically unsafe bus yard with a modern bus maintenance and storage facility to help ensure Muni has buses available to provide transit service after a disaster. The Potrero Yard Modernization Project would rebuild the facility, a converted streetcar facility into a modern, four-story, efficient bus maintenance and storage facility. It would become Muni's trolley bus hub with room to accommodate 246 electric trolley buses, 100 more than the current capacity allows. Potrero Yard does not meet modern seismic standards.

## Environmental Review

Except for the project noted below, the Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response (ESER) 2026 Bond Program is not an activity subject to CEQA because it would not result in a direct or indirect physical change in the environment pursuant to Guidelines Section 15378(b)(4). Further, CEQA Guidelines Section 15378(b)(4) provides that a project does not include the creation of government funding mechanisms or other government fiscal activities that do not involve any commitment to any specific project which may result in a potentially significant physical impact on the environment.

As to the exception noted above, the ESER 2026 Bond Program includes funding for one specific project that has already received CEQA review. The Planning Commission certified the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Potrero Yard Modernization Project on January 11, 2024 (Planning Case No. 2019-021884ENV).

If the Bond is approved, Bond-funded projects that are not yet identified or proposed would be referred to the Planning Department for separate environmental review.

## General Plan Compliance and Basis for Recommendation

As described below, the Project is consistent with the Eight Priority Policies of Planning Code Section 101.1 and is, on balance, in conformity with the Objectives and Policies of the General Plan.

Note: General Plan Objectives are shown in **BOLD UPPER CASE** font; Policies are in **Bold** font; staff comments are in *italic* font.

### SAFETY AND RESILIENCE ELEMENT

#### OBJECTIVE 3.1

**EXISTING BUILDINGS. ENSURE RETROFITS AND RENOVATIONS TO EXISTING STRUCTURES INCREASE BUILDING LONGEVITY AND MEET CURRENT BEST PRACTICES TO PROTECT OCCUPANTS AND STRUCTURES.**

#### POLICY 3.1.3

**Abate structural and non-structural hazards in City-owned properties.**

#### OBJECTIVE 3.3

**INFRASTRUCTURE AND PUBLIC REALM. ENSURE THE CITY'S LIFELINE SYSTEMS, TRANSPORTATION AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE FACILITIES, UTILITIES, STREETS, PUBLIC SPACES, AND COASTS CAN WITHSTAND AND ADAPT TO ALL HAZARDS.**

#### POLICY 3.3.1

**Reduce the risk of all hazards to community facilities and lifeline infrastructure, starting with Environmental Justice Communities.**

#### POLICY 3.3.2

**Identify and replace vulnerable infrastructure and critical service lifelines in high-risk areas.**

**POLICY 3.3.3**

**Conduct capital planning to advance resilient infrastructure prioritizing life safety and functional recovery, as well as the needs of Environmental Justice Communities and other vulnerable people.**

**OBJECTIVE 3.4**

**CITY AGENCY CAPABILITIES. PLAN FOR THE OPERATIONAL, DATA, AND LOGISTICAL CAPACITIES NEEDED TO FACILITATE COMMUNITY SAFETY DURING THE RESPONSE, RECOVERY, AND RECONSTRUCTION PHASES OF ALL HAZARDS.**

**POLICY 4.2.5**

**Utilize the City's and region's transit network to facilitate response and recovery during and after a disaster.**

**OBJECTIVE 5.1**

**LIFELINES. PROVIDE CRITICAL INFORMATION AND SERVICES TO PREVENT FURTHER LOSS OF LIFE AND ESTABLISH COMMUNITY SAFETY DURING THE IMMEDIATE AFTERMATH OF DISASTERS.**

**POLICY 5.1.1**

**Ensure the City's lifeline systems are constantly maintained to be in a state of good repair.**

*The Project is a component of the City's capital planning process to advance resilient infrastructure, prioritizing life safety and functional recovery. It would provide funding for seismic upgrades and other improvements to increase longevity of existing City properties and protect their occupants, and to ensure that lifeline systems, transportation and emergency response facilities can withstand seismic hazards. The Project would:*

