



PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 21220

HEARING DATE: DECEMBER 15, 2022

Project Name: Housing Element 2022 Update: Adoption of CEQA Findings, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and General Plan Findings
Case Number: 2019-016230GPA
Initiated by: Planning Commission
Staff Contact: James Pappas, Senior Planner
James.Pappas@sfgov.org, (628) 6527425
Reviewed by: Miriam Chion, Director of Community Equity
Miriam.Chion@sfgov.org, 628-652-7437

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; ADOPTING A MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM; AND ADOPTING FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN AND PRIORITY POLICIES OF THE PLANNING CODE, IN CONNECTION WITH THE ADOPTION OF THE HOUSING ELEMENT 2022 UPDATE AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO THE AIR QUALITY, COMMERCE & INDUSTRY, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, AND URBAN DESIGN ELEMENTS.

WHEREAS, Section 4.105 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco mandates that the Planning Commission (“Commission”) shall periodically recommend to the Board of Supervisors for approval or rejection proposed amendments to the General Plan; and

WHEREAS, in compliance with State law, the San Francisco Planning Department (“Department”) is seeking to update the Housing Element of the San Francisco General Plan, and to make amendments to the Air Quality, Commerce & Industry, Environmental Protection, and Urban Design Elements of the San Francisco General Plan to conform with the Housing Element amendments; and

WHEREAS, the Housing Element must be updated and submitted to the State of California every eight years by state law; and

WHEREAS, The Department led the Housing Element 2022 Update preparation in coordination with multiple city agencies through a comprehensive community-based planning effort. The Department worked closely with community members and leaders, subject-matter experts, City agencies, regional agencies, and state agencies to develop goals, objectives, and policies for the Housing Element 2022 Update; and

WHEREAS, The City is the lead agency responsible for the implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, California Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq., (“CEQA”), the Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, 14 California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq. (“CEQA Guidelines”); and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors has delegated implementation of CEQA to the Department through Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code (“Chapter 31”); and

WHEREAS, the Department commenced the CEQA process for the Housing Element 2022 Update in June 2021; and

WHEREAS, On April 20, 2022, the Department published the draft EIR (“DEIR”) for the Housing Element 2022 Update; 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; and mailed this notice to the Department’s list of persons requesting such notice, individuals who submitted comments on the notice of preparation of an EIR, the State Clearinghouse, and local agencies/departments/jurisdictions including decisionmakers. Hard copies of the document were mailed to individuals who requested physical copies; and

WHEREAS, The Commission held a duly advertised public hearing on the DEIR on June 9, 2022, 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 July 12, 2022; and

WHEREAS, the Department prepared responses to comments on the DEIR and published the Comments and Responses document on November 2, 2022, which together with the DEIR constitute the Final Environmental Impact Report (“FEIR”). The FEIR files and other Project-related Department files have been available for review by the Planning Commission and the public, and those files are part of the record before this Commission; and

WHEREAS, The Commission, at a duly noticed public hearing on November 17, 2022, by Motion NO. 21206, reviewed and considered the FEIR and found that the contents of said report and the procedures through which the FEIR was prepared, publicized, and reviewed complied with the provisions of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31; and

Whereas, the Commission by Motion No. 21206, also certified the FEIR and found that the FEIR was adequate, accurate, and objective, reflected the independent judgment of the Commission and that the Comments and Responses document contains no significant revisions to the DEIR that would have required recirculation under CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, and adopted findings of significant impacts associated with the Project and certified the completion of the FEIR for the Project in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines.

WHEREAS, the Commission will consider adoption of the Housing Element 2022 Update as the Housing Element of the San Francisco General Plan at a duly noticed public hearing on December 15, 2022; and

WHEREAS, the Department prepared proposed Findings, as required by CEQA, regarding the alternatives, mitigation measures and significant environmental impacts analyzed in the FEIR and a statement of overriding considerations related to the adoption of the Housing Element 2022 Update, attached hereto as Attachment A, and a proposed Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (“MMRP”), attached hereto as Attachment B, which material was made available to the public and this Planning Commission for the Planning Commission’s review, consideration and actions; and

WHEREAS, the Department prepared Findings of Consistency with the San Francisco General Plan and Priority Policies of the San Francisco Planning Code, attached hereto as Attachment C, which material was also made available to the public and the Planning Commission for its review, consideration and actions; and now

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the FEIR and the actions associated with adoption of the Housing Element 2022 Update as the Housing Element of the San Francisco General Plan, and hereby adopts the CEQA Findings attached hereto as Attachment A, including a statement of overriding considerations; the MMRP attached hereto as Attachment B; and the Consistency Findings attached hereto as Attachment C.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Commission at its meeting on December 15, 2022.



Jonas P Ionin Digitally signed by Jonas P Ionin
Date: 2022.12.16 15:47:18 -0800

Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES: Braun, Diamond, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

RECUSED: Ruiz

ADOPTED: December 15, 2022

ATTACHMENT A

San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update

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 San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update (housing element update or proposed action), described in Section I, Project Description, below, the San Francisco Planning Commission (Planning Commission) makes and adopts the following findings of fact and decisions regarding the significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed action, as well as mitigation measures and alternatives, and adopts the statement of overriding considerations, based on substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding and pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), California Public Resources Code section 21000 et seq., particularly sections 21081 and 21081.5; the Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, 14 California Code of Regulations section 15000 et seq. (CEQA Guidelines), particularly sections 15091 through 15093; and chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code (administrative code). The Planning 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 Planning Commission's certification of the proposed action's final environmental impact report (final EIR), which the Planning Commission certified prior to adopting these CEQA findings.

These findings are organized as follows:

- **Section I** provides a description of the proposed action, the environmental review process for the proposed action, the City and County of San Francisco (city) approval actions to be taken, and the location and custodian of the record.
- **Section II** identifies the proposed action's less-than-significant impacts that do not require mitigation.
- **Section III** identifies potentially significant impacts that can be avoided or reduced to less-than-significant levels through mitigation and describes the disposition of the mitigation measures.
- **Section IV** identifies significant proposed action-specific or cumulative impacts that would not be eliminated or reduced to a less-than-significant level, and describes any applicable mitigation measures as well as the disposition of the mitigation measures.
- **Section V** evaluates the different alternatives to the proposed action and the economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations that support approval of the proposed action and the rejection of the alternatives, or elements thereof.

- **Section VI** evaluates Plan Bay Area 2050 and the economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations that support approval of the proposed action and the rejection of Plan Bay Area 2050, or elements thereof.
- **Section VII** presents a statement of overriding considerations pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15093, which sets forth specific reasons in support of the Planning Commission’s actions and its rejection of the alternatives to the proposed action.

The mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP) for the mitigation measures that have been proposed for adoption is attached with these findings as Attachment B to Planning Commission motion No. [_____]. The MMRP is required by CEQA section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines section 15091. The MMRP provides a table setting forth each mitigation measure listed in the Final EIR that is required to reduce or avoid a significant adverse impact. Attachment B also specifies the agency responsible for implementation of each measure and establishes monitoring actions and a monitoring schedule. The full text of the mitigation measures is set forth in Attachment B.

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

SECTION I. Project Description and Procedural Background

A. Housing Element Legal Requirements

The housing element is one of the seven required elements in a general plan. Its required contents are set forth in California Government Code section 65583. Housing element law requires local governments to adequately plan to meet their existing and projected housing needs, including their share of the “regional housing need,” described below. The law recognizes that in order for the private sector to adequately address housing needs and demand, local governments must adopt land use plans and regulatory schemes that provide opportunities for, and do not unduly constrain, housing development. Specifically, section 65583 states that the housing element shall consist of “[...] an identification and analysis of existing and projected housing needs and a statement of goals, policies, quantified objectives, financial resources and scheduled programs for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing.” The housing element must also contain a schedule of actions that the local government is undertaking to implement the goals and objectives (i.e., the city’s required contribution to the provision of housing for the region). As discussed above, state law requires that the housing element be updated periodically, usually every eight years. It is subject to detailed statutory requirements and mandatory review by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).

Under state law, the HCD is required to allocate a region's share of the projected statewide housing need to its council of governments, based on California Department of Finance population projections and regional population forecasts. The Association of Bay Area Governments is the regional authority charged with preparing the regional housing needs allocation (RHNA), which quantifies the housing need for local jurisdictions in the San Francisco Bay Area. Although land use planning is generally a local issue, the HCD recognizes that the availability of housing is a matter of statewide importance. Therefore, state housing element law requires local housing elements to balance the need for growth, including the need for additional housing, with local interests.

B. Proposed Action Overview

The Planning Commission is proposing to update the 2014 housing element (existing 2014 housing element) of the San Francisco General Plan (general plan). The housing element update establishes goals, policies, and actions to address the existing and projected housing needs of San Francisco. The goals, policies, and actions are required to plan for the regional housing targets allocated to San Francisco by regional agencies for 2023 to 2031 and to meet future housing demand in San Francisco. The housing element update includes policies designed to improve housing affordability and advance racial and social equity in accordance with the directives from the Planning Commission and San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission in summer 2020. The housing element update includes overarching goals for the future of housing in San Francisco that respond both to state law requirements as well as local community values as understood from community outreach conducted for the housing element update. The underlying policies and actions would guide development patterns and the allocation of resources to San Francisco neighborhoods. In general, the housing element update would shift an increased share of the city's future housing growth to transit corridors and low-density residential districts within, but not limited to, well-resourced areas.¹

The housing element update would modify the policies of the general plan's housing element. It would not implement specific changes to existing land use controls (e.g., zoning) or approve any physical development (e.g., construction of housing or infrastructure). As such, the proposed action would not result in any direct physical changes to the environment, but would result in reasonably foreseeable indirect changes. Specifically, the San Francisco Planning Department (Department) assumes that adoption of the housing element update would lead to future actions, such as planning code amendments to increase height limits along transit corridors and to modify density controls in low-density areas that are primarily located on the

¹ *Well-resourced areas* are high- and highest-resource areas, which are neighborhoods identified by the State of California that provide strong economic, health, and educational outcomes for its residents. The state annually updates the high-and highest-resource areas based on updated economic, education, and health data. As a result, the well-resourced areas may slightly fluctuate year to year. More information is available at: <https://www.sfhousingelement.org/well-resourced-neighborhoods>.

west and north sides of the city, designation of housing sustainability districts, removal of other government constraints on the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing, and approval of development projects consistent with the goals, policies, and actions of the housing element update.

Under the proposed action, the Department projects approximately 150,000 housing units would be constructed in the city by 2050 compared to the number of units in 2020 , or an average of approximately 5,000 housing units per year through 2050. The Department projects approximately 102,000 housing units would be constructed by 2050 under the existing 2014 housing element (2050 environmental baseline). In other words, the Department predicts that approximately 50,000 more housing units would be constructed by 2050 if the housing element update is adopted compared with the development anticipated under the existing 2014 housing element. Future development consistent with the housing element update would predominately consist of residential projects, some with ground floor neighborhood services (e.g., retail or small medical offices), in well-resourced areas and along transit corridors.

Although the housing element update includes plans and policies that would enable the city to accommodate 82,070 units by 2031 as required by the RHNA and housing element law, the final EIR analyzed an aggressive but reasonably foreseeable scenario in which 5,000 housing units per year would be constructed. As discussed in Response PD-2 in the responses to comments document, for the purpose of CEQA, the final EIR analyzes the impacts of housing development that is reasonably foreseeable between 2020 and 2050. This approach is supported by substantial evidence, as set forth in Response PD-2. It provides the public and decision makers with the most accurate and understandable picture possible using the best information available. In addition, as explained in Response PD-2 and in Attachment 5 of the responses to comments document, the draft EIR adequately addresses the potential environmental impacts from construction of 82,070 housing units by 2031, because such impacts would be substantially the same as impacts from construction of 150,000 units by 2050. Although certain impacts could occur sooner, or could be slightly greater due to the concentration of construction in a shorter time frame, those impacts would not be substantially different than the impacts identified in the draft EIR.

C. Proposed Action Objectives

Consistent with state law, the housing element update promotes the accommodation and the construction of housing units to meet San Francisco's RHNA. The primary objective of the housing element update is to provide a roadmap for the future of housing in San Francisco through goals, policies, and actions. The housing element update is San Francisco's first housing plan centered in racial and social equity. Therefore, the roadmap directs how and where the city would grow and direct its investments to advance racial and social equity.

The housing element update includes the following overarching goals, which also are the proposed action's objectives, or project objectives under CEQA:

- Goal 1: Recognize the right to housing as a foundation for health, and social and economic well-being
- Goal 2: Repair the harms of historic racial and ethnic discrimination against American Indian, Black, and other people of color
- Goal 3: Foster racially and socially inclusive neighborhoods through equitable distribution of investment and growth
- Goal 4: Provide sufficient housing for existing residents and future generations for a city with diverse cultures, family structures, and abilities
- Goal 5: Promote neighborhoods that are well-connected, healthy, and rich with community culture

D. Proposed Action Approvals

General plan amendments must first be initiated by the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission certified the final EIR on November 17, 2022 by adoption of Motion No. 21206, and initiated general plan amendments on November 17, 2022. The Planning Commission will consider recommending the general plan amendments to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors (board of supervisors) on December 15, 2022. Thereafter, the board of supervisors would consider adopting an ordinance amending the general plan to include the housing element update. The board of supervisors may approve or reject the general plan ordinance, but may not modify the housing element update as recommended by the Planning Commission, pursuant to Planning Code section 340(d). HCD will review the housing element to determine if it is compliant with state housing element law.

E. Environmental Review

The city is the lead agency responsible for administering environmental review of projects within San Francisco under CEQA, and the board of supervisors has delegated that function to the Department in Chapter 31 of the Administrative Code. As such, the Department conducts environmental review in the city. The Department published a notice of preparation (NOP) of an EIR for the proposed action on June 16, 2021. The Department sent this notice of availability of the NOP to the State Clearinghouse, responsible agencies, and interested individuals and organizations. The Department held a virtual scoping meeting on June 29, 2021. The purpose of the scoping meeting and publication of the NOP was to explain the environmental review process for the proposed action and provide an opportunity to take public comments related to the environmental issues of the housing element update, including input on the scope of the analysis in the EIR. Comments received during the scoping process were considered in preparation of the EIR.

The Department prepared the draft EIR for the proposed action in accordance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and San Francisco Administrative Code chapter 31. The draft EIR was

published on April 20, 2022, and circulated to local, state, and federal agencies as well as interested organizations and individuals. Originally the Department circulated the draft EIR for a public comment period of 62 days (until June 20, 2022). On June 16, 2022, the Department extended the comment period to July 12, 2022 (for a total of 83 days).

The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing regarding the draft EIR on June 9, 2022, to solicit additional comments on the draft EIR from members of the public and to receive comments from the Planning Commission. The public hearing was a hybrid meeting and comments were collected remotely via phone call and in person in room 400 at city hall. A court reporter at the public hearing transcribed the verbal comments verbatim and prepared a written transcript. As the proposed action could affect historic resources, the Historic Preservation Commission held a public hearing on June 1, 2022. A court reporter at the public hearing transcribed the verbal comments verbatim and prepared a written transcript.

The Department prepared a responses to comments document on environmental issues received during the 83-day public review period for the draft EIR, prepared revisions to the text of the draft EIR in response to comments received, made revisions or clarifications of new information that updates, supplements, or replaces project description or associated environmental analysis that became available during the public review period, and corrected clerical errors in the draft EIR.

A final EIR has been prepared by the Department, consisting of the draft EIR, any consultations and comments received during the review process, any additional information that became available, and the responses to comments document dated November 2, 2022, all as required by law. Additionally, the Department issued a supplemental memorandum dated November 17, 2022; this memorandum documents that changes to the Housing Element Update do not alter the conclusions in the EIR. The proposed action EIR files have been made available for review by the Planning Commission and the public. These files are available for public review at the Department at 49 S. Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, and are part of the record before the Planning Commission.