- *Renovate, expand and provide seismic upgrades to the City's Emergency Firefighting Water System (EFWS) and related facilities, a crucial lifeline system, for more effective firefighting and to ensure full operation during and after a major seismic event or other disaster.*
- *Repair, replace and provide seismic upgrades to firefighting facilities and infrastructure, police facilities and infrastructure, and public safety facilities and infrastructure, to increase building longevity, protect occupants, and ensure full operation during and after a major seismic event or other disaster.*
- *Replace the 110-year-old, seismically unsafe Muni bus storage and maintenance facility at Potrero Yard with a modern bus maintenance and storage facility, to protect occupants and ensure that the City's transit network is functional and can be utilized for response and recovery during and after a disaster.*

**COMMUNITY FACILITIES ELEMENT****OBJECTIVE 1**

**DISTRIBUTE, LOCATE, AND DESIGN POLICE FACILITIES IN A MANNER THAT WILL ENHANCE THE EFFECTIVE, EFFICIENT AND RESPONSIVE PERFORMANCE OF POLICE FUNCTIONS.**

**POLICY 1.6**

**Design facilities to allow for flexibility, future expansion, full operation in the event of a seismic emergency, and security and safety for personnel, while still maintaining an inviting appearance that is in scale with neighborhood development.**

*The Project would repair, replace and provide seismic upgrades to police facilities and infrastructure, including without limitation district police stations, to enable them to remain in full operation in the event of a seismic emergency.*

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ELEMENT

### OBJECTIVE 5

#### **ASSURE A PERMANENT AND ADEQUATE SUPPLY OF FRESH WATER TO MEET THE PRESENT AND FUTURE NEEDS OF SAN FRANCISCO.**

##### **POLICY 5.5**

**Improve and extend the Auxiliary Water Supply system of the Fire Department for more effective fire fighting.**

*The Project would renovate, expand and provide seismic upgrades to the City's Emergency Firefighting Water System (formerly known as the Auxiliary Water Supply system) and related facilities, for more effective firefighting and to ensure full operation during and after a major seismic event or other disaster.*

## Planning Code Section 101 Findings

Planning Code Section 101.1 establishes Eight Priority Policies and requires review of discretionary approvals and permits for consistency with said policies. The Project is found to be consistent with the Eight Priority Policies as set forth in Planning Code Section 101.1 for the following reasons:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;

*The improvement and expansion of seismically vulnerable public safety facilities would not interfere with any existing neighborhood-serving retail uses.*

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

*The improvement and expansion of SFPD, SFFD, and MTA facilities and PUC infrastructure would not convert any existing residential uses to non-residential uses, and will provide improved services to affected neighborhoods, especially in the case of public safety and transit response in following a disaster event.*

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

*The improvement and expansion of SFPD, SFFD and MTA facilities would not convert any existing*

affordable housing to non-residential uses. The MTA Potrero Yard project may create approximately 100 new affordable housing units. The Project would help preserve the City's supply of affordable housing by ensuring that firefighting can operate during and after a major seismic event or other disaster.

4. That commuter traffic not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

*The Project would not overburden streets or neighborhood parking. It would help preserve MUNI service by replacing the Potrero bus yard with a modern bus maintenance and storage facility, protecting occupants and ensuring transit can operate after a disaster.*

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

*The improvement and expansion of SFFD and SFPD facilities would not convert any existing industrial and service sectors to commercial office space. The Project would help protect the City's industrial and service sectors by increasing the ability of the City's firefighting, police, transit, and other lifeline services to operate during and after a major seismic event or other disaster.*

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

*The Project's proposed seismic improvements would significantly improve the City's earthquake preparedness and response.*

7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved;

*The Project would fund the replacement of the 110-year-old, seismically unsafe Muni Bus Storage and Maintenance Facility at Potrero Yard, which may result in the loss of potentially historic structures. The Project may fund rehabilitation and preservation of historic neighborhood fire stations and/or police stations.*

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development;

*The Project would have no effect on the City's parks and open space.*

**Recommendation: Finding the Project, on balance, is in conformity with the General Plan**




---

## MEMORANDUM

---

Date: December 12, 2025  
 To: Planning Department / Commission  
 From: Brent Jalipa, Clerk of the Budget and Finance Committee  
 Subject: Board of Supervisors Legislation Referral - File No. 251216 - General Obligation Bond  
 Election - Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response - Not to Exceed \$535,000,000 and  
 File No. 251217 - General Obligation Bonds - Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response  
 - Not to Exceed \$535,000,000

<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Determination  <i>(California Public Resources Code, Sections 21000 et seq.)</i></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ordinance / Resolution</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Ballot Measure</p>	<p>CEQA clearance under General Plan Referral issued on 12/9/2025 (Case Number 2025-011186GPR).</p> <p style="text-align: right;">12/18/2025      <i>Don Lewis</i></p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Amendment to the Planning Code, including the following Findings:  <i>(Planning Code, Section 302(b): 90 days for Planning Commission review)</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> General Plan    <input type="checkbox"/> Planning Code, Section 101.1    <input type="checkbox"/> Planning Code, Section 302</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Amendment to the Administrative Code, involving Land Use/Planning  <i>(Board Rule 3.23: 30 days for possible Planning Department review)</i></p>	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Plan Referral for Non-Planning Code Amendments  <i>(Charter, Section 4.105, and Administrative Code, Section 2A.53)</i></p> <p>(Required for legislation concerning the acquisition, vacation, sale, or change in use of City property; subdivision of land; construction, improvement, extension, widening, narrowing, removal, or relocation of public ways, transportation routes, ground, open space, buildings, or structures; plans for public housing and publicly-assisted private housing; redevelopment plans; development agreements; the annual capital expenditure plan and six-year capital improvement program; and any capital improvement project or long-term financing proposal such as general obligation or revenue bonds.)</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Historic Preservation Commission</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Landmark <i>(Planning Code, Section 1004.3)</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Districts <i>(Charter, Section 4.135 &amp; Board Rule 3.23)</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mills Act Contract <i>(Government Code, Section 50280)</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Designation for Significant/Contributory Buildings <i>(Planning Code, Article 11)</i></p>	

Please send the Planning Department/Commission recommendation/determination to Brent Jalipa at [Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org](mailto:Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org).



## MEMORANDUM

TO: Carol Isen, Director, Department of Human Resources

FROM: Brent Jalipa, Assistant Clerk, Budget and Finance Committee  
Board of Supervisors

DATE: December 12, 2025

SUBJECT: LEGISLATION INTRODUCED – MEET AND CONFER DETERMINATION

---

The Board of Supervisors' Budget and Finance has received the following Legislation. This matter is being **referred** to you as it may require the Department of Human Resources to fulfill "**Meet and Confer**" requirements. Please review, assess the impact and provide proper noticing as required and report back to on the status of the "Meet and Confer" requirement.

**File No. 251216**

**Ordinance calling and providing for a special election to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, June 2, 2026, for the purpose of submitting to San Francisco voters a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of up to \$535,000,000 to finance the construction, acquisition, improvement, rehabilitation, renovation, expansion, and seismic retrofitting of the Emergency Firefighting Water System, Firefighting Facilities and Infrastructure, Police Facilities and Infrastructure, transportation facilities for the Municipal Railway Bus Storage and Maintenance Facility at Potrero Yard, and other Public Safety Facilities and Infrastructure for earthquake and public safety and related costs necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes (collectively, the "ESER Facilities"); authorizing landlords to pass-through 50% of the resulting property tax increase, if any, to residential tenants in accordance with Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code; finding that the estimated cost of such proposed ESER Facilities is and will be too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefor by the annual tax levy; reciting the estimated cost of such proposed ESER Facilities; fixing the date of election and the manner of holding such election and the procedure for voting for or against the proposition; fixing the maximum rate of interest on such bonds and providing for the levy and collection of taxes to pay both principal and interest; prescribing notice to**

be given of such election; finding that portions of the bond proposal are not a “project” under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and adopting findings under CEQA for the remaining portion of the bond proposal; finding that the bond proposal is in conformity with the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1(b) and is consistent with the General Plan; consolidating the special election with the general election; establishing the election precincts, voting places, and officers for the election; waiving the word limitation on ballot propositions imposed by Municipal Elections Code, Section 510; complying with the restrictions on the use of bond proceeds specified in Section 53410 of the California Government Code; incorporating the provisions of the Administrative Code, Sections 5.30-5.36; and waiving the time requirements specified in Section 2.34 of the Administrative Code.