On November 17, 2022, 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 of the Administrative Code. The final EIR was certified by the Planning Commission on November 17, 2022, by adoption of its motion no. 21206.

E. Content and Location of Record

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

- The final EIR consisting of the draft EIR, the responses to comments document, the November 17, 2022 supplemental memorandum to the Planning Commission, 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 proposed approvals and entitlements, the proposed action, and the alternatives set forth in the final EIR;
- All information (including written evidence and testimony) presented to the Planning Commission by the environmental consultant and subconsultants who prepared the final EIR, or incorporated into reports presented by the Planning Commission;
- All information (including written evidence and testimony) presented to the city from other public agencies relating to the proposed action or the final EIR;
- All applications, letters, testimony, and presentations provided to the city by the Department and its consultants in connection with the proposed action;
- All information (including written evidence and testimony) presented at any public hearing or workshop related to the 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 Department Custodian of Records is the custodian of these documents and materials.

F. Findings about Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The following Sections II, III, and IV set forth the 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 proposed action and the mitigation measures included as part of the final EIR and adopted by the Planning Commission as part of the proposed action. 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 proposed action. 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 proposed action impact 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 proposed action set forth in the final EIR, which are set forth in the attached MMRP, to reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed action. 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.

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

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 Proposed Action Found to Be Less than Significant and Thus Do Not Require Mitigation

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

A. Effects Found Not to Be Significant

Section 4.1 of the draft EIR, Effects Found Not to Be Significant, determined that the proposed action would result in a less-than-significant impact or no impact for the following impact areas:

- Land Use and Land Use Planning (all topics) (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.1-19 through 4.1-24)
- Aesthetics (all topics) (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.1-50 through 4.1-58)
- Population and Housing (all topics) (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.1-73 through 4.1-78)
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions (all topics) (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.1-92 through 4.1-97)
- Recreation (impacts on regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration would occur and cumulative impacts) (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.1-107 through 4.1-109)
- Public Services (cumulative impacts on public services) (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.1-128 through 4.1-129)
- Biological Resources (all topics) (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.1-139 through 4.1-149)
- Geology and Soils (all topics, except Paleontological Resources) (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.1-166 through 4.1-172)
- Hydrology and Water Quality (all topics) (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.1-196 through 4.1-204)
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials (all topics) (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.1-217 through 4.1-224)
- Energy (all topics) (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.1-229 through 4.1-233)

- Mineral Resources, Agricultural and Forest Resources, and Wildfire (all topics) (refer to draft EIR p. 4.1-233)

Following Section 4.1 of the draft EIR, Effects Found Not to Be Significant, the remaining CEQA topics were addressed in individual sections. As listed below the final EIR determined that for the following topic areas the proposed action would not:

Transportation and Circulation (EIR Section 4.4)

- Create potentially hazardous conditions for people walking, bicycling, or driving or public transit operations (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.4-92 through 4.4-96)
- Interfere with accessibility of people walking or bicycling to and from the project site, and adjoining areas, or result in inadequate emergency access (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.4-96 through 4.4-99)
- Cause substantial additional vehicle miles traveled or substantially induce automobile travel (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.4-119 through 4.4-124)
- Result in a parking deficit (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.4-130 and 4.4-131)
- In combination with cumulative projects (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.4-133 through 4.4-134)
 - Create potentially hazardous conditions,
 - Interfere with accessibility;
 - Cause substantial additional vehicle miles traveled or substantially induce automobile travel;
 - Result in significant parking impacts.

Noise and Vibration (EIR Section 4.4)

- In combination with cumulative projects, result in a significant cumulative operational noise impact (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.5-66 and 4.5-67)

Air Quality (EIR Section 4.6)

- Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.6-41 through 4.6-44)
- Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) that would adversely affect a substantial number of people (refer to draft EIR p. 4.6-71)
- Result in a significant cumulative odor impact in combination with cumulative projects. (refer to draft EIR p. 4.6-73)

Wind (EIR Section 4.7)

- Result in a significant cumulative wind impact in combination with cumulative projects. (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.7-13 and 4.7-14)

Shadow (EIR Section 4.8)

- Result in a significant cumulative shadow impact in combination with cumulative projects. (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.8-42 and 4.8-43)

Utilities and Service Systems (EIR Section 4.9)

- Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair attainment of solid waste reduction goals (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.9-36 and 4.9-37)
- Result in the city being out of compliance with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste (refer to draft EIR p. 4.9-37)
- In combination with cumulative projects, result in a significant cumulative impact related to: (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.9-38 and 4.9-39)
 - Wastewater and stormwater collection and treatment system.
 - Electric and telecommunication facilities.
 - Solid waste facilities and regulations.

Paleontological Resources (EIR Section 4.10)

- In combination with cumulative projects, result in a significant cumulative impact related to paleontological resources (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.10-14)

SECTION III. Findings of Potentially Significant Impacts 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 and in Section IV concern mitigation measures set forth in the EIR to mitigate the potentially significant impacts of the proposed action. These mitigation measures are included in the MMRP. A copy of the MMRP is included as Attachment B to the Planning Commission motion adopting these findings.

The Planning Commission, as the project sponsor, has agreed to implement the following mitigation measures to address the potential transportation and circulation, noise, air quality, cultural resources, and paleontological resources 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 proposed action will be required to incorporate mitigation measures identified in the EIR into the proposed action 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 proposed action, as applicable, and also will be enforced through conditions of approval in building permits issued for the proposed action by the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection, as applicable. With the required mitigation measures, these proposed action impacts would be avoided or reduced to a less-than-significant level.

The following topics are within the EIR Section 4.1, Effects Found Not to Be Significant, and mitigation has been identified to avoid or reduce the significant impact to less than significant.

A. Recreation (EIR Section 4.1, Effects Found Not to Be Significant)

Impact RE-2: The proposed action would not include recreational facilities but would require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that would have an adverse physical effect on the environment. These impacts would be generally similar to the impacts identified in the final EIR that could result from the construction and operation of future development projects consistent with the housing element update, and would be subject to the same or similar regulatory requirements and mitigation measures, as applicable. Such mitigation measures could include those identified in the EIR, including Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a, Archeological Resources Requirements for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance; M-CR-2b, Archeological Monitoring Program; M-CR-2c, Archeological Testing Program; M-CR-2d, Treatment of Submerged and Deeply Buried Resources; M-TCR-1, Tribal Notification and Consultation; M-NO-1, Construction Noise Control; M-NO-3a, Protection of Adjacent Buildings/Structures and Vibration Monitoring during Construction; M-NO-3b, Prevent Damage to Vibration-Sensitive Equipment; and M-AQ-3, Construction Air Quality. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce Impact RE-2 to less than significant (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.1-109).

New or expanded open spaces and recreational facilities may be required to accommodate future demand from residents and employees anticipated as an indirect result of the proposed action. Future development consistent the housing element update could result in the construction and operation of new or expanded open spaces and recreational facilities in the city by San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department (SFRPD) in response to population and housing growth anticipated under the proposed action. Such open space and recreation facilities would be subject to project-level environmental review in accordance with CEQA at the time they are proposed. This project-level review would identify any significant environmental impacts that could result from the construction and operation of these facilities

and would identify project-specific mitigation measures to lessen or avoid any significant impacts as feasible. While it is not possible to identify project-specific impacts and mitigation measures with certainty at this time, based on the available information and review of CEQA environmental documents for similar projects, the Department anticipates that the construction of new or expanded open spaces and recreational facilities could have significant impacts, including temporary transportation, noise, and air quality impacts related to the use of heavy construction equipment, demolition, excavation, hauling, and construction activities. Depending on the specific location of the project sites, such projects could also have significant impacts on built-environment historic resources, archeological resources, tribal cultural resources, paleontological resources, and biological resources. These impacts would be generally similar to the impacts identified in the EIR that could result from the construction and operation of future development projects consistent with the housing element update, and would be subject to the same or similar regulatory requirements and mitigation measures, as applicable. Implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a, M-CR-2, M-CR-2c, M-CR-2d, M-TCR-1, M-NO-1, M-NO-3a, M-NO-3b, and M-AQ-3 would result in a less-than-significant impact with mitigation.

B. Public Services (EIR Section 4.1, Effects Found Not to Be Significant)

Impact PS-1: The proposed action would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection and emergency medical services. These impacts would be generally similar to the impacts identified in the final EIR that could result from the construction and operation of future development projects consistent with the housing element update, and would be subject to the same or similar regulatory requirements and mitigation measures, as applicable. Such mitigation measures could include those identified in the final EIR, including Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a, Archeological Resources Requirements for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance; M-CR-2b, Archeological Monitoring Program; M-CR-2c, Archeological Testing Program; M-CR-2d, Treatment of Submerged and Deeply Buried Resources; M-TCR-1, Tribal Notification and Consultation; M-NO-1, Construction Noise Control; M-NO-3a, Protection of Adjacent Buildings/Structures and Vibration Monitoring during Construction; M-NO-3b, Prevent Damage to Vibration-Sensitive Equipment; and M-AQ-3, Construction Air Quality. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce Impact PS-1 to less than significant (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.1-121 and 4.1-122).

Because future development consistent with the housing element update would increase the number of new residents in the city, and population is the primary contributor to demand for public services, fire and medical service facilities throughout the city are anticipated to experience increases in demand and potential increases in response times due to additional congestion. To accommodate the anticipated increase in demand for fire protection and

emergency medical services as a result of future development consistent with the proposed action, the San Francisco Fire Department would be expected to construct new or expand existing fire protection and medical facilities. Any new or expanded fire protection facilities necessary to serve growth anticipated as a result of the proposed action would be subject to project-level environmental review in accordance with CEQA at the time that it is proposed. These project-level reviews would identify any significant environmental impacts that could result from the construction and operation of these facilities and would identify project-specific mitigation measures to lessen or avoid any significant impacts as feasible. While it is not possible to identify project-specific impacts and mitigation measures with certainty at this time, based on the available information and review of CEQA environmental documents for similar projects, the Department anticipates that the construction of new or expanded fire protection facilities could have significant impacts, including temporary transportation, noise, and air quality impacts related to the use of heavy construction equipment, demolition, excavation, hauling, and construction activities. Depending on the specific location of the project sites, such projects could also have significant impacts on built-environment historic resources, archeological resources, tribal cultural resources, paleontological resources, and biological resources. These impacts would be generally similar to the impacts identified in the final EIR that could result from the construction and operation of future development projects consistent with the housing element update, and would be subject to the same or similar regulatory requirements and mitigation measures, as applicable. Implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a, M-CR-2, M-CR-2c, M-CR-2d, M-TCR-1, M-NO-1, M-NO-3a, M-NO-3b, and M-AQ-3 would result in a less-than-significant impact with mitigation.

Impact PS-2: The proposed action would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for police protection. These impacts would be generally similar to the impacts identified in the final EIR that could result from the construction and operation of future development projects consistent with the housing element update, and would be subject to the same or similar regulatory requirements and mitigation measures, as applicable. Such mitigation measures could include those identified in the final EIR, including Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a, Archeological Resources Requirements for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance; M-CR-2b, Archeological Monitoring Program; M-CR-2c, Archeological Testing Program; M-CR-2d, Treatment of Submerged and Deeply Buried Resources; M-TCR-1, Tribal Notification and Consultation; M-NO-1, Construction Noise Control; M-NO-3a, Protection of Adjacent Buildings/Structures and Vibration Monitoring during Construction; M-NO-3b, Prevent Damage to Vibration-Sensitive Equipment; and M-AQ-3, Construction Air Quality. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce Impact PS-2 to less than significant (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.1-122 and 4.1-123).

Because future development consistent with the housing element update would increase the number of new residents in the city, and population is the primary contributor to demand for public services, police services throughout the city are anticipated to experience increases in demand. To accommodate the increase in demand from residents anticipated as a result of future development consistent with the proposed action, the San Francisco Police Department would be expected to construct new or expand existing police facilities. Any new or expanded police facilities necessary to serve growth anticipated as a result of the proposed action would be subject to project-level environmental review in accordance with CEQA at the time that it is proposed. These project-level reviews would identify any significant environmental impacts that could result from the construction and operation of these facilities and would identify project-specific mitigation measures to lessen or avoid any significant impacts as feasible. While it is not possible to identify project-specific impacts and mitigation measures with certainty at this time, based on the available information and review of CEQA environmental documents for similar projects, the Department anticipates that the construction of new or expanded police facilities could have significant impacts, including temporary transportation, noise, and air quality impacts related to the use of heavy construction equipment, demolition, excavation, hauling, and construction activities. Depending on the specific location of the project sites, such projects could also have significant impacts on built-environment historic resources, archeological resources, tribal cultural resources, paleontological resources, and biological resources. These impacts would be generally similar to the impacts identified in the final EIR that could result from the construction and operation of future development projects consistent with the housing element update, and would be subject to the same or similar regulatory requirements and mitigation measures, as applicable. Implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a, M-CR-2, M-CR-2c, M-CR-2d, M-TCR-1, M-NO-1, M-NO-3a, M-NO-3b, and M-AQ-3 would result in a less-than-significant impact with mitigation.

Impact PS-3: The proposed action would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives for schools. These impacts would be generally similar to the impacts identified in the final EIR that could result from the construction and operation of future development projects consistent with the housing element update, and would be subject to the same or similar regulatory requirements and mitigation measures, as applicable. Such mitigation measures could include those identified in the final EIR, including Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a, Archeological Resources Requirements for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance; M-CR-2b, Archeological Monitoring Program; M-CR-2c, Archeological Testing Program; M-CR-2d, Treatment of Submerged and Deeply Buried Resources; M-TCR-1, Tribal Notification and Consultation; M-NO-1, Construction Noise Control; M-NO-3a, Protection of Adjacent Buildings/Structures and Vibration Monitoring during Construction; M-NO-3b, Prevent Damage to Vibration-Sensitive Equipment; and M-AQ-3, Construction Air Quality.

Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce Impact PS-3 to less than significant (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.1-124 through 4.1-126).

Because future development consistent with the housing element update would increase the number of new residents in the city, and population is the primary contributor to demand for public services, school facilities throughout the city are anticipated to experience increases in demand. To accommodate anticipated future demand, the San Francisco Unified School District and private schools within the city may construct new or expanded school facilities. Any new or expanded school facilities required to serve the future development consistent with the housing element update would be subject to project-level environmental review in accordance with CEQA at the time that it is proposed. These project-level reviews would identify any significant environmental impacts that could result from the construction and operation of these facilities and would identify project-specific mitigation measures to lessen or avoid any significant impacts as feasible. While it is not possible to identify project-specific impacts and mitigation measures at this time, based on the available information and review of CEQA environmental documents for similar projects, the Department anticipates that the construction of new or expanded school facilities could have significant impacts, including temporary transportation, noise, and air quality impacts related to the use of heavy construction equipment, demolition, excavation, hauling, and construction activities. Depending on the specific location of the project sites, such projects could also have significant impacts on built-environment historic resources, archeological resources, tribal cultural resources, paleontological resources, and biological resources. These impacts would be generally similar to the impacts identified in the final EIR that could result from the construction and operation of future development projects consistent with the housing element update and would be subject to the same or similar regulatory requirements and mitigation measures, as applicable. Implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a, M-CR-2, M-CR-2c, M-CR-2d, M-TCR-1, M-NO-1, M-NO-3a, M-NO-3b, and M-AQ-3 would result in a less-than-significant impact with mitigation.

Impact PS-4: The proposed action would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives for libraries. These impacts would be generally similar to the impacts identified in the final EIR that could result from the construction and operation of future development projects consistent with the housing element update, and would be subject to the same or similar regulatory requirements and mitigation measures, as applicable. Such mitigation measures could include those identified in the final EIR, including Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a, Archeological Resources Requirements for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance; M-CR-2b, Archeological Monitoring Program; M-CR-2c, Archeological Testing Program; M-CR-2d, Treatment of Submerged and Deeply Buried Resources; M-TCR-1, Tribal Notification and Consultation; M-NO-1, Construction Noise Control; M-NO-3a, Protection of Adjacent

Buildings/Structures and Vibration Monitoring during Construction; M-NO-3b, Prevent Damage to Vibration-Sensitive Equipment; and M-AQ-3, Construction Air Quality. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce Impact PS-4 to less than significant (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.1-126 and 4.1-127).