**File No. 251217**

Resolution determining and declaring that the public interest and necessity demand the construction, acquisition, improvement, rehabilitation, expansion, renovation, and seismic retrofitting of the Emergency Firefighting Water System, Firefighting Facilities and Infrastructure, Police Facilities and Infrastructure, transportation facilities for the Municipal Railway Bus Storage and Maintenance Facility at Potrero Yard, and other Public Safety Facilities and Infrastructure for earthquake and public safety and related costs necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes (collectively, the “ESER Facilities”); authorizing landlords to pass-through 50% of the resulting property tax increase, if any, to residential tenants in accordance with Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code; finding that the estimated cost of \$535,000,000 for the proposed ESER Facilities is and will be too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefore by the annual tax levy; finding that portions of the bond proposal are not a “project” under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and adopting findings under CEQA for the remaining portion of the bond proposal; finding that the proposed bond is in conformity and consistent with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1(b); and waiving the time requirements specified in Section 2.34 of the Administrative Code.

If you have any questions or concerns, please call me at (415) 554-7712 or email: [brent.jalipa@sfgov.org](mailto:brent.jalipa@sfgov.org). To submit documentation, please email or forward to me at the Board of Supervisors, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102.

\*\*\*\*\*

\*

**RESPONSE FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES - Date:**  
**12/16/2025**

**Meet and Confer requirement has been fulfilled.**

**Meet and Confer requirement not applicable.**

**Additional information attached.**

*Kate Howard*

---

**Department of Human Resources**

c: Aliya Chisti, Department of Human Resources  
Kate Howard, Department of Human Resources  
Ardis Graham, Department of Human Resources

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall

Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco 94102-4689  
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184  
Fax No. (415) 554-5163  
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

December 12, 2025

**File Nos. 251216 and 251217**

Sarah Dennis Phillips, Director  
Planning Department  
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400  
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Director Dennis Phillips:

The Board of Supervisors' Budget and Finance Committee has received the following General Obligation Bond legislation for the June 2, 2026, Election, introduced by Mayor Daniel Lurie:

**File No. 251216**

**Ordinance calling and providing for a special election to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, June 2, 2026, for the purpose of submitting to San Francisco voters a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of up to \$535,000,000 to finance the construction, acquisition, improvement, rehabilitation, renovation, expansion, and seismic retrofitting of the Emergency Firefighting Water System, Firefighting Facilities and Infrastructure, Police Facilities and Infrastructure, transportation facilities for the Municipal Railway Bus Storage and Maintenance Facility at Potrero Yard, and other Public Safety Facilities and Infrastructure for earthquake and public safety and related costs necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes (collectively, the "ESER Facilities"); authorizing landlords to pass-through 50% of the resulting property tax increase, if any, to residential tenants in accordance with Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code; finding that the estimated cost of such proposed ESER Facilities is and will be too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefor by the annual tax levy; reciting the estimated cost of such proposed ESER Facilities; fixing the date of election and the manner of holding such election and the procedure for voting for or against the proposition; fixing the maximum rate of interest on such bonds and providing for the levy and collection of taxes to pay both principal and interest; prescribing notice to be given of such election; finding that portions of the bond proposal are not a "project" under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and adopting findings under CEQA for the remaining portion of the bond**

proposal; finding that the bond proposal is in conformity with the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1(b) and is consistent with the General Plan; consolidating the special election with the general election; establishing the election precincts, voting places, and officers for the election; waiving the word limitation on ballot propositions imposed by Municipal Elections Code, Section 510; complying with the restrictions on the use of bond proceeds specified in Section 53410 of the California Government Code; incorporating the provisions of the Administrative Code, Sections 5.30-5.36; and waiving the time requirements specified in Section 2.34 of the Administrative Code.

File No. 251217

Resolution determining and declaring that the public interest and necessity demand the construction, acquisition, improvement, rehabilitation, expansion, renovation, and seismic retrofitting of the Emergency Firefighting Water System, Firefighting Facilities and Infrastructure, Police Facilities and Infrastructure, transportation facilities for the Municipal Railway Bus Storage and Maintenance Facility at Potrero Yard, and other Public Safety Facilities and Infrastructure for earthquake and public safety and related costs necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes (collectively, the “ESER Facilities”); authorizing landlords to pass-through 50% of the resulting property tax increase, if any, to residential tenants in accordance with Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code; finding that the estimated cost of \$535,000,000 for the proposed ESER Facilities is and will be too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefore by the annual tax levy; finding that portions of the bond proposal are not a “project” under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and adopting findings under CEQA for the remaining portion of the bond proposal; finding that the proposed bond is in conformity and consistent with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1(b); and waiving the time requirements specified in Section 2.34 of the Administrative Code.

The proposed ordinance and resolution are being transmitted to the Planning Department for review and determination under the California Environmental Quality Act, and consistency with the City's General Plan and eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1. The ordinance is pending before the Budget and Finance Committee and will be scheduled for hearing following receipt of your response.

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

*Brent Jalipa*

By: Brent Jalipa, Assistant Clerk  
Budget and Finance Committee

Attachment

c: Jonas Ionin, Director of Commission Affairs  
Dan Sider, Chief of Staff  
Aaron Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs  
Josh Switzky, Acting Director of Citywide Planning  
Tina Tam, Deputy Zoning Administrator  
Corey Teague, Zoning Administrator  
Lisa Gibson, Environmental Review Officer  
Joy Navarrete, Environmental Planning  
Don Lewis, Environmental Planning  
Debra Dwyer, Principal Environmental Planner  
Elizabeth Watty, Current Planning Division



---

## MEMORANDUM

---

Date: December 12, 2025  
To: Planning Department / Commission  
From: Brent Jalipa, Clerk of the Budget and Finance Committee  
Subject: Board of Supervisors Legislation Referral - File No. 251216 - General Obligation Bond Election - Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response - Not to Exceed \$535,000,000 and File No. 251217 - General Obligation Bonds - Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response - Not to Exceed \$535,000,000

- California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Determination  
(*California Public Resources Code, Sections 21000 et seq.*)
  - Ordinance / Resolution
  - Ballot Measure
- Amendment to the Planning Code, including the following Findings:  
(*Planning Code, Section 302(b): 90 days for Planning Commission review*)
  - General Plan
  - Planning Code, Section 101.1
  - Planning Code, Section 302
- Amendment to the Administrative Code, involving Land Use/Planning  
(*Board Rule 3.23: 30 days for possible Planning Department review*)
- General Plan Referral for Non-Planning Code Amendments  
(*Charter, Section 4.105, and Administrative Code, Section 2A.53*)  
(Required for legislation concerning the acquisition, vacation, sale, or change in use of City property; subdivision of land; construction, improvement, extension, widening, narrowing, removal, or relocation of public ways, transportation routes, ground, open space, buildings, or structures; plans for public housing and publicly-assisted private housing; redevelopment plans; development agreements; the annual capital expenditure plan and six-year capital improvement program; and any capital improvement project or long-term financing proposal such as general obligation or revenue bonds.)
- Historic Preservation Commission
  - Landmark (*Planning Code, Section 1004.3*)
  - Cultural Districts (*Charter, Section 4.135 & Board Rule 3.23*)
  - Mills Act Contract (*Government Code, Section 50280*)
  - Designation for Significant/Contributory Buildings (*Planning Code, Article 11*)

Please send the Planning Department/Commission recommendation/determination to Brent Jalipa at [Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org](mailto:Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org).

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall

Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco 94102-4689  
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184  
Fax No. (415) 554-5163  
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Adam Thongsavat, Liaison to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor's Office  
Brad Russi, Deputy City Attorney, Office of the City Attorney  
John Arntz, Director, Department of Elections  
Patrick Ford, Executive Director, Ethics Commission  
Carmen Chu, City Administrator, Office of the City Administrator  
Katy Tang, Director, Office of Small Business  
Dean Crispen, Fire Chief, Fire Department  
Paul Yep, Interim Police Chief, Police Department  
Julie Kirschbaum, Director of Transportation, Municipal Transportation Agency  
Brian Strong, Program Director, Office of Resilience of Capital Planning  
Christina Varner, Executive Director, Rent Board

FROM: Brent Jalipa, Assistant Clerk, Budget and Finance Committee  
Board of Supervisors

DATE: December 12, 2025

SUBJECT: GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND INTRODUCED  
June 2, 2026 Election

---

The Board of Supervisors' Budget and Finance Committee has received the following General Obligation Bond legislation for the June 2, 2026, Election, introduced by Mayor Daniel Lurie.