Because future development consistent with the housing element update would increase the number of new residents in the city, and population is the primary contributor to demand for public services, library facilities throughout the city are anticipated to experience increases in demand. Any new or expanded library facilities determined to be needed by the San Francisco Public Library to serve new development resulting from the proposed action would be subject to project-level environmental review in accordance with CEQA at the time that it is proposed. These project-level reviews would identify any significant environmental impacts that could result from the construction and operation of these facilities and would identify project-specific mitigation measures to lessen or avoid any significant impacts as feasible. While it is not possible to identify project-specific impacts and mitigation measures with certainty at this time, based on the available information and review of CEQA environmental documents for similar projects, the Department anticipates that the construction of new or expanded library facilities could have significant impacts, including temporary transportation, noise, and air quality impacts related to the use of heavy construction equipment, demolition, excavation, hauling, and construction activities. Depending on the specific location of the project sites, such projects could also have significant impacts on built-environment historic resources, archeological resources, tribal cultural resources, paleontological resources, and biological resources. These impacts would be generally similar to the impacts identified in the final EIR that could result from the construction and operation of future development projects consistent with the housing element update and would be subject to the same or similar regulatory requirements and mitigation measures, as applicable. Implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a, M-CR-2, M-CR-2c, M-CR-2d, M-TCR-1, M-NO-1, M-NO-3a, M-NO-3b, and M-AQ-3 would result in a less-than-significant impact with mitigation.

Impact PS-5: The proposed action would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for parks. These impacts would be generally similar to the impacts identified in the final EIR that could result from the construction and operation of future development projects consistent with the housing element update, and would be subject to the same or similar regulatory requirements and mitigation measures, as applicable. Such mitigation measures could include those identified in the final EIR, including Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a, Archeological Resources Requirements for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance; M-CR-2b, Archeological Monitoring Program; M-CR-2c, Archeological Testing Program; M-CR-2d, Treatment of Submerged and Deeply Buried Resources; M-TCR-1, Tribal

Notification and Consultation; M-NO-1, Construction Noise Control; M-NO-3a, Protection of Adjacent Buildings/Structures and Vibration Monitoring during Construction; M-NO-3b, Prevent Damage to Vibration-Sensitive Equipment; and M-AQ-3, Construction Air Quality. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce Impact PS-5 to less than significant (refer to draft EIR p. 4.1-128).

The proposed action would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for parks. These impacts would be generally similar to the impacts identified in the final EIR that could result from the construction and operation of future development projects consistent with the housing element update, and would be subject to the same or similar regulatory requirements and mitigation measures, as applicable. Implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a, M-CR-2, M-CR-2c, M-CR-2d, M-TCR-1, M-NO-1, M-NO-3a, M-NO-3b, and M-AQ-3 would result in a less-than-significant impact with mitigation.

The following topics are within the referenced sections of Chapter 4, Environmental Setting and Impacts.

C. Cultural Resources (EIR Section 4.2)

Impact CR-2: The proposed action has the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to section 15064.5. With implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a, Procedures for Discovery of Archeological Resources for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance; M-CR-2b, Archeological Monitoring Program; M-CR-2c, Archeological Testing Program; M-CR-2d, Treatment of Submerged and Deeply Buried Resources; and M-TCR-1, Tribal Notification and Consultation, Impact CR-2 is reduced to a less-than-significant level (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.2-100 through 4.2-123).

Future development consistent with the housing element update would involve excavation and other ground-disturbance that could result in substantial adverse changes in the significance of archeological resources. The potential for significant archeological resources to be present at a particular location, to have survived past development, and to be affected by future development consistent with the housing element update must necessarily be assessed in more detail at the time a specific project is proposed. This is the case because, although it is possible to make generalizations about the patterns of Native American archeological and historic land use and development at a neighborhood or district level, the archeological impact potential of each individual project site can be determined only by consideration of the specific project site and the proposed development of that site. This potential would be assessed at the project level through the Department's preliminary archeological review process. Significant impacts to both Native American and historic-period archeological resources are anticipated under both the

2050 environmental baseline and the proposed action because each would involve ground-disturbing activities that could cause a substantial adverse change in significance of an archeological resource. With implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a, M-CR-2b, M-CR-2c, M-CR-2d, and M-TCR-1, identified through the preliminary archeological review process, the impacts of the proposed action on archeological resources would be less than significant with mitigation.

Impact CR-3: The proposed action has the potential to disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. With implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a, Archeological Resources Requirements for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance, and M-TCR-1, Tribal Notification and Consultation, and, as applicable, Mitigation Measures M-CR-2b, Archeological Monitoring Program; M-CR-2c, Archeological Testing Program; and M-CR-2d, Treatment of Submerged and Deeply Buried Resources, Impact CR-3 is reduced to a less-than-significant level (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.2-123 and 4.2-124).

Future development consistent with the proposed action has the potential to result in impacts on archeological resources that may include human remains and disturbance of human remains as the result of future development consistent with the housing element update would be a significant impact. For locations assessed as archeologically sensitive and where future project soil disturbance would be assessed through the preliminary archeological review process, the potential for impacts on human remains in an archeological context would be addressed through implementation of the provisions of mitigation measures determined applicable. Human remains of Native American origin are also presumed to be tribal cultural resources and the potential for impacts on human remains as tribal cultural resources would be addressed through implementation, as applicable, of Mitigation Measure M-TCR-1. Based on the conclusions of preliminary archeological review, and the outcome of tribal cultural resources notification and consultation, the Department would identify which, if any, of the following mitigation measures would be required to mitigate the potential for impacts on human remains related to the construction of future development projects consistent with the housing element update: Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a and, as applicable, Mitigation Measure M-CR-2b; Mitigation Measure M-CR-2c; Mitigation Measure M-CR-2d; and, as applicable, Mitigation Measure M-TCR-1. These measures include procedures for the protection and treatment of human remains. The mitigation measures, together with regulatory compliance, would reduce the significant impact of the proposed action on human remains to less than significant with mitigation.

Impact C-CR-2: The proposed action, in combination with cumulative projects, would result in a significant cumulative impact related to archeological resources and human remains. With implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a, Archeological Resources Requirements for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance, and M-TCR-1, Tribal Notification and Consultation, and, as applicable, Mitigation Measures M-CR-2b, Archeological Monitoring Program; M-CR-2c, Archeological Testing Program; and M-CR-2d, Treatment of Submerged and Deeply

Buried Resources, Impact C-CR-2 is reduced to a less-than-significant level (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.2-126 and 4.2-127).

For archeological resources, significant cumulative impacts could result if more than one project would affect the same archeological resource. Construction activities associated with future development consistent with the housing element update could result in ground-disturbing activities in areas identified as having moderate to very high sensitivity for archeological resources, and therefore has the potential to make a cumulatively considerable contribution to the significant cumulative impact. With incorporation of Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a and M-TCR-1, and as applicable, M-CR-2b, M-CR-2c, and M-CR-2d, the proposed action's contribution to any significant cumulative archeological resource impacts would not be cumulatively considerable and the impact would be less than significant. The cumulative impact on archeological resources would be less than significant with mitigation. In addition, significant cumulative impacts could result if more than one project would affect the same human remains in an archeological context. Construction activities associated with future development consistent with the housing element update could result in ground-disturbing activities in areas identified as having moderate to very high sensitivity for human remains in an archeological context, and therefore has the potential to make a cumulatively considerable contribution to the significant cumulative impact. With incorporation of Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a and M-TCR-1, and as applicable, M-CR-2b, M-CR-2c, and M-CR-2d, the proposed action's contribution to any significant cumulative human remains impacts would not be cumulatively considerable and the impact would be less than significant. The cumulative impact on human remains would be less than significant with mitigation.

D. Tribal Cultural Resources (EIR Section 4.3)

Impact TCR-1: The proposed action would result in a substantial adverse change to an archeological tribal cultural resource. With implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a, Archeological Resources Requirements for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance, and M-TCR-1, Tribal Notification and Consultation, and, as applicable, Mitigation Measures M-CR-2b, Archeological Monitoring Program; M-CR-2c, Archeological Testing Program; and M-CR-2d, Treatment of Submerged and Deeply Buried Resources, Impact TCR-1 is reduced to a less-than-significant level (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.3-20 through 4.3-23).

Native American archeological resources are known to be present in many areas of the city, and many areas have been assessed as sensitive for the presence of undiscovered Native American archeological resources. Construction activities associated with future development consistent with the housing element update have the potential to disturb or destroy both documented and previously undocumented Native American archeological resources. All Native American archeological resources in San Francisco are presumed to be potential tribal cultural resources. This would constitute a significant impact on tribal cultural resources. Based on tribal consultation conducted for the housing element update, Mitigation Measure M-TCR-1 was

developed to require notification of Native American tribal representatives regarding environmental review of future development under the proposed action. If consultation is requested by a Native American tribal representative, Mitigation Measure M-TCR-1 specifies that consultation regarding archeological tribal cultural resources will focus on, but not be limited to, opportunities for tribal representatives to provide input on the treatment and interpretation of archeological resources and participate in archeological treatment if so desired. Based on the identification of potential impacts on Native American archeological resources identified through preliminary archeological review for future development consistent with the housing element update, Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a and, as applicable, Mitigation Measures M-CR-2b, M-CR-2c, and M-CR-2d would also be implemented. These mitigation measures would fully mitigate any significant impacts on Native American archeological tribal cultural resources, and impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

Impact TCR-2: The proposed action would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a non-archeological tribal cultural resource. With implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a, Archeological Resources Requirements for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance, and M-TCR-1, Tribal Notification and Consultation, and, as applicable, Mitigation Measures M-CR-2b, Archeological Monitoring Program; M-CR-2c, Archeological Testing Program; and M-CR-2d, Treatment of Submerged and Deeply Buried Resources, Impact TCR-2 is reduced to a less-than-significant level (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.3-23 through 4.3-25).

Tribal representatives have identified the past and modern San Francisco shoreline; the historical corridors of creek networks, ponds, marshes, and other wetland locations; and modern locations of aboveground remnants of creeks and natural ponds and their associated shorelines as highly sensitive for the presence of tribal cultural resources. Future development consistent with the proposed action along existing shoreline areas in the Marina planning district could result in limited impacts on potential tribal cultural resources. Therefore, future development consistent with the housing element update could result in the disturbance or destruction of non-archeological tribal cultural resources, which would be a significant impact. Mitigation Measure M-TCR-1 would be implemented if a project is proposed in an area identified as potentially sensitive for tribal cultural resources and the project meets the criteria specified in the measure. With implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TCR-1, and, as applicable, Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a, M-CR-2b, M-CR-2c, and M-CR-2d, the impacts of future development consistent with the housing element update on non-archeological tribal cultural resources would be less than significant with mitigation.

Impact C-TCR-1: The proposed action, in combination with cumulative projects, would result in a significant cumulative impact on tribal cultural resources. With implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a, Archeological Resources Requirements for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance, and M-TCR-1, Tribal Notification and Consultation, and, as applicable, Mitigation Measures M-CR-2b, Archeological Monitoring Program; M-CR-2c, Archeological

Testing Program; and M-CR-2d, Treatment of Submerged and Deeply Buried Resources, Impact C-TCR-1 is reduced to a less-than-significant level (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.3-26 and 4.3-26).

For tribal cultural resources, significant cumulative impacts could result if more than one project would affect the same tribal cultural resource. Future development consistent with the housing element update when combined with a cumulative project could result in a substantial adverse change in the valued elements of the archeological or non-archeological tribal cultural resource, which may include loss of information or interpretive value or diminishment of the cultural values associated with the resource. For archeological tribal cultural resources, construction activities associated with future development consistent with the housing element update have the potential to disturb or destroy both documented and previously undocumented Native American archeological resources. Therefore, the proposed action has the potential to make a cumulatively considerable contribution to the significant cumulative impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measures M-TCR-1 and M-CR-2a, and as applicable, Mitigation Measures M-CR-2b, M-CR-2c, and M-CR-2d would reduce the proposed action's contribution to the significant cumulative impact to a less-than-significant level. The cumulative impact on tribal cultural resources would be less than significant with mitigation.

E. Noise and Vibration (EIR Section 4.5)

Impact NO-3: Construction of future development consistent with the proposed action would generate excessive groundborne vibration. With implementation of Mitigation Measures M-NO-3a, Protection of Adjacent Buildings/Structures and Vibration Monitoring during Construction, and M-NO-3b, Prevent Interference with Vibration-Sensitive Equipment, Impact NO-3 is reduced to a less-than-significant level (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.5-54 through 4.5-63).

Future development consistent with the proposed action would require the use of heavy equipment that can produce perceptible levels of vibration. The use of vibration generating equipment could result in significant impacts related to building damage and interference with vibration sensitive equipment, resulting in a significant impact. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-3a and Mitigation Measure M-NO-3b, the proposed action would not expose persons to or generate vibration levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

Identification of the less-than-significant-with-mitigation impact does not preclude finding less-than-significant impacts for future development consistent with the proposed action based on the circumstances of such future development. For example, future projects that meet the construction vibration screening criteria identified in the EIR or projects for which a detailed vibration analysis demonstrates that an established vibration standard would not be exceeded would have less-than-significant impacts and would not require mitigation.

F. Air Quality (EIR Section 4.6)

Impact AQ-3: Construction of future development consistent with the proposed action would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in non-attainment criteria pollutant emissions. With implementation of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3, Clean Construction Equipment, Impact AQ-3 is reduced to a less-than-significant level (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.6-48 through 4.6-54).

NO_x emissions would be below the significance threshold of 54 pounds per day for all building types analyzed, apart from the largest building type, a 590-foot-tall residential building providing 984 dwelling units. Emissions from a building of this size and scale would result in NO_x emissions significant impacts. In the event that a project specific analysis finds that a future development project would result in significant construction-related criteria air pollutant emissions, Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3 would be required. Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3 requires Tier 4 Final emissions standards for off-road construction equipment and would ensure that NO_x emissions would be below the significance threshold. Therefore, construction criteria air pollutant impacts associated with the proposed action are considered less than significant with mitigation.

G. Utilities and Service Systems (EIR Section 4.9)

Impact UT-3: The proposed action would require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded electric power or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects. With implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a, Archeological Resources Requirements for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance; M-CR-2b, Archeological Monitoring Program; M-CR-2c, Archeological Testing Program; M-CR-2d, Treatment of Submerged and Deeply Buried Resources; M-TCR-1, Tribal Notification and Consultation; M-NO-1, Construction Noise Control; M-NO-3a, Protection of Adjacent Buildings/Structures and Vibration Monitoring during Construction; and M-NO-3b, Prevent Damage to Vibration-Sensitive Equipment; and M-AQ-3, Construction Air Quality, Impact UT-3 is reduced to a less-than-significant level (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.9-33 and 4.9-34).

The proposed action would not be likely to require relocation or construction of new or expanded electric power or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects. If new electric power or telecommunication facilities were required, project level environmental review would be conducted, and appropriate mitigation measures would be identified. These impacts would be generally similar to the impacts identified in the final EIR that could result from the construction and operation of future development projects consistent with the housing element update, and would be subject to the same or similar regulatory requirements and mitigation measures, as applicable. Implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a, M-CR-2, M-CR-2c, M-CR-2d, M-TCR-1, M-NO-1, M-NO-3a, M-NO-3b, and M-AQ-3 would result in a less-than-significant impact with mitigation.

H. Paleontological Resources (EIR Section 4.10)

Impact GE-5: The proposed action would directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site. With implementation of Mitigation Measure M-GE-5, Inadvertent Discovery of Paleontological Resources during Construction, Impact GE-5 is reduced to a less-than-significant level (refer to draft EIR pp. 4.10-11 through 4.10-13).