File No. 251216

Ordinance calling and providing for a special election to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, June 2, 2026, for the purpose of submitting to San Francisco voters a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of up to \$535,000,000 to finance the construction, acquisition, improvement, rehabilitation, renovation, expansion, and seismic retrofitting of the Emergency Firefighting Water System, Firefighting Facilities and Infrastructure, Police Facilities and Infrastructure, transportation facilities for the Municipal Railway (“Muni”) Bus Storage and Maintenance Facility at Potrero Yard, and other Public Safety Facilities and Infrastructure for earthquake and public safety and related costs necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes (collectively, the “ESER Facilities”); authorizing landlords to pass-through 50% of the resulting property tax increase, if any, to residential tenants in accordance with Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code; finding that the estimated cost of such proposed ESER Facilities is and will be too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefor by the annual tax levy; reciting the estimated cost of such proposed ESER Facilities; fixing the date of election and the manner of holding such election and the procedure for voting for or against the proposition; fixing the maximum rate of interest on such bonds and providing for the levy and collection of taxes to pay both principal and interest; prescribing notice to be given of such election; finding that portions of the bond proposal are not a “project” under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and adopting findings under CEQA for the remaining portion of the bond proposal; finding that the bond proposal is in conformity with the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1(b) and is consistent with the General Plan; consolidating the special election with the general election; establishing the election precincts, voting places, and officers for the election; waiving the word limitation on ballot propositions imposed by Municipal Elections Code, Section 510; complying with the restrictions on the use of bond proceeds specified in Section 53410 of the California Government Code; incorporating the provisions of the Administrative Code, Sections 5.30–5.36; and waiving the time requirements specified in Section 2.34 of the Administrative Code.

**File No. 251217**

**Resolution determining and declaring that the public interest and necessity demand the construction, acquisition, improvement, rehabilitation, expansion, renovation, and seismic retrofitting of the Emergency Firefighting Water System, Firefighting Facilities and Infrastructure, Police Facilities and Infrastructure, transportation facilities for the Municipal Railway Bus Storage and Maintenance Facility at Potrero Yard, and other Public Safety Facilities and Infrastructure for earthquake and public safety and related costs necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes (collectively, the “ESER Facilities”); authorizing landlords to pass-through 50% of the resulting property tax increase, if any, to residential tenants in accordance with Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code; finding that the estimated cost of \$535,000,000 for the proposed ESER Facilities is and will be too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefore by the annual tax levy; finding that portions of the bond proposal are not a “project” under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and adopting findings under CEQA for the remaining portion of the bond proposal; finding that the proposed bond is in conformity and consistent with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1(b); and waiving the time requirements specified in Section 2.34 of the Administrative Code.**

Please review and submit any reports or comments you wish to be included with the legislative file.

If you have any questions or concerns, please call me at (415) 554-7712 or email: [brent.jalipa@sfgov.org](mailto:brent.jalipa@sfgov.org). To submit documentation, please forward to me at the Board of Supervisors, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102.

c: Aly Bonde, Mayor’s Office  
Michael Canning, Ethics Commission  
Sophie Hayward, Office of the City Administrator  
Vivian Po, Office of the City Administrator  
Angela Yip, Office of the City Administrator  
Kerry Birnbach, Office of Small Business  
Theresa Ludwig, Fire Department  
Steven Lopez, Police Department  
Cal Nicita, Police Department  
Giannina Miranda, Police Department  
Janet Martinsen, Municipal Transportation Agency  
Joel Ramos, Municipal Transportation Agency

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall  
Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco 94102-4689  
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184  
Fax No. (415) 554-5163  
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Greg Wagner, City Controller, Office of the Controller

FROM: Brent Jalipa, Assistant Clerk, Budget and Finance Committee  
Board of Supervisors

DATE: December 12, 2025

SUBJECT: GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND INTRODUCED  
June 2, 2026 Election

---

The Board of Supervisors' Budget and Finance Committee has received the following General Obligation Bond legislation for the June 2, 2026, Election, introduced by Mayor Daniel Lurie. These matters are being referred to you in accordance with Administrative Code 2.33.

### File No. 251216

**Ordinance calling and providing for a special election to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, June 2, 2026, for the purpose of submitting to San Francisco voters a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of up to \$535,000,000 to finance the construction, acquisition, improvement, rehabilitation, renovation, expansion, and seismic retrofitting of the Emergency Firefighting Water System, Firefighting Facilities and Infrastructure, Police Facilities and Infrastructure, transportation facilities for the Municipal Railway Bus Storage and Maintenance Facility at Potrero Yard, and other Public Safety Facilities and Infrastructure for earthquake and public safety and related costs necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes (collectively, the "ESER Facilities"); authorizing landlords to pass-through 50% of the resulting property tax increase, if any, to residential tenants in accordance with Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code; finding that the estimated cost of such proposed ESER Facilities is and will be too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefor by the annual tax levy; reciting the estimated cost of such proposed ESER Facilities; fixing the date of election and the manner of holding such election and the procedure for voting for or against the proposition; fixing the maximum rate of interest on such bonds and providing for the levy and collection of taxes to pay both principal and interest; prescribing notice to be given of such election; finding that portions of the bond proposal are not a "project" under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and adopting findings under**

CEQA for the remaining portion of the bond proposal; finding that the bond proposal is in conformity with the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1(b) and is consistent with the General Plan; consolidating the special election with the general election; establishing the election precincts, voting places, and officers for the election; waiving the word limitation on ballot propositions imposed by Municipal Elections Code, Section 510; complying with the restrictions on the use of bond proceeds specified in Section 53410 of the California Government Code; incorporating the provisions of the Administrative Code, Sections 5.30-5.36; and waiving the time requirements specified in Section 2.34 of the Administrative Code.

**File No. 251217**

**Resolution determining and declaring that the public interest and necessity demand the construction, acquisition, improvement, rehabilitation, expansion, renovation, and seismic retrofitting of the Emergency Firefighting Water System, Firefighting Facilities and Infrastructure, Police Facilities and Infrastructure, transportation facilities for the Municipal Railway Bus Storage and Maintenance Facility at Potrero Yard, and other Public Safety Facilities and Infrastructure for earthquake and public safety and related costs necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes (collectively, the “ESER Facilities”); authorizing landlords to pass-through 50% of the resulting property tax increase, if any, to residential tenants in accordance with Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code; finding that the estimated cost of \$535,000,000 for the proposed ESER Facilities is and will be too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefore by the annual tax levy; finding that portions of the bond proposal are not a “project” under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and adopting findings under CEQA for the remaining portion of the bond proposal; finding that the proposed bond is in conformity and consistent with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1(b); and waiving the time requirements specified in Section 2.34 of the Administrative Code.**

Please review and prepare a financial analysis of the proposed measure prior to the first Budget and Finance Committee hearing.

If you have any questions or concerns, please call me at (415) 554-7712 or email: [brent.jalipa@sfgov.org](mailto:brent.jalipa@sfgov.org). To submit documentation, please forward to me at the Board of Supervisors, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102.

c: ChiaYu Ma, Deputy City Controller  
Ayeesha Hossain, Administrative Analyst  
Claire Stone, Manager of Special Projects & Key Initiatives  
Natasha Mihal, City Performance Director  
Janice Levy, Office of the Controller



## MEMORANDUM

TO: Carol Isen, Director, Department of Human Resources

FROM: Brent Jalipa, Assistant Clerk, Budget and Finance Committee  
Board of Supervisors

DATE: December 12, 2025

SUBJECT: LEGISLATION INTRODUCED – MEET AND CONFER DETERMINATION

---

The Board of Supervisors' Budget and Finance has received the following Legislation. This matter is being **referred** to you as it may require the Department of Human Resources to fulfill "**Meet and Confer**" requirements. Please review, assess the impact and provide proper noticing as required and report back to on the status of the "Meet and Confer" requirement.