Anticipated future development consistent with the proposed action would have the potential to destroy unique paleontological resources in locations where excavations would extend as deep as moderately sensitive geologic units. Some impacts on paleontological resources would result from projects that are already anticipated under the existing 2014 housing element. The housing element update would allow for increased housing density as compared to the existing 2014 housing element. Increased density under the housing element update would mean more construction activity and therefore greater ground disturbance. In addition, in areas where taller structures would be constructed, construction would most likely be deeper and, accordingly, would disturb older sediments, which are more likely to have moderate paleontological potential. Accordingly, future development consistent with the housing element update could have significant impacts on paleontological resources. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure M-GE-5 would ensure that the proposed action would not result in the destruction of unique paleontological resources. As such, the proposed action would result in a paleontological resources impact that is less than significant with mitigation.

SECTION IV. Significant Impacts that Cannot Be Avoided or Reduced to a Less-than-Significant Level

Based on substantial evidence in the whole record of these proceedings, the Planning Commission finds that there are significant proposed action-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 16 topic areas that would remain significant and unavoidable, even with implementation of mitigation measures; those topics and the mitigation measures that reduce the impacts, although not to a less-than-significant level, are listed below. In addition, the final EIR identifies three topic areas for which impacts would be significant and unavoidable, where mitigation is not feasible. Those topic areas are also 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 proposed action 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 for the legal, environmental, economic, social, technological and other benefits of the proposed action. This finding is supported by substantial evidence in the record of this proceeding.

Impacts That Remain Significant and Unavoidable After Implementation of Mitigation Measures

The final EIR identifies the following topic areas with significant environmental impacts for which mitigation measures were identified, but no feasible mitigation measures were identified that would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level; therefore, they remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation:

A. Impacts on Cultural Resources (EIR Section 4.2)

Impact CR-1: The proposed action would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to section 15064.5. No feasible mitigation measures were identified that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level after consideration of several potential mitigation measures. The city has agreed to implement the following mitigation measures:

- M-CR-1a, Avoid or Minimize Effects on Identified Built-Environment Resources;
- M-CR-1b, Best Practices and Construction Monitoring Program for Historic Resources;
- M-CR-1c, Relocation Plan;
- M-CR-1d, Documentation;
- M-CR-1e, Oral History;
- M-CR-1f, Salvage Plan;
- M-CR-1g, Interpretation;
- M-CR-1h, Historic Context;
- M-CR-1i, Walking or Building Tour;
- M-CR-1j, Educational Program;
- M-CR-1k, Community Memorial Event;
- M-CR-1l, Revise Historic District Documentation; and
- M-NO-3a, Protection of Adjacent Buildings/Structures and Vibration Monitoring during Construction.

The Planning Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the final EIR, implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CR-1a, M-CR-1b, M-CR-1c, M-CR-1d, M-CR-1e, M-CR-1f, M-CR-1g, M-CR-1h, M-CR-1i, M-CR-1j, M-CR-1k, M-CR-1l, and M-NO-3a would partially compensate for impacts associated with development under the proposed action through feasible design changes, avoidance, preservation, relocation, comprehensive documentation and

memorialization of the affected resource. However, this impact would nevertheless remain significant and unavoidable because the mitigation measures would not fully avoid, rectify, reduce, or compensate for the loss of built-environment historic resources, as set forth on draft EIR pp. 4.2-78 through 4.2-100.

Impact C-CR-1:

The proposed action, in combination with cumulative projects, would result in a significant cumulative impact related to historical resources, as defined in CEQA Guidelines section 150.64.5. No feasible mitigation measures were identified that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level after consideration of several potential mitigation measures. The city has agreed to implement Mitigation Measures M-CR-1a to M-CR-1l and Mitigation Measure M-NO-3a, as detailed above.

The Planning Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the final EIR, and more specifically on draft EIR pp. 4.2-124 and 4.2-125, although implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CR-1a, M-CR-1b, M-CR-1c, M-CR-1d, M-CR-1e, M-CR-1f, M-CR-1g, M-CR-1h, M-CR-1i, M-CR-1j, M-CR-1k, and M-CR-1l would partially compensate for impacts associated with development under the proposed action and other cumulative projects, through comprehensive documentation and memorialization of historic resources, this impact would nevertheless remain significant and unavoidable because the mitigation measures would not be enough to avoid, rectify, reduce, or compensate for the loss of individual historic resources and historic districts, as set forth on draft EIR pp. 4.2-124 and 4.2-125.

B. Impacts on Transportation and Circulation (EIR Section 4.4)

Impact TR-4: The proposed action would substantially delay public transit. No feasible mitigation measures were identified that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level after consideration of several potential mitigation measures. The city has agreed to implement the following mitigation measures:

- M-TR-4a, Parking Maximums and Transportation Demand Management;
- M-TR-4b, Driveway and Loading Operations Plan and Curb Cut Restrictions;
- M-TR-4c, Implement Transit Travel Times Measures to Reduce Transit Delay; and
- M-TR-6, Curb Management Plans.

The Planning Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the final EIR, and more specifically on draft EIR pp. 4.4-99 through 4.4-119, although implementation of Mitigation Measures M-TR-4a, M-TR-4b, M-TR-4c, and M-TR-6 would reduce impacts related to transit delay on Muni transit service, this impact would nevertheless remain significant and unavoidable because the mitigation measures are uncertain and full funding for future transit network improvements have not yet been identified, as set forth on draft EIR pp. 4.4-99 through 4.4-119.

Identification of the significant transit delay impacts does not preclude finding future less-than-significant or less-than-significant-with-mitigation impacts for future residential development projects consistent with the proposed action based on the circumstances of such future development for the following reasons. As stated on EIR pp. 4.4-110, future development consistent with the proposed action would be subject to numerous planning code provisions that would reduce the significant transit delay impact. These provisions may include parking maximums (planning code sections 151, 151.1), curb cut restrictions (planning code section 155r), driveway and loading operations plan (planning code section 155(u)), and transportation demand management requirements (planning code section 169). Such provisions were not assumed in the transit-travel time modeling as the details of future development are unknown at this time, and the modeling is at the transportation analysis zone level, not site-level. It is anticipated that such provisions could reduce vehicle trips assumed in the modeling generated by future residential development by several percentage points.² Further, future developments that result in more than 20 dwelling units would be subject to the transportation sustainability fee. The city may use fee funds for transit capital maintenance, service expansion, and reliability improvements.

Thus, much of the future development consistent with the proposed action would not contribute considerably to the significant transit delay impact because of the size of the future development would be small and because of prospective provisions outlined above.

Impact TR-6: The proposed action could result in a loading deficit and the secondary effects could create potentially hazardous conditions for people walking, bicycling, or driving; or substantially delay public transit. No feasible mitigation measures were identified that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level after consideration of several potential mitigation measures. The city has agreed to implement the following mitigation measures:

- M-TR-4b, Driveway and Loading Operations Plan and Curb Cut Restrictions; and
- M-TR-6, Curb Management Plans.

The Planning Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR, and more specifically on draft EIR pp. 4.4-124 through 4.4-130, although implementation of Mitigation Measures M-TR-4b and M-TR-6 would reduce the loading deficit, this impact would nevertheless remain significant and unavoidable because the mitigation measures would reduce but not eliminate the significant impacts related to hazardous conditions for people walking or bicycling, or driving; interference with accessibility for people walking or bicycling; or substantially delay public transit, as set forth on draft EIR pp. 4.4-124 through 4.4-130.

² SF Planning Department, Transportation Demand Management Technical Justification (January 22, 2018), https://default.sfplanning.org/transportation/tdm/TDM_Technical_Justification_update2018.pdf. Accessed February 3, 2022.

Identification of the significant loading impacts does not preclude finding less-than-significant or less-than-significant-with-mitigation impacts for future residential development projects consistent with the proposed action based on the circumstances of such future residential development for the following reasons. As described on EIR pp. 4.4-126-127, in general, individual building projects would not result in a loading deficit due to planning code provisions and city review processes. However, there may be circumstances where a loading deficit occurs, but does not result in a significant loading impact. Based on current practice, the city may not recommend conversion of on-street general parking spaces to commercial vehicle and/or passenger loading spaces to accommodate the demand from building with fewer than 50 units. This is because, under most circumstances, the loading deficit would likely not result in significant secondary effects. Most streets would be able to accommodate any queuing or double-parked vehicles, and these activities would not create secondary effects that could create potentially hazardous conditions for people walking, bicycling, or driving or substantial delays to transit. Future residential development consistent with the proposed action could occur along major bicycle corridors. In these instances, the city may recommend, and it may be possible to implement, on-street commercial vehicle or passenger loading zones that do not conflict with bicycle facilities. Possible loading zone configurations include, but are not limited to, curbside or floating³ loading zones with or without separation from adjacent vehicular traffic.

Impact C-TR-3: The proposed action, in combination with cumulative projects, would substantially delay public transit, and the proposed action would contribute considerably to those impacts. No feasible mitigation measures were identified that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level after consideration of several potential mitigation measures. The city has agreed to implement the following mitigation measures:

- M-TR-4a, Parking Maximums and Transportation Demand Management;
- M-TR-4b, Driveway and Loading Operations Plan and Curb Cut Restrictions; and
- M-TR-4c, Implement Transit Travel Times Measures to Reduce Transit Delay.

The Planning Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the final EIR, and more specifically on draft EIR pp. 4.4-134 and 4.4-135, although implementation of Mitigation Measures M-TR-4a, M-TR-4b, and M-TR-4c would reduce or minimize the severity of transit delay associated with future development, this impact would nevertheless remain significant and unavoidable because the mitigation measures would reduce but not eliminate the significant cumulative impacts related to transit delay impacts, as set forth on draft EIR pp. 4.4-134 and 4.4-135.

³ A *floating zone* is a parking or loading zone that is moved away from the curb, further into the street, to allow for a bicycle lane against the curb. Drivers use the parking spaces or loading zone just as they would at any other curb location. Drivers may not park or drive within the bicycle lane.

Identification of the significant and unavoidable cumulative transit delay impacts does not preclude finding less-than-significant or less-than-significant-with-mitigation impacts for future residential development projects consistent with the proposed action based on circumstances of such future residential development as described above under Impact TR-4.

Impact C-TR-4: The proposed action, in combination with cumulative projects, could result in significant cumulative loading impacts, and the proposed action could contribute considerably to those impacts. No feasible mitigation measures were identified that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level after consideration of several potential mitigation measures. The city has agreed to implement the following mitigation measures:

- M-TR-4b, Driveway and Loading Operations Plan and Curb Cut Restrictions; and
- M-TR-6, Curb Management Plans.

The Planning Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the final EIR, and more specifically on draft EIR p. 4.4-135, although implementation of Mitigation Measures M-TR-4b and M-TR-6 would reduce or minimize the severity of loading impacts associated with future development, this impact would nevertheless remain significant and unavoidable because the mitigation measures would reduce but not eliminate the significant cumulative impacts related loading impacts, as set forth on draft EIR p. 4.4-135.

Identification of the significant and unavoidable cumulative loading impacts does not preclude finding less-than-significant or less-than-significant-with-mitigation impacts for future residential development projects consistent with the proposed action based on the circumstances of such future residential development.

C. Impacts on Noise and Vibration (EIR Section 4.5)

Impact NO-1: Construction of future development consistent with the proposed action would generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. No feasible mitigation measures were identified that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level after consideration of several potential mitigation measures. The city has agreed to implement the following mitigation measure:

- M-NO-1, Construction Noise Control.

The Planning Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the final EIR, and more specifically on draft EIR pp. 4.5-31 to 4.5-41, although implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-1 would reduce the construction noise impacts from development consistent with the proposed action where individual projects are determined to result in a significant construction noise impact, this impact would nevertheless remain significant and unavoidable because of the potential for simultaneous or consecutive construction involving more than one project affecting the same sensitive receptor, as set forth on draft EIR pp. 4.5-31 through pp. 4.5-41.

Identification of the significant impact does not preclude finding less-than-significant or less-than-significant-with-mitigation impacts for future development consistent with the proposed action based on the circumstances of such future residential development, including projects that meet the construction noise screening criteria, projects for which a detailed noise analysis demonstrates that an established noise standard would not be exceeded, or projects for which the Department determines that the frequency, duration, and severity of an identified exceedance would not be substantial either individually or in combination with other future development consistent with the housing element update.

Impact NO-2: Operation of the proposed action would generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies. No feasible mitigation measures were identified that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level after consideration of several potential mitigation measures. The city has agreed to implement the following mitigation measures:

- M-TR-4a, Parking Maximums and Transportation Demand Management; and
- M-NO-2, Noise Analysis and Attenuation.

The Planning Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the final EIR, and more specifically on draft EIR pp. 4.5-41 through 4.5-54, although implementation of Mitigation Measures M-TR-4a and M-NO-2 would reduce the noise impact resulting from traffic noise, this impact would nevertheless remain significant and unavoidable because it is not feasible to quantify the reduction in vehicle trips or traffic noise that would result from implementation of the mitigation measures. Given the uncertainty in quantifying traffic noise reductions from this measure, operational noise impacts related to traffic noise would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation, as set forth on draft EIR pp. 4.5-41 through pp. 4.5-54.

Identification of this significant impact does not preclude finding less-than-significant or less-than-significant-with-mitigation impacts for future residential development consistent with the proposed action based on the circumstances of such future residential development, including projects that meet the traffic noise screening criterion above or projects for which a detailed noise analysis demonstrates that noise impacts from the future project would not be significant.

Impact C-NO-1: The proposed action, in combination with cumulative projects, would result in a significant cumulative construction noise impact. No feasible mitigation measures were identified that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level after consideration of several potential mitigation measures. The city has agreed to implement the following mitigation measure:

- M-NO-1, Construction Noise Control.

The Planning Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the final EIR, and more specifically on draft EIR pp. 4.5-64 through 4.5-66, although implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-1 would reduce the cumulative construction noise impact resulting from future

development consistent with the housing element in combination with cumulative projects, this impact would nevertheless remain significant and unavoidable because due to the potential for simultaneous or ongoing construction involving one or more future developments consistent with the proposed action and other cumulative construction activities to occur near noise sensitive receptors the mitigation measures would reduce but not eliminate the significant cumulative increase in construction noise, as set forth on draft EIR pp. 4.5-64 through pp. 4.5-66.

Identification of this conclusion does not preclude a finding of less than significant or less than significant with mitigation for future projects consistent with the housing element update, including projects that meet the construction noise screening criteria identified under the discussion for Impact NO-1, projects for which a detailed noise analysis demonstrates that an established noise standard would not be exceeded, or projects for which the Planning Department determines that the frequency, duration, and severity of an identified exceedance would not be substantial either individually or in combination with cumulative projects.

D. Impacts on Air Quality (EIR Section 4.6)

Impact AQ-2: The proposed action would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria pollutants for which the project region is in nonattainment status under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. No feasible mitigation measures were identified that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level after consideration of several potential mitigation measures. The city has agreed to implement the following mitigation measure:

- M-TR-4a, Parking Maximums and Transportation Demand Management.

The Planning Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the final EIR, and more specifically on draft EIR pp. 4.6-44 through 4.6-47, although implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-4a would reduce the air quality impact resulting from the regional emissions of criteria air pollutants, this impact would nevertheless remain significant and unavoidable because there are no feasible mitigation measures to reduce impacts from citywide vehicle traffic. Further, the city has no control over the rate of emissions or fuel efficiency of vehicles that travel within the city, because emissions from on-road vehicle travel are governed by state or federal action.

Impact AQ-5: The proposed action would expose sensitive receptors to substantial levels of fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) and toxic air contaminants. No feasible mitigation measures were identified that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level after consideration of several potential mitigation measures. The city has agreed to implement the following mitigation measures:

- M-TR-4a, Parking Maximums and Transportation Demand Management;
- M-AQ-3, Clean Off-Road Construction Equipment; and
- M-AQ-5, Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Engines.

The Planning Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the final EIR, and more specifically on draft EIR pp. 4.6-56 through 4.6-70, although implementation of Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3, M-TR-4a, and M-AQ-5 would reduce the air quality impact resulting from the net increase in fine particulate matter and toxic air contaminants, and due to uncertainty of timing, duration, and intensity of construction, this impact would nevertheless remain significant and unavoidable because the mitigation measures would reduce but not eliminate the significant health risk impacts.

Identification of this significant impact does not preclude finding less-than-significant or less-than-significant-with-mitigation impacts for future residential development consistent with the proposed action for the following reasons. As described in the EIR pp. 4.6-67 to 4.6-69, the air quality analysis with respect to health risk associated with exposure to TACs and particulate matter for the Housing Element Update is based on a generalized assessment of the range of building types that has been conducted in the absence of project-specific information. Because the specific characteristics of each future development consistent with the housing element update and the required construction equipment information (year and duration of construction, equipment type, operating hours, horsepower, etc.) are not known, future projects would be required to undergo a project-level analysis at the time the project is proposed. The project-level analysis would include an evaluation that considers: the existing background health risk, project characteristics compared to the seven building types analyzed here and in EIR Appendix I.3, or other similar projects where a quantitative health risk analysis has been conducted to determine the project's health risk contribution, and location of nearby sensitive receptors. Alternatively, a project-specific health risk analysis may be conducted. The project-level analysis would also consider whether other future development consistent with the proposed action would contribute to health risks at sensitive receptors (that analysis would be conducted as part of that project's cumulative air quality impact analysis). Such analysis could result in to less-than-significant air quality impacts or in impacts that could be mitigated to less-than-significant level through the identified mitigation measures, M-AQ-3, M-TR-4a, and M-AQ-5.

In addition, the quantitative analysis provided for each building type analyzed in EIR Appendix I.3 can be used as a screening tool to determine whether impacts would be significant at the specific sensitive receptors in the vicinity of a project. Appendix I.3 includes unmitigated PM_{2.5} concentration and cancer risk results from construction and operation of multiple building types and at increasing distances from the building. To use the results in Appendix I.3 to demonstrate less-than-significant impacts, future projects would need to identify the applicable building type from the list in Appendix I.3, the distance to the closest sensitive receptors, and the existing background health risks at the sensitive receptor (from the citywide health risk assessment). If a future project can demonstrate that unmitigated construction and operational PM_{2.5} and cancer risk impacts would be less than significant at the corresponding receptor

distances and that the project would not result in a considerable contribution to cumulative health risks, then Mitigation Measures M-TR-4a, M-AQ-3 and M-AQ-5 would not be required.

Impact C-AQ-1:

The proposed action, in combination with cumulative projects, would expose sensitive receptors to substantial levels of fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) and toxic air contaminants under cumulative conditions. No feasible mitigation measures were identified that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level after consideration of several potential mitigation measures. The city has agreed to implement the following mitigation measures:

- M-TR-4a, Parking Maximums and Transportation Demand Management;
- M-AQ-3, Clean Off-Road Construction Equipment; and
- M-AQ-5, Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Engines.

The Planning Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the final EIR, and more specifically on draft EIR pp. 4.6-72 and 4.6-73, although implementation of Mitigation Measures M-TR-4a, M-AQ-3, and MAQ5 would reduce the cumulative fine particulate matter and toxic air contaminants generated during combined construction and operation, this impact would nevertheless remain significant and unavoidable because fine particulate matter and cancer risk thresholds would be exceeded.

Identification of the significant impact does not preclude finding less-than-significant or less-than-significant-with-mitigation impacts for future residential development consistent with the proposed action based on the circumstances of such future residential development.

E. Impacts on Wind (EIR Section 4.7)

Impact WI-1: The proposed action would create wind hazards in publicly accessible areas of substantial pedestrian use. No feasible mitigation measures were identified that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level after consideration of several potential mitigation measures. The city has agreed to implement the following mitigation measures:

- M-WI-1a, Wind Minimization; and
- M-WI-1b, Maintenance Plan for Landscaping on or off the Project Site and Wind Baffling Measures in the Public Right-of-Way.

The Planning Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the final EIR, and more specifically on draft EIR pp. 4.7-9 to 4.7-13, although implementation of Mitigation Measures M-WI-1a and M-WI-1b would reduce or avoid the potential for wind impacts resulting from future projects consistent with the proposed action, this impact would nevertheless remain significant and unavoidable. The specific massing and design of individual future projects consistent with the housing element update is currently unknown. In addition, there are uncertainties regarding the ability of project sponsors to obtain approvals for wind baffling measures that would require modifications off site and/or in public rights-of-way, such as sidewalk

landscaping. Therefore, it cannot be stated with certainty that each future development project would not contribute to a cumulative impact without substantial modifications to individual project design and programs.

F. Impacts on Shadow (EIR Section 4.8)

Impact SH-1: The proposed action would create new shadow that would substantially and adversely affect the use and enjoyment of publicly accessible open spaces. No feasible mitigation measures were identified that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level after consideration of several potential mitigation measures. The city has agreed to implement the following mitigation measure:

- M-SH-1, Shadow Minimization.

The Planning Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the final EIR, and more specifically on draft EIR pp. 4.8-18 through 4.8-42, implementation of Mitigation Measure M-SH-1 would be effective at reducing or avoiding the potential for significant shadow impacts by requiring redesign to reduce or avoid the creation of new shadow that would substantially and adversely affect the use and enjoyment of publicly accessible open spaces in some but not all cases, and impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. The specific location, height, massing, and orientation of individual future projects consistent with the housing element update is currently unknown. In addition, there are uncertainties regarding the feasibility of redesigning projects to reduce or avoid significant shadow impacts. Therefore, the ability of Mitigation Measure M-SH-1 to reduce the shadow impact to a less-than-significant level is uncertain and must be evaluated on a project-by-project basis. As such, the proposed action would result in shadow impacts that would substantially and adversely affect the use and enjoyment of public open space areas, and this impact is significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

G. Impacts on Utilities and Service Systems (EIR Section 4.9)

Impact UT-2: The proposed action would require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects. These impacts would be generally similar to the impacts identified in the final EIR that could result from the construction and operation of future development projects consistent with the housing element update, and would be subject to the same or similar regulatory requirements and mitigation measures, as applicable. No feasible mitigation measures were identified that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level after consideration of several potential mitigation measures. However, the city has agreed to implement the following mitigation measures, as applicable:

- M-CR-2a, Archeological Resources Requirements for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance;

- M-CR-2b, Archeological Monitoring Program;
- M-CR-2c, Archeological Testing Program;
- M-CR-2d, Treatment of Submerged and Deeply Buried Resources;
- M-TCR-1, Tribal Notification and Consultation;
- M-NO-1, Construction Noise Control;
- M-NO-3a, Protection of Adjacent Buildings/Structures and Vibration Monitoring during Construction;
- M-NO-3b, Prevent Damage to Vibration-Sensitive Equipment; and
- M-AQ-3, Construction Air Quality.

The Planning Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the final EIR, and more specifically on draft EIR pp. 4.9-28 through 4.9-33, implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a, M-CR-2b, M-CR-2c, M-CR-2d, M-TCR-1, M-NO-1, M-NO-3a, M-NO-3b, and M-AQ-3 could reduce significant impacts of improvements needed at a recycled water treatment plant and a stormwater drainage basin; however, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable because specific impacts and associated mitigation cannot be determined at this time.

Impact UT-4: The proposed action would result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments.

These impacts would be generally similar to the impacts identified in the final EIR that could result from the construction and operation of future development projects consistent with the housing element update, and would be subject to the same or similar regulatory requirements and mitigation measures, as applicable. No feasible mitigation measures were identified that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level after consideration of several potential mitigation measures. However, the city has agreed to implement the following mitigation measures, as applicable:

- M-CR-2a, Archeological Resources Requirements for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance;
- M-CR-2b, Archeological Monitoring Program;
- M-CR-2c, Archeological Testing Program;
- M-CR-2d, Treatment of Submerged and Deeply Buried Resources;
- M-TCR-1, Tribal Notification and Consultation;
- M-NO-1, Construction Noise Control;
- M-NO-3a, Protection of Adjacent Buildings/Structures and Vibration Monitoring During Construction;
- M-NO-3b, Prevent Damage to Vibration-Sensitive Equipment; and
- M-AQ-3, Construction Air Quality.

The Planning Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the final EIR, and more specifically on draft EIR pp. 4.9-35 and 4.9-36, implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a,

M-CR-2b, M-CR-2c, M-CR-2d, M-TCR-1, M-NO-1, M-NO-3a, M-NO-3b, and M-AQ-3 could reduce significant impacts of improvements needed at a recycled water treatment plant and a stormwater drainage basin; however, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable since specific impacts and associated mitigation cannot be determined at this time.

Significant and Unavoidable Impacts for which No Feasible Mitigation Measures Were Identified

In addition, the final EIR found the following impacts for which no feasible mitigation measures were identified; therefore, they remain significant and unavoidable.

H. Impacts on Transportation and Circulation (EIR Section 4.4)

Impact TR-1: The proposed action would require a substantially extended duration or intense activity due to construction and the secondary effects of that construction could create potentially hazardous conditions for people walking, bicycling, or driving, or public transit operations, or interfere with emergency access or accessibility for people walking or bicycling or substantially delay public transit. There are no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce impacts, and therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable, for the reasons set forth on draft EIR pp. 4.4-86 through 4.4-92.

Many projects consistent with the housing element update, by themselves, would not result in significant construction-related transportation impacts given their anticipated construction duration and intensity. Additionally, city regulations would reduce such impacts. However, given the potential magnitude of future development consistent with the proposed action, and the uncertainty concerning construction schedules, construction activities associated with multiple overlapping projects could result in multiple travel lane closures, high volumes of trucks in the vicinity, and sidewalk closures. These conditions could, in turn, substantially delay transit or result in potentially hazardous conditions. In some instances, depending on construction activities, the overlap of two or more construction projects may not result in significant impacts. However, for conservative purposes, in considering of this, the EIR found that construction-related transportation impacts of the proposed action a significant impact.

Known measures to avoid or minimize effects of construction activities of development, transportation, and infrastructure projects in the public right-of-way are covered by existing SFMTA and public works regulations. Imposing sequential (i.e., non-overlapping schedules) for all projects would be infeasible due to potential lengthy delays in project implementation and thus prolonged transportation impacts. Because no feasible mitigation measures are available to avoid or minimize this impact, the construction-related transportation impacts of future residential development consistent with the proposed action would be significant and unavoidable.

Identification of the significant impact does not preclude finding less-than-significant or less-than-significant-with-mitigation impacts for future residential development consistent with the proposed action based on the circumstances of such future residential development.

Impact C-TR-1: The proposed action, in combination with cumulative projects, would result in significant construction-related transportation impacts, and the proposed action would contribute considerably to those impacts. There are no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce impacts, and therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable, for the reasons set forth on draft EIR pp. 4.4-132 and 4.4-133.

Under cumulative conditions, construction of future residential development consistent with the proposed action would likely overlap with other residential and non-residential development (i.e., the total growth of 150,000 housing units between 2020 conditions and 2050 proposed action conditions), transportation network projects (e.g., Geary BRT), and infrastructure projects, such as the Caltrain Pennsylvania Avenue Extension tunnel, the Second Transbay Tube Project, and the Downtown Congestion Pricing. In some instances, depending on construction activities, overlapping construction may not result in significant impacts. However, as described in Impact TR-1, given the uncertainties of projects related to timing and location, it is possible that simultaneous construction of development consistent with the proposed action could result in significant disruptions for vehicular traffic, transit, people walking, and people bicycling, even if each individual project alone would not result in significant impacts. Therefore, for conservative purposes, given the potential concurrent construction of multiple residential and non-residential projects, and infrastructure projects, some in close proximity to each other; the expected intensity and duration; and the likely impact on transit, people walking and bicycling, significant cumulative construction impacts would occur.

I. Impacts on Utilities and Service Systems (EIR Section 4.9)

Impact UT-1:

Sufficient water supplies would be available to serve projected growth in normal, dry, and multiple dry years without implementation of the Bay Delta Plan Amendment. If the Bay Delta Plan Amendment is implemented, the SFPUC would require rationing and could develop new or expanded water supply facilities to address shortfalls in single and multiple dry years. Environmental impacts related to new or expanded water supply facilities and increased rationing would result in significant and unavoidable environmental impacts. There are no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts. Environmental impacts related to new or expanded water supply facilities and increased rationing would result in significant and unavoidable environmental impacts, for the reasons set forth on draft EIR pp. 4.9-14 through 4.9-28.

Future development consistent with the housing element update could require the construction and operation of new or expanded water supply facilities. The construction or expansion of such facilities would be subject to project-level environmental review in accordance with CEQA at the time that it is proposed. This project-level review would identify any significant environmental impacts that could result from the construction and operation of such facilities and would identify project-specific mitigation measures to lessen or avoid any significant impacts as feasible. While it is not possible to identify project-specific impacts and mitigation measures with certainty at this time, based on the available information and review of CEQA environmental documents for similar projects, the EIR anticipated that the construction of new or expanded water supply facilities could have significant impacts, including temporary noise, hazards and hazardous materials, and air quality impacts related to the use of heavy construction equipment, demolition, excavation, hauling, and construction activities. Depending on the scale of the projects and specific location of the project sites, such projects could also have significant impacts on other resource areas, such as aesthetics, transportation, built environment historic resources, archeological resources, tribal cultural resources, geology and soils, paleontological resources, biological resources, land use and planning, hydrology and water quality, and utilities.

These impacts would be generally similar to the impacts identified in the final EIR that could result from the construction and operation of future development projects consistent with the housing element update, and would be subject to the same or similar regulatory requirements and mitigation measures, as applicable. Such mitigation measures could include those identified in the final EIR, including Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a, Archeological Resources Requirements for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance; Mitigation Measure M-CR-2b, Archeological Monitoring Program; Mitigation Measure M-CR-2c, Archeological Testing Program; Mitigation Measure M-CR-2d, Treatment of Submerged and Deeply Buried Resources, in Section 4.2, Cultural Resources; Mitigation Measure M-TCR-1, Tribal Notification and Consultation, in Section 4.3, Tribal Cultural Resources; Mitigation Measure M-NO-1, Construction Noise Control; Mitigation Measure M-NO-3a, Protection of Adjacent Buildings/Structures and Vibration Monitoring during Construction; and Mitigation Measure M-NO-3b, Prevent Damage to Vibration-Sensitive Equipment, in Section 4.5, Noise and Vibration; as well as Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3, Construction Air Quality, in Section 4.6, Air Quality.

SECTION V. Evaluation of Project Alternatives

A. Alternatives Analyzed in the Final Environmental Impact Report

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 proposed project or the project location that would feasibly attain most of the proposed project's 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 proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed action.

The Department considered a range of alternatives in draft EIR Chapter 6, Alternatives. The EIR analyzed the proposed action compared to four CEQA alternatives:

- The **No Project Alternative**, which assumes housing development would continue to occur in San Francisco under the goals, policies, and implementing measures of the existing 2014 housing element.
- The **Eastside Alternative**, which would include policies that would be an enhanced continuation of the existing development pattern in the city, which focuses development on the east side of the city and maintains lower density in the western neighborhoods.
- The **Preservation Alternative**, which assumes that some of the proposed action’s policies would be revised to include an additional focus on preserving historic resources and ensuring compatibility with historic districts.
- The **Dispersed Growth Alternative**, which would include policies that would direct growth to well-resourced areas, mostly within low-density neighborhoods, focusing only on small multi-family buildings.

In addition, the EIR analyzed the proposed action compared to Plan Bay Area 2050. Plan Bay Area 2050 is evaluated in the EIR at a programmatic level to acknowledge and disclose the similarities and differences in environmental impacts between this regional plan’s projections for San Francisco and the proposed action. Plan Bay Area 2050 is the long-range integrated transportation and land use/housing strategy through 2050 for the San Francisco Bay Area.

Each CEQA alternative and Plan Bay Area 2050 is discussed and analyzed in these findings, in addition to being analyzed in draft EIR Chapter 6. These CEQA alternatives adequately represent a range of potentially feasible alternatives required under CEQA for the proposed action. These CEQA alternatives would lessen or, in some cases, avoid significant and unavoidable adverse impacts related to cultural resources, transportation and circulation, air quality, noise and vibration, wind, and shadow.

In addition, in developing the proposed action and the CEQA alternatives, the final EIR analyzed a series of alternatives that were rejected and did not receive in-depth analysis. These alternatives were rejected and not studied in depth because either they were determined to be infeasible, or they did not avoid or lessen (and in some cases increased) the impacts of the proposed action. These alternatives considered but rejected included a Transit Corridors

Alternative, a Full Preservation Alternative, an Increased Demolition Alternative, and a 100 Percent Affordable Housing Alternative (refer to draft EIR pp. 6-234 and 6-235).

The Planning Commission certifies that it has independently reviewed and considered the information on the alternatives provided in the final EIR and in the record. The final EIR reflects the Planning Commission's and the city's independent judgment as to the alternatives. The Planning Commission finds that the proposed action provides the best balance between satisfaction of proposed action objectives and mitigation of environmental impacts to the extent feasible, as described and analyzed in the final EIR.

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 proposed action as described in the final EIR that would reduce or avoid the impacts of the proposed action 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 proposed action alternatives and proposed action were fully considered and compared in the final EIR.

No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative assumes that the proposed action does not take place, and instead that housing development would continue to occur in San Francisco under the goals, policies, and implementing measures of the existing 2014 housing element of the general plan and under existing zoning through 2050. The environmental baseline used to identify the impacts of the No Project Alternative is 2020 conditions. The impacts of the No Project Alternative are the reasonably foreseeable impacts that could result from construction and operation of future development consistent with the existing 2014 housing element and the city’s existing zoning and other land use controls. Housing development would continue under the polices and land

use controls that are currently in place. Housing development would continue to occur in the same areas and in the same general manner as it has under the existing 2014 housing element and zoning controls. That is, most of the new housing development would occur on the east side of the city and outside of well-resourced areas.

The No Project Alternative would reduce some—but not all—of the significant and less-than-significant impacts identified for the proposed action because it would rely on a program of reduced future development intensity that is currently in place under the existing 2014 housing element policies. The No Project Alternative assumes that growth in the city would occur with or without implementation of the proposed action but that, absent implementation of the proposed action, a smaller amount of future development would occur and the distribution of future development would continue to be primarily on the east side of the city. Therefore, although it is likely that the No Project Alternative would reduce the intensity of impacts, it cannot be stated with certainty whether the No Project Alternative would substantially reduce or avoid any of the identified impacts because development would continue under this alternative. However, if under the No Project Alternative, the additional housing units anticipated are not constructed in the city and are instead constructed elsewhere in the San Francisco Bay Area, regional VMT and related greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and energy use would be greater under the No Project Alternative than under the proposed action. This is because the city has the lowest VMT per capita in the region, and any future development outside of the city would increase VMT per capita and resulting GHG emissions.

The No Project Alternative would accommodate substantially less new housing than the proposed action and broadly continue the existing development pattern of future housing construction on the east side of the city. As such, this alternative would be less successful than the proposed action in meeting project objectives such as recognizing the right to housing as a foundation for health and social and economic well-being; repairing the harms of historic racial, ethnic, and social discrimination against American Indian, Black, and other people of color; and fostering racially and socially inclusive neighborhoods through equitable distribution of investment and growth. In addition, the No Project Alternative would not meet the objective to provide sufficient housing for existing and future residents.

The No Project Alternative does not meet one objective and only partially meets three of the four objectives of the proposed action. Most importantly, the No Project Alternative would be unlikely to allow the city to fulfill its legally mandated obligation to update its housing element to accommodate the city's RHNA allocation, and to affirmatively further fair housing.

The Planning Commission rejects the No Project Alternative as infeasible because it would not allow the city to comply with state housing law, it would fail to avoid several significant and unavoidable impacts, and it would fail to meet the proposed action objectives (as described in the final EIR) and the city's policy objectives for the following reasons:

- It would only partially fulfill the objective of recognizing the right to housing as a foundation for health, and social and economic well-being due to the reduction in total number of housing units produced compared to the proposed action.
- It would only partially fulfill the objective of repairing the harms of historic racial and ethnic discrimination against American, Indian, Black, and other people of color due to the reduction in total number of housing units produced compared to proposed action. It would also continue the pattern of housing growth on the east side of San Francisco, where most priority equity geographies and areas vulnerable to displacement are located. It would therefore not meet state mandates and local goals to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing by distributing a significant share of new housing growth to well-resourced areas and areas with lower concentrations of non-white and lower income populations.
- It would only partially fulfill the objective of fostering racially and socially inclusive neighborhoods through equitable distribution of investment and growth due to the reduction in total number of housing units produced and the location and inequitable distribution of growth.
- It would not provide sufficient housing for existing residents and future generations for a city with diverse cultures, family structures, and abilities because it would not meet the goal of producing 5,000 housing units per year, or 150,000 housing units by 2050.

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

Eastside Alternative

The Eastside Alternative is informed by an eastside land use pattern that the Department analyzed in its Housing Affordability Strategies Report. To achieve a reduction in vehicle trip-related impacts, the Eastside Alternative would concentrate growth in areas of San Francisco with greater transit capacity and accessibility as well as areas closer to San Francisco job centers, such as downtown and South of Market. The Eastside Alternative would be an enhanced continuation of the existing development pattern in the city (e.g., with height and density increases), which focuses development primarily on the east side of the city and maintains lower density in the western neighborhoods. The Eastside Alternative would result in approximately 50,000 net new housing units and similar job totals compared to the 2050 environmental baseline, similar to the proposed action. However, policies and objectives supporting the Eastside Alternative would focus additional housing growth on the east side, primarily in neighborhoods with existing area plans, in existing neighborhood commercial districts, and along corridors such as Van Ness Avenue, Mission Street, and Third Street. As a result, the Eastside Alternative would result in fewer housing units on the west side of the city than the proposed action. The Eastside Alternative would also encourage an increase in residential density close to downtown, in light industrial areas, and near the eastern waterfront. Policies and objectives supporting this alternative would not direct housing growth to well-

resourced areas, as under the proposed action. Under the Eastside Alternative, density would increase outside of well-resourced areas, including former industrial areas on the east side of the city.

The Eastside Alternative aims to meet fully or partially most of the project objectives while reducing impacts related to vehicle trips, such as air quality, noise, greenhouse gas, and transportation impacts. The Eastside Alternative would avoid or reduce some of the significant impacts and less-than-significant impacts identified for the proposed action because it would focus future development on the east side of the city. This would reduce impacts related to criteria air pollutants, wind, shadow, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage facilities, and wastewater treatment capacity. However, impacts related to transportation hazards during construction, loading, cumulative transportation hazards during construction, cumulative public transit delay, cumulative loading, cultural resources, tribal cultural resources, cumulative construction noise, cumulative operational noise, sensitive species, and whether development could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it was located on a site found on the Cortese List (Government Code section 65962.5) (hereinafter “Cortese List hazards”) would be greater than those of the proposed action because of additional future development being focused on the east side of the city. All other impacts would be similar to impacts under the proposed action.

The Eastside Alternative would accommodate the same level of housing production as the proposed action. As such, this alternative would be as successful as the proposed action in providing sufficient housing for existing residents and future generations for a city with diverse cultures, family structures, and abilities. The Eastside Alternative would concentrate housing growth on the east side of the city where most priority equity geographies and areas vulnerable to displacement are located and would not direct new a substantial portion of new housing to well-resourced areas and areas with lower concentrations of non-white and lower-income populations. As such, this alternative would not meet state requirements or proposed Housing Element objectives to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing. This alternative would be less successful than the proposed action in meeting project objectives such as recognizing the right to housing as a foundation for health and social and economic well-being; repairing the harms of historic racial, ethnic, and social discrimination against American Indian, Black, and other People of Color; and fostering racially and socially inclusive neighborhoods through equitable distribution of investment and growth. Therefore, the Eastside Alternative only meets one of the four objectives and partially meets three of the four objectives of the proposed action.

The Planning Commission rejects the Eastside Alternative as infeasible because it would fail to avoid several significant and unavoidable impacts, it would fail to meet the proposed action objectives (as described in the final EIR) and the city’s policy objectives for the following reasons:

- It would only partially fulfill the objective of recognizing the right to housing as a foundation for health, and social and economic well-being due to the concentration of housing growth on the east side of San Francisco, mostly within areas vulnerable to displacement and outside of well-resourced areas.
- It would only partially fulfill the objective of repairing the harms of historic racial and ethnic discrimination against American Indian, Black, and other people of color due to concentration of housing growth on the east side of San Francisco, where most priority equity geographies and areas vulnerable to displacement are located.
- It would only partially fulfill the objective of fostering racially and socially inclusive neighborhoods through equitable distribution of investment and growth because the alternative would concentrate housing growth on the east side of San Francisco where most priority equity geographies and areas vulnerable to displacement are located, and the alternative would not meet state and local goals to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing.
- It would result in greater impacts compared to the proposed action regarding: cultural resources; tribal cultural resources; construction-related potentially hazardous transportation hazards during construction, loading, cumulative transportation hazards during construction, cumulative public transit delay, cumulative loading, cumulative construction noise, cumulative operational noise, sensitive species, and Cortese List hazards.

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

Preservation Alternative

The Preservation Alternative would direct a greater portion of housing development away from parcels with existing built-environment historic resources compared to the proposed action. Under the Preservation Alternative, some of the proposed action's policies would be revised to include an additional focus on preserving built-environment historic resources and reducing incompatibility with historic districts. These revisions would direct new housing to avoid significant impacts on built-environment historic resources. This alternative would preserve built-environment historic resources by protecting parcels with individual historic resources from future development, promoting the use of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (secretary's standards) in the future development of parcels with historic resources, and requiring development in historic districts to be compatible with historic districts. High and mid-rise development projects would be developed primarily on parcels that do not contain built-environment historic resources that would be impacted by such development or on parcels that are located in historic districts where such buildings would be incompatible with the scale of the historic district. The Preservation Alternative would result in approximately 50,000 net new housing units and similar job totals compared to the 2050

environmental baseline, similar to the proposed action. This growth would be concentrated in well-resourced areas, similar to the proposed action.

The Preservation Alternative would result in impacts similar to those of the proposed action with the exception of impacts to built-environment historical resources and scenic resources, which would be less than for the proposed action, because it would include the same amount of future development, and the distribution of this development would be very similar to the proposed action. The intent of the Preservation Alternative is to reduce impacts to built-environment historic resources, which would redirect growth within well-resourced areas.

The Preservation Alternative would accommodate the same level of housing production as the proposed action. As such, this alternative would be as successful as the proposed action in recognizing the right to housing as a foundation for health and social and economic well-being and providing sufficient housing for existing residents and future generations for a city with diverse cultures, family structures, and abilities. The Preservation Alternative would redistribute housing growth based on impacts to built-environment historic resources and not intangible cultural heritage. As such, this alternative would not be as successful as the proposed action in repairing the harms of historic racial, ethnic, and social discrimination against American Indian, Black, and other people of color. The Preservation Alternative would redirect growth from less racially diverse but well-resourced areas to more racially diverse areas. Because more growth would be directed to diverse and well-resourced areas, this alternative would not be as successful as the proposed action in fostering racially and socially inclusive neighborhoods through equitable distribution of investment and growth, as less-diverse areas would see less growth.

The Preservation Alternative meets two of the four objectives and partially meets two of the four objectives of the proposed action.

The Planning Commission rejects the Preservation Alternative as infeasible because it would fail to avoid several significant and unavoidable impacts, it would fail to meet the project objectives (as described in the final EIR) and the city's policy objectives for the following reasons:

- It would only partially fulfill the object of repairing the harms of historic racial and ethnic discrimination against American Indian, Black, and other people of color as housing growth is redistributed based on impacts on built- environment historic resources alone and not intangible cultural heritage.
- It would only partially fulfill the objective of fostering racially and socially inclusive neighborhoods through equitable distribution of investment and growth because this alternative re-directs growth from less racially diverse areas within well-resourced areas such as the Marina, Cow Hollow, Pacific Heights, Buena Vista, Noe Valley, and West of Twin Peaks to more racially diverse areas like the Sunset and Richmond. The

Preservation Alternative would therefore meet state mandates and local policy goals to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing to a lesser degree than the proposed action.

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

Dispersed Growth Alternative

The Dispersed Growth Alternative is informed by a land use pattern that the Department analyzed in its Housing Affordability Strategies Report, a residential district growth option, which would allow the development of small multi-family homes (i.e., four stories and four to 19 housing units) on the majority of the city's residential land currently zoned to allow low-density neighborhoods (e.g., RH-1 or RH-2). Under the Dispersed Growth Alternative, there would be no change to limits on building height, but density controls would be removed. The Dispersed Growth Alternative would direct growth to low-density neighborhoods, encouraging construction of small multi-family buildings. In contrast to the proposed action, this alternative would not promote mid-rise, multi-family buildings (six- to eight-story buildings) because there would be no height changes. Therefore, this alternative would not result in as much growth in well-resourced areas, and a greater portion of housing growth would continue to occur on the east side of the city compared to the proposed action.

The Dispersed Growth Alternative would result in approximately 50,000 net new housing units and similar job totals compared to the 2050 environmental baseline, similar to the proposed action. The distribution of future housing units consistent with the Dispersed Growth Alternative differs from that of the proposed action. Under this alternative, neighborhoods in the western and northern parts of San Francisco, such as Inner and Outer Sunset, West of Twin Peaks, and the Inner and Outer Richmond neighborhoods, would see increased housing growth, above the 2050 environmental baseline, but this growth would be less than that under the proposed action. In contrast, the Dispersed Growth Alternative would result in more housing units in the southern and eastern neighborhoods, such as the Mission, South of Market, Downtown, Portola, Oceanview/Merced/Ingleside, and the Excelsior, compared to the proposed action.

The Dispersed Growth Alternative would avoid or reduce some of the significant impacts and less-than-significant impacts identified for the proposed action because it would focus future development in low-density neighborhoods, encouraging construction of small multi-family buildings. This would reduce impacts related to criteria air pollutants, wind, and shadow. However, impacts related to built-environment historic resources, archeological resources, tribal cultural resources, transportation hazards during construction, loading, cumulative transportation hazards during construction, cumulative public transit delay, cumulative loading, and Cortese List hazards would be greater than those of the proposed action because additional future development would be dispersed throughout the city, including more

housing on the east side, compared to the proposed action. All other impacts would be similar to impacts under the proposed action.

The Dispersed Growth Alternative would accommodate the same level of housing production as the proposed action. As such, this alternative would be as successful as the proposed action in providing sufficient housing for existing residents and future generations for a city with diverse cultures, family structures, and abilities. The Dispersed Growth Alternative would result in more housing growth on the east side of the city than would occur under the proposed action where most priority equity geographies and areas vulnerable to displacement are located. As such, this alternative would be less successful than the proposed action in meeting some of the project objectives such as recognizing the right to housing as a foundation for health and social and economic well-being; repairing the harms of historic racial, ethnic, and social discrimination against American Indian, Black, and other people of color; and fostering racially and socially inclusive neighborhoods through equitable distribution of investment and growth, and would meet requirements and goals to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing to a lesser degree than the proposed action.

The Dispersed Growth Alternative only meets one of the four objectives and partially meets three of the four objectives of the proposed action.

The Planning Commission rejects the Dispersed Growth Alternative as infeasible because it would fail to avoid several significant and unavoidable impacts, it would fail to meet the project objectives (as described in the final EIR) and the city's policy objectives for the following reasons:

- It would only partially fulfill the objective of recognizing the right to housing as a foundation for health, and social and economic well-being due to the relatively greater, compared to the proposed action, concentration of housing growth on the east side of San Francisco, mostly within areas vulnerable to displacement and outside of well-resourced areas. This Alternative would not sufficiently meet requirements and goals to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing.
- It would only partially fulfill the objective of repairing the harms of historic racial and ethnic discrimination against American Indian, Black, and other people of color due to increased housing growth on the east side of San Francisco, where most priority equity geographies and areas with people vulnerable to displacement are located.
- It would only partially fulfill the objective of fostering racially and socially inclusive neighborhoods through equitable distribution of investment and growth because this alternative would have increased housing growth on the east side of San Francisco where most priority equity geographies and areas vulnerable to displacement are located.
- It would result in greater impacts compared to the proposed action regarding: built-environment historic resources, archeological resources, tribal cultural resources,

transportation hazards during construction, loading, cumulative transportation hazards during construction, cumulative public transit delay, cumulative loading, and Cortese List hazards.

For the foregoing reasons, the Planning Commission rejects the Dispersed Growth Alternative as infeasible.

Alternatives Proposed by the Public Comments

During the housing element update draft EIR comment period, various commenters proposed alternatives to the housing element update. The responses to comments document Response ALT-1 on RTC pp. 4-101 through 4-114 provides a detailed discussion of how the alternatives proposed by the commenters on the draft EIR are consistent with the reasonable range of alternatives studied in the EIR and/or how the alternatives do not meet the basic objectives of housing element update and or reduce or eliminate the housing element update's significant environmental impacts. That discussion is incorporated herein by reference, and the Planning Commission rejects these alternatives as infeasible.

SECTION VI. Evaluation of Plan Bay Area 2050

Plan Bay Area 2050 is the long-range integrated transportation and land use/housing strategy for the San Francisco Bay Area through 2050. On October 21, 2021, the executive board of the Association of Bay Area Governments and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission jointly approved Plan Bay Area 2050. Although it would not substantially lessen or avoid impacts of the proposed action, the EIR evaluated Plan Bay Area 2050 at a programmatic level to acknowledge and disclose the similarities and differences in environmental impacts between this regional plan's projections for San Francisco and the proposed action.

Plan Bay Area 2050 forecasts that approximately 578,000 households will be in San Francisco by 2050. The approximately 578,000 households would result in approximately 596,000 housing units, a 37,600-unit increase compared with the proposed action. Plan Bay Area 2050 assumes a different development pattern compared with the proposed action. Future growth would be focused on the east side of the city, particularly in the Northeast, Downtown, Mission, and South Bayshore planning districts, and also in the Richmond planning district. Plan Bay Area 2050 would include approximately 87,600 net new housing units and 6,600 net new jobs by 2050 compared with the 2050 environmental baseline.

As set forth in the final EIR, Plan Bay Area 2050 would not substantially lessen or avoid impacts of the proposed action because future growth would be greater under Plan Bay Area 2050 than under the proposed action. The only exception is related to criteria air pollutants, which would be reduced under Plan Bay Area 2050 as growth in vehicle miles traveled would be less than the growth in service population. Impacts related to built-environment historic resources, archeological resources, tribal cultural resources, transportation hazards during construction, loading, cumulative transportation hazards during construction, cumulative public transit

delay, cumulative loading, construction noise, operational noise, construction vibration, cumulative construction noise, cumulative operational noise, PM2.5 and toxic air contaminants (TACs), cumulative PM2.5 and TACs, shadow, recreation, water supply, solid waste capacity, fire services, police services, schools, libraries, parks, special-status species, paleontological resources, and Cortese List hazards would be greater than those of the proposed action because the amount of future growth would be greater under Plan Bay Area 2050 than under the proposed action.

The Plan Bay Area 2050 Alternative, because of its geographic distribution of growth focused more on the east side of the city and not to the well-resourced areas, would also fail to meet the project objectives related to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing to the same degree as the proposed action. For these reasons, to the extent required, the Planning Commission rejects Plan Bay Area 2050 Alternative as infeasible.

SECTION VII. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The Planning Commission finds that, notwithstanding the imposition of all feasible mitigation measures, 16 significant impacts related to cultural resources, transportation, noise, air quality, wind, shadow, and utilities would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation, as described in more detail above. In addition, the Planning Commission finds that three additional impacts related to transportation and utilities would be significant and unavoidable, also as described above, and that no mitigation measures have been identified to reduce these impacts.

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 proposed action as set forth below independently and collectively outweighs these significant and unavoidable impacts and is an overriding consideration warranting approval of the proposed action. Any one of the reasons for approval cited below is sufficient to justify approval of the proposed action. 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 proposed action to support approval of the proposed action 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 proposed action approvals, significant effects on the environment from implementation of the proposed action have been eliminated or substantially lessened, where feasible. All mitigation measures identified in the EIR and MMRP are adopted as part of the Proposed Action Approval

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 proposed action would meet all of the objectives, as described in the draft EIR.

The proposed action would have the following benefits:

1. Approval of the 2022 Housing Element will help the city meet its policy goals and state requirements to demonstrate that the city's housing policies and programs are Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing in ways that combat housing discrimination, eliminate racial bias, undo historic patterns of segregation, and lift barriers that restrict access in order to foster inclusive communities and achieve racial equity, fair housing choice, and opportunity for all. In addition to undertaking operational and financial programs, the AFFH principle requires that the city direct future housing growth, particularly in any rezoning actions and investments, toward well-resourced areas and areas of affluence and not in areas of concentrated poverty, non-white and vulnerable populations. The proposed 2022 Housing Element would achieve these goals and foster a more equitable geographic distribution of housing growth, including housing for lower income households, to well-resourced areas. The 2022 Housing Element is the city's first Housing Element to be explicitly centered on racial and social equity and has been directly guided by Planning Commission Resolution No. 20738.
2. Approval of the 2022 Housing Element will help the city to fulfill its state-mandated fair share housing obligations as adopted by the Association of Bay Area Governments. The city's fair share of regional housing, or RHNA, for the period of 2023-2031 has been determined to be a total of 82,069 units, including 20,867 units affordable to households with very low income; 12,014 for low income households; 13,717 for moderate income households; and 35,471 for above moderate income households. In order to ensure "No Net Loss" and adequate sites over the RHNA period, the city has identified capacity for 115% of these targets, or 94,379 units overall. In keeping with the AFFH principles and the broader policy objectives to improve racial and social equity, the 2022 Housing Element encourages the production of housing in well-resourced areas, primarily on the northern, central and western parts of the city, with a focus on areas in these neighborhoods that are better served by transit, proximity to jobs and services and other amenities.
3. The adoption of the 2022 Housing Element will allow the city to have a housing element that complies with state housing element law and is consistent with the standards and expectations set by HCD for certification. Without a housing element that substantially complies with state housing element law as determined by HCD, the city would be subject to shortened timelines to rezone areas within the city to meet the city's RHNA obligations; could be found ineligible for certain grant funds affecting affordable housing and transit programs; could be subject to judicial remedies, including financial

penalties and judicial intervention. Regarding transportation grants, the city has over \$151 million in awarded grants for 2022-2023 alone that would be jeopardized by not having a compliant housing element. In addition, without a housing element that substantially complies with state housing element law, the city's ability to deny certain housing developments could be constrained.

4. The adoption of the 2022 Housing Element is consistent with, and will help the city meet the land use and housing expectations of, the region's Sustainable Communities Strategy, Plan Bay Area 2050. The SCS is mandated under state SB375 and achieving its land use patterns and housing strategies is necessary for the region to meet the greenhouse gas reduction targets established by the state pursuant to AB32, the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. Notably, the well-resourced areas that are necessarily the focus of the 2022 Housing Element's housing production policies in order to achieve AFFH goals substantially overlap with several Priority Development Areas (PDAs) recognized in Plan Bay Area 2050 and designated by the board of supervisors in Resolution 8-20 adopted on January 14, 2020. The PDAs are recognized in Plan Bay Area 2050 as preferable to direct the region's growth because they are transit-served and have access to opportunity.
5. The 2022 Housing Element embodies policies and actions called for in the city's 2021 Climate Action Plan (CAP). The CAP recognizes that "Providing housing to people of all incomes near services, jobs, and activities helps replace private vehicle trips with low-carbon modes such as walking, biking, and transit." Many strategies called for in the CAP are expanded on in the Housing Element 2022, including taking steps to increase housing production in the well-resourced areas, advancing policies and programs to reverse harms to communities of color and lower income populations, increasing funding for affordable housing, and pursuing cost-effective green building practices.
6. The 2022 Housing Element is the result of an extensive multi-year community engagement process. Starting in May 2020, the Housing Element Update process included three major rounds of outreach with feedback integrated into each draft of the plan. The outreach was inclusive of organizations and residents across the city and had a particular focus on previously underrepresented groups, including Black, indigenous, and other people of color, low-income, LGBTQ+, senior, and other vulnerable communities. Outreach was conducted through 23 focus groups (including 6 in Cantonese and Spanish), 65+ community group events, 12 discussions with industry experts and leaders, 200+ online comment forms, 1,600+ paper and digital surveys, and frequent informational hearings at the Planning Commission. The Department published summaries and documented changes made between Housing Element drafts 1, 2 and 3 showing how this input was incorporated. The Commission finds that the policies and objectives in the resulting 2022 Housing Element best balances the diverse, and sometimes competing, needs of all San Francisco residents, while providing a comprehensive vision for the city's future projected housing needs.

Having considered the above, and in light of the evidence contained in the final EIR and in the record, the Planning Commission finds that the benefits of the proposed action outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects identified in the final EIR and that those adverse environmental effects are therefore acceptable.

AGREEMENT TO IMPLEMENT MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

<i>Record No.:</i>	2019-016230ENV	<i>Block/Lot:</i>	Multiple
<i>Project Title:</i>	San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update	<i>Lot Size:</i>	Not Applicable
<i>BPA Nos:</i>	Not Applicable	<i>Project Sponsor:</i>	San Francisco Planning Commission, James Pappas, 628.652.7470
<i>Zoning:</i>	Multiple Use Districts Multiple Height and Bulk Districts	<i>Lead Agency:</i>	San Francisco Planning Department
		<i>Staff Contact:</i>	Elizabeth White – 628.652.7557

The table below indicates when compliance with each mitigation measure must occur. Some mitigation 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.

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Period of Compliance			Compliance with Mitigation Measure Completed?
	Prior to the Start of Construction*	During Construction**	Post-construction or Operational	
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1a: Avoid or Minimize Effects on Identified Built Environment Resources	X			
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1b: Best Practices and Construction Monitoring Program for Historic Resources	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1c: Relocation Plan	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1d: Documentation	X			
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1e: Oral History	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1f: Salvage Plan	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1g: Interpretation	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1h: Historic Context	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1i: Walking or Building Tour	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1j: Educational Program	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1k: Community Memorial Event	X			
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1l: Revise Historic District Documentation	X	X		

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Period of Compliance			Compliance with Mitigation Measure Completed?
	Prior to the Start of Construction*	During Construction**	Post-construction or Operational	
Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a: Procedures for Discovery of Archeological Resources for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-2b: Archeological Monitoring Program	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-2c: Archeological Testing Program	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-CR-2d: Treatment of Submerged and Deeply Buried Resources	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-TCR-1: Tribal Notification and Consultation	X			
Mitigation Measure M-TR-4a: Parking Maximums and Transportation Demand Management	X			
Mitigation Measure M-TR-4b: Driveway and Loading Operations Plan and Curb Cut Restrictions	X			
Mitigation Measure M-TR-4c: Implement Transit Travel Times Measures to Reduce Transit Delay	X	X	X	
Mitigation Measure M-TR-6: Curb Management Plans	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-NO-1: Construction Noise Control	X			
Mitigation Measure M-NO-2: Noise Analysis and Attenuation	X			
Mitigation Measure M-NO-3a: Protection of Adjacent Buildings/Structures and Vibration Monitoring During Construction	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-NO-3b: Prevent Interference with Vibration-Sensitive Equipment	X	X		
Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3: Clean Construction Equipment	X			
Mitigation Measure M-AQ-5: Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Engines	X	X	X	
Mitigation Measure M-WI-1a: Wind Minimization	X			
Mitigation Measure M-WI-1b: Maintenance Plan for Landscaping on or off the Project Site and Wind Baffling Measures in the Public Right-of-Way	X			
Mitigation Measure M-SH-1: Shadow Minimization	X			
Mitigation Measure M-GE-5: Inadvertent Discovery of Paleontological Resources during Construction	X	X		

NOTES:

* 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.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
MITIGATION MEASURES AGREED TO BY PROJECT SPONSOR					
CULTURAL RESOURCES					
<p>Mitigation Measure M-CR-1a: Avoid or Minimize Effects on Identified Built Environment Resources.</p> <p>The project sponsor of a future development project consistent with the housing element update that would result in material impairment to a built-environment historic resource, either an individual resource or a historic district, shall consult with the department’s preservation and design staff on feasible means for avoiding or reducing significant adverse effects on built-environment resources per applicable department guidelines, such as residential design guidelines and policies in the urban design element. The project sponsor, in consultation with preservation and design staff, shall provide at minimum drawings and rendering of a proposed project that avoids material impairment of the historic resource in order for the environmental review officer (ERO) to determine if such a project is feasible. Additional studies and reports, such as an economic feasibility analysis, may be required as directed by the ERO. If the project is determined infeasible based on the above criteria, the project sponsor shall consult with the department’s preservation and design staff to determine an approach to reduce the significant impact on built-environment resources. This could include, but is not limited to, retaining a portion of the existing building or retaining specific character-defining features and incorporating them into the project. The project sponsor shall demonstrate the feasibility, as defined in CEQA Guidelines section 15364 and as determined by the ERO, of retention of character-defining features or a portion of the existing building to the department’s preservation and design staff by providing drawings and renderings along with other requested studies and reports.</p>	<p>Required for future development consistent with the housing element update that would not comply with the secretary’s standards, would demolish historic resources, or would substantially alter important characteristics of a resource’s historic setting</p>	<p>Project sponsor</p>	<p>Prior to approval of the future development project</p>	<p>Planning Department (preservation and design staff)</p>	<p>Considered complete upon review and approval of a proposed project</p>

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<p>Mitigation Measure M-CR-1b: Best Practices and Construction Monitoring Program for Historic Resources.</p> <p>Prior to the issuance of demolition, building, or site permits, the project sponsor of a future development project consistent with the housing element update using heavy-duty construction equipment on a project site that contains a historic resources or on a project site that is adjacent to a historic resource shall incorporate into contract specifications a requirement that the contractor(s) use all feasible means to protect and avoid damage to onsite and adjacent historic resources as identified by the department, including, but not necessarily limited to, staging of equipment and materials so as to avoid direct damage, maintaining a buffer zone when possible between heavy equipment and historic resources, or covering the roof of adjacent structures to avoid damage from falling objects. Specifications shall also stipulate that any damage incurred to historic resources as a result of construction activities shall be reported to the environmental review officer within three days. Prior to the issuance of demolition, building, or site permits, the project sponsor shall submit to the department preservation staff for review and approval, a list of measures to be included in contract specifications to avoid damage to historic resources.</p> <p>If damage to a historic resource occurs during construction, the project sponsor shall hire a qualified professional who meets the standards for history, architectural history, or architecture (as appropriate), as set forth by the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards (36 Code of Federal Regulations, part 61). Damage incurred to the historic resource shall be repaired per the secretary’s standards in consultation with the qualified professional and department preservation staff. If directed by department preservation staff, the project sponsor shall engage a qualified preservation professional to undertake a monitoring program to ensure that best practices are being followed. If monitoring is required, the qualified preservation professional shall prepare a monitoring plan to direct the monitoring program that shall be reviewed and approved by department preservation staff.</p>	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update that would use heavy-duty construction equipment on a project site that contains a historic resource or on a project site that is adjacent to a historic resource	Project sponsor, qualified historic professional	Prior to the issuance of demolition, building, or site permits for the list of measures to be included in contract specifications; during construction if damage to a historic resource occurs.	Planning Department (preservation and design staff)	Considered complete when Planning Department preservation staff approve a list of measures to be included in contract specifications to avoid damage to historic resources. If damage occurs, considered complete upon approval of repair to historic resource and/or monitoring plan by Planning Department preservation staff.
<p>Mitigation Measure M-CR-1c: Relocation Plan.</p> <p>If the department determines relocation of a historic resource is a feasible means of reducing impacts to the resource, the project sponsor shall retain a qualified historical architect who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards (36 Code of Federal Regulations, part 61) and structural</p>	Required for future development consistent with the housing	Project sponsor, qualified historical architect,	Prior to the approval of any permits for the relocation plan; implementation	Planning Department (preservation and design staff)	Considered complete upon implementation of a Planning Department-

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<p>engineer with experience in moving historic resources to prepare a relocation plan. The relocation plan will be reviewed and approved by the department to ensure that character-defining features of the buildings will be retained. The department’s review and approval of the relocation plan shall occur prior to the approval of any permits for the proposed project. The relocation plan shall include required qualifications for the building relocation company to ensure that relocation is undertaken by a company that is experienced in moving historic buildings of a similar size and/or structural system as the historic resource. The relocation plan shall ensure that the historic resource will be moved without irreparable damage to the character-defining historic fabric of the resource. The project sponsor will incorporate into construction specifications for the proposed project a requirement that the construction contractor(s) use all feasible means to avoid damage to the subject property during its relocation, including, but not limited to, relocation methods and relocation activity routes, closures, and timing.</p>	<p>element update if relocation of a historic resource is a feasible means of reducing impacts to the resource</p>	<p>structural engineer</p>	<p>of the relocation plan prior to the issuance of occupancy permit</p>		<p>approved relocation plan</p>
<p>Mitigation Measure M-CR-1d: Documentation.</p> <p>Prior to the issuance of demolition, building, or site permits, the project sponsor shall submit to the department for review photographic and narrative documentation of the subject building, structure, object, material, and landscaping. Documentation may apply to individually significant resources as well as district contributors and shall focus on the elements of the property that the project proposes to demolish or alter. The documentation shall be funded by the project sponsor and undertaken by a qualified professional who meets the standards for history, architectural history, or architecture (as deemed appropriate by the department’s preservation staff), as set forth by the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards (36 Code of Federal Regulations, part 61). The department’s preservation staff will determine the specific scope of the documentation depending upon the individual property’s character-defining features and reasons for significance. The documentation scope shall be reviewed and approved by the department prior to any work on the documentation. A documentation package shall consist of the required forms of documentation and shall include a summary of the historic resource and an overview of the documentation provided. The types and level of documentation will be determined by department staff and may include any of the following formats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>HABS/HALS-Like Measured Drawings</i> –A set of Historic American Building/Historic American Landscape Survey-like (HABS/HALS-like) measured drawings that 	<p>Required for future development consistent with the housing element update that proposes to demolish or substantially alter a built-environment historic resource with distinctive physical qualities that contribute to the value of the physical environment and/or the public’s</p>	<p>Project sponsor, qualified historic consultant</p>	<p>Prior to the issuance of demolition, building, or site permits</p>	<p>Planning Department preservation staff</p>	<p>Considered complete upon distribution by the project sponsor of completed documentation approved by Planning Department preservation staff</p>

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<p>depict the existing size, scale, and dimension of the subject property. The department's preservation staff will accept the original architectural drawings or an as-built set of architectural drawings (plan, section, elevation, etc.). The department's preservation staff will assist the consultant in determining the appropriate level of measured drawings. A cover sheet may be required that describes the historic significance of the property.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>HABS/HALS-Like Photographs</i> – Digital photographs of the interior and the exterior of the subject property. Large-format negatives are not required. The scope of the digital photographs shall be reviewed by the department's preservation staff for concurrence, and all digital photography shall be conducted according to current National Park Service standards. The photography shall be undertaken by a qualified professional with demonstrated experience in HABS photography. • <i>HABS/HALS-Like Historical Report</i> – If the department determines that existing survey information or historic resource evaluations of a property do not sufficiently document the historic resources' significant associations, 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. • <i>Print-on-Demand Book</i> – The Print-on-Demand book shall be made available to the public for distribution by the project sponsor. The project sponsor shall make the content from the historical report, historical photographs, HABS photography, measured drawings, and field notes available to the public through a preexisting print-on-demand book service. This service will print and mail softcover books containing the aforementioned materials to members of the public who have paid a nominal fee. The project sponsor shall not be required to pay ongoing printing fees once the book has been made available through the service. • <i>Digital Recordation</i> – In coordination with the department's preservation staff, the project sponsor may be required to prepare some other form of digital 	<p>understanding of San Francisco history</p>				

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<p>recording of the historic resource. The most commonly requested digital recording is video documentation but other forms of digital recording, include 3D laser scan models or 3D virtual tours, Gigapan/Matterpoint or other high-resolution immersive panoramic photography, time-lapse photography, photogrammetry, audio/olfactory recording, or other ephemeral documentation of the historic resource may be required. The purpose of these digital records is to supplement other recording measures and enhance the collection of reference materials that would be available to the public and inform future research. This digital recording could also be incorporated into the public interpretation program. Digital recording shall be conducted by individuals with demonstrated experience in the requested type of digital recording. If video documentation is required, it shall be conducted by a professional videographer with experience recording architectural resources. The professional videographer shall provide a storyboard of the proposed video recording for review and approval by the department's preservation staff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project sponsor, in consultation with the department, shall conduct outreach to determine which repositories may be interested in receiving copies of the documentation. Potential repositories include but are not limited to, the San Francisco Public Library, the Environmental Design Library at the University of California, Berkeley, the Northwest Information Center, San Francisco Architectural Heritage, the California Historical Society, and Archive.org. The final approved documentation shall be provided in electronic form to the department and the interested repositories. The department will make electronic versions of the documentation available to the public for their use at no charge. • The professional(s) shall submit the completed documentation for review and approval by the department's preservation staff. All documentation must be reviewed and approved by the department prior to the issuance of any demolition, building or site permit is approved for a proposed project. 					
<p>Mitigation Measure M-CR-1e: Oral History.</p> <p>The project sponsor shall retain the services of a qualified historian with experience in oral history to undertake an oral history about the historic resource. This oral history project shall consist of interviews and recollections of individuals with a connection to the historic resource that may include owners, occupants, or other</p>	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update	Project sponsor, qualified historian	Prior to the issuance of occupancy permits	Planning Department preservation staff	Considered complete when Planning Department

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<p>related community members. The success of this effort will depend primarily on the ability of the project sponsor to locate such persons, and on their willingness/ability to participate. Therefore, the project sponsor shall make a good faith effort to publicize the oral history project, conduct public outreach, and identify a wide range of potential interviewees. To accomplish this, the sponsor shall employ a range of measures that may include hosting events that allow participants to record their recollections, and hosting a website that allows interviewees to contribute remotely. Prior to undertaking this effort, the scope and methodology of the oral history project shall be reviewed and approved by the department's preservation staff.</p> <p>In addition to potentially use for the on-site interpretive program or documentation, the project sponsor shall have the recordings of the oral history project transcribed and indexed, and the department shall host the transcribed and indexed recordings, which will made available to the public at no charge. The department will also ensure that any information provided in the oral histories are integrated with SF Survey and Citywide historic context statement summarized above. Transcribed and indexed recordings will also be made available to other archives and repositories in order to allow for remote, off-site historical interpretation of the historic resources.</p>	<p>when a future project proposes to demolish or substantially alter an individual resource or historic district whose significance is closely associated with the lifeways or cultural heritage of an individual or group</p>				<p>staff approves the oral history</p>
<p>Mitigation Measure M-CR-1f: Salvage Plan.</p> <p>Prior to the issuance of demolition, building, or site permits that would remove character-defining features of a built environment historic resource that would have a significant impact, the project sponsor shall consult with the department's preservation staff as to whether any such features may be salvaged, in whole or in part, during demolition or alteration. The project sponsor shall make a good faith effort to salvage and protect materials of historical interest to be used as part of the interpretative program (if required), incorporated into the architecture of the new building that will be constructed on the site, or offered to non-profit or cultural affiliated groups. If this proves infeasible, the sponsor shall attempt to donate significant character-defining features or features of interpretative or historical interest to a historical organization or other educational or artistic group. The project sponsor shall prepare a salvage plan for review and approval by the department's preservation staff prior to issuance of any site demolition permit.</p>	<p>Required for future development consistent with the housing element update that would result in material impairment to a built-environment historic resource or would involve the removal of physical elements of a</p>	<p>Project sponsor, qualified historic consultant</p>	<p>Prior to the issuance of demolition, building, or site permits; prior to issuance of an occupancy permit for completed implementation of the salvage plan.</p>	<p>Planning Department preservation staff</p>	<p>Considered complete when Planning Department preservation staff approve the salvage plan and confirms project sponsor has completed all actions identified in the salvage plan</p>

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
	historic resource that have discrete and identifiable significance				
<p>Mitigation Measure M-CR-1g: Interpretation.</p> <p>The project sponsor shall facilitate the development of a public interpretive program focused on the history of the project site, its identified historic resources, and its significant historic context. The interpretive program should be developed and implemented by a qualified design professional with demonstrated experience in displaying information and graphics to the public in a visually interesting manner, as well as a professionally qualified historian or architectural historian, or community group approved by the department. Through consultation with department preservation staff, coordination with local artists should occur. The primary goal of the program 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.</p> <p>The interpretive program shall be initially outlined in an interpretive plan subject to review and approval by the department’s preservation staff prior to approval of demolition, building, or site permits for the project. The plan shall include the general parameters of the interpretive program including the substance, media, and other elements of the interpretative program. The interpretive program shall include within publicly accessible areas of the project site permanent display(s) of interpretive materials concerning the history and design features of the affected historic resource, including both the site as a whole and the individual contributing buildings and features. The display shall be placed in a prominent, public setting within, on the exterior of, or in the vicinity of newly constructed buildings or other features within the project site. The interpretive material(s) shall be made of durable all-weather materials and may also include digital media in addition to a permanent display. The interpretive material(s) shall be of high quality and installed to allow for high public visibility. Content developed for other mitigation measures, as applicable, including the oral history and documentation programs, may be used to inform and provide content for the interpretive program. For properties that do not have a completed Historic Resource Evaluation, the professionally qualified consultant shall</p>	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update that would demolish or substantially alter an individual built-environment historic resource or historic district associated with significant social, cultural, architectural, or historical themes or narratives	Project sponsor, qualified design professional, qualified historian or architectural historian, or community group	Prior to approval of demolition, building, or site permits for interpretation plan; prior to issuance of an occupancy permit for installation and maintenance of interpretation program	Planning Department preservation staff	Considered complete when Planning Department preservation staff approve the installation of interpretation program; maintenance of interpretation program ongoing

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<p>undertake research to sufficiently place the historic resource within its larger historic context (geographic and thematic). The interpretive program may also incorporate video documentation completed under M-CR-1f, Documentation, as applicable to provide a narrated video that describes the materials, construction methods, current condition, historical use, historic context and cultural significance of the historic resource.</p> <p>The detailed content, media, and other characteristics of such an interpretive program shall be coordinated and approved by the department’s preservation staff. The final components of the public interpretation program shall be constructed and an agreed upon schedule for their installation and a plan for their maintenance shall be finalized prior to issuance of a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy.</p> <p>The interpretive program shall be developed in coordination with the other interpretative programs as relevant, such as interpretation required under archeological resource mitigation measures and tribal cultural resource mitigation measures, Native American land acknowledgments, or other public interpretation programs.</p> <p>The department will also ensure that any information gathered through the interpretative program development is integrated with SF Survey and Citywide historic context statement summarized above.</p>					
<p>Mitigation Measure M-CR-1h: Historic Context.</p> <p>To assist in the collection of information that will inform and direct the historical interpretation, the sponsor shall fund a historic context study prepared by a professionally qualified historian or architectural historian, or community group approved by the department to identify significant trends and events associated with a relevant topic to the identified historic resource, as well as identify other associated buildings and sites throughout San Francisco. The objective of this study is to provide background information that will enrich the historical contexts that have already been established for the subject building and to place the subject building within the wider relevant context, for the benefit of the general public interpretation program.</p> <p>The department will also ensure that the historic context is integrated with SF Survey and Citywide historic context statement summarized above.</p>	<p>Required for future planning code amendments to implement the housing element update or required for future development consistent with the housing element update that would demolish or</p>	<p>Planning department or project sponsor, professionally qualified historian or architectural historian, or community group</p>	<p>Prior to implementation of future planning code amendments or for future development projects, prior to approval of demolition, building, or site permits for study scope; prior to issuance of occupancy</p>	<p>Planning Department preservation staff</p>	<p>Considered complete upon approval of historic context study by Planning Department preservation staff. Planning department preservation staff will include historic context statement into the SF Survey</p>

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
	substantially alter an individual built-environment historic resource or historic district associated with significant social, cultural, architectural, or historical themes or narratives		permit for completion of the approved historic context		and Citywide historic context statement.
<p>Mitigation Measure M-CR-1i: Walking or Building Tour.</p> <p>The project sponsor shall engage with SF City Guides, or another tour guide group or association as approved by the department’s preservation staff, to develop content for a walking or building tour relevant to the historic resource. The project sponsor shall reach out to the list of tour guide groups provided by preservation staff and provide copies of communication with those groups. Once a tour guide group has been identified, the project sponsor shall engage a qualified architectural historian meeting the qualifications set forth in the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards to work with the sponsor and selected tour guide group to develop content for the tour. Tour content shall use information found in the Historic Resources Evaluation and the Historic Resources Evaluation Response prepared for the project, other available background information on the resource, and the content from other mitigation measures. Other existing information, including photographs, news articles, oral histories, memorabilia and video, may be used to develop information for the walking tour as necessary. The qualified architectural historian and scope of work must be reviewed by preservation staff prior to the issuance of demolition, building, or site permits. Preservation staff must review and approve final content of the walking tour and must receive proof of receipt by the approved tour group or association prior to issuance of temporary certificate of occupancy.</p>	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update that would demolish or substantially alter an individual built-environment historic resource or historic district associated with significant social, cultural, architectural, or historical	Project sponsor, qualified architectural historian, community or tour group	Prior to the issuance of demolition, building, or site permits project sponsor will obtain a qualified architectural historian and Planning Department approval of a scope of work; prior to issuance of occupancy permit Planning Department will review and approve walking	Planning Department preservation staff	Considered complete when proof of receipt from approved tour group or association received by Planning Department preservation staff

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
	themes or narratives		or building tour content		
<p>Mitigation Measure M-CR-1j: Educational Program.</p> <p>The project sponsor shall fund the preparation of an educational program that describes the history and significant associations of the historic resource. The scope of the program shall be determined in consultation with the department and shall be prepared by a professionally qualified historian, architectural historian, or historical architecture (as appropriate), as set forth by the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards (36 Code of Federal Regulations, part 61), or community or educational group approved by the department. The purpose of the educational program is to package the relevant history and significant associations into an educational format that engages the public in the significance of the resource, which could serve as a teaching curriculum or presentation the public could easily understand. Other mitigation measures may provide materials that aid in the preparation of the educational program.</p>	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update that would demolish or substantially alter an individual built-environment historic resource or historic district associated with significant social, cultural, architectural, or historical themes or narratives	Project sponsor, professionally qualified historian, architectural historian, or historical architecture, or community or educational group	Prior to the issuance of demolition, building, or site permits Planning Department will approve scope of work; prior to issuance of occupancy permit Planning Department will approve educational program	Planning Department preservation staff	Considered complete upon distribution of educational program approved by Planning Department preservation staff
<p>Mitigation Measure M-CR-1k: Community Memorial Event.</p> <p>For the public benefit in commemorating a publicly