**File No. 251216**

**Ordinance calling and providing for a special election to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, June 2, 2026, for the purpose of submitting to San Francisco voters a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of up to \$535,000,000 to finance the construction, acquisition, improvement, rehabilitation, renovation, expansion, and seismic retrofitting of the Emergency Firefighting Water System, Firefighting Facilities and Infrastructure, Police Facilities and Infrastructure, transportation facilities for the Municipal Railway Bus Storage and Maintenance Facility at Potrero Yard, and other Public Safety Facilities and Infrastructure for earthquake and public safety and related costs necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes (collectively, the "ESER Facilities"); authorizing landlords to pass-through 50% of the resulting property tax increase, if any, to residential tenants in accordance with Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code; finding that the estimated cost of such proposed ESER Facilities is and will be too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefor by the annual tax levy; reciting the estimated cost of such proposed ESER Facilities; fixing the date of election and the manner of holding such election and the procedure for voting for or against the proposition; fixing the maximum rate of interest on such bonds and providing for the levy and collection of taxes to pay both principal and interest; prescribing notice to**

be given of such election; finding that portions of the bond proposal are not a “project” under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and adopting findings under CEQA for the remaining portion of the bond proposal; finding that the bond proposal is in conformity with the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1(b) and is consistent with the General Plan; consolidating the special election with the general election; establishing the election precincts, voting places, and officers for the election; waiving the word limitation on ballot propositions imposed by Municipal Elections Code, Section 510; complying with the restrictions on the use of bond proceeds specified in Section 53410 of the California Government Code; incorporating the provisions of the Administrative Code, Sections 5.30-5.36; and waiving the time requirements specified in Section 2.34 of the Administrative Code.

**File No. 251217**

Resolution determining and declaring that the public interest and necessity demand the construction, acquisition, improvement, rehabilitation, expansion, renovation, and seismic retrofitting of the Emergency Firefighting Water System, Firefighting Facilities and Infrastructure, Police Facilities and Infrastructure, transportation facilities for the Municipal Railway Bus Storage and Maintenance Facility at Potrero Yard, and other Public Safety Facilities and Infrastructure for earthquake and public safety and related costs necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes (collectively, the “ESER Facilities”); authorizing landlords to pass-through 50% of the resulting property tax increase, if any, to residential tenants in accordance with Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code; finding that the estimated cost of \$535,000,000 for the proposed ESER Facilities is and will be too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefore by the annual tax levy; finding that portions of the bond proposal are not a “project” under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and adopting findings under CEQA for the remaining portion of the bond proposal; finding that the proposed bond is in conformity and consistent with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1(b); and waiving the time requirements specified in Section 2.34 of the Administrative Code.

If you have any questions or concerns, please call me at (415) 554-7712 or email: [brent.jalipa@sfgov.org](mailto:brent.jalipa@sfgov.org). To submit documentation, please email or forward to me at the Board of Supervisors, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102.

\*\*\*\*\*

**RESPONSE FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES - Date: \_\_\_\_\_**

- Meet and Confer requirement has been fulfilled.**
- Meet and Confer requirement not applicable.**
- Additional information attached.**

---

**Department of Human Resources**

c: Aliya Chisti, Department of Human Resources  
Kate Howard, Department of Human Resources  
Ardis Graham, Department of Human Resources

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR  
SAN FRANCISCO



DANIEL LURIE  
MAYOR

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors  
FROM: Adam Thongsavat, Liaison to the Board of Supervisors  
RE: General Obligation Bonds - Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response \$535,000,000  
DATE: December 9, 2025

---

Resolution determining and declaring that the public interest and necessity demand the construction, acquisition, improvement, rehabilitation, expansion, renovation, and seismic retrofitting of the Emergency Firefighting Water System, Firefighting Facilities and Infrastructure, Police Facilities and Infrastructure, transportation facilities for the Municipal Railway Bus Storage and Maintenance Facility at Potrero Yard, and other Public Safety Facilities and Infrastructure for earthquake and public safety and related costs necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes (collectively, the "ESER Facilities"); authorizing landlords to pass-through 50% of the resulting property tax increase, if any, to residential tenants in accordance with Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code; finding that the estimated cost of \$535,000,000 for the proposed ESER Facilities is and will be too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefor by the annual tax levy; finding that portions of the bond proposal are not a "project" under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and adopting findings under CEQA for the remaining portion of the bond proposal; finding that the proposed bond is in conformity with the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1(b), and is consistent with the General Plan; and waiving the time requirements specified in Section 2.34 of the Administrative Code.

Should you have any questions, please contact Adam Thongsavat at [adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org](mailto:adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org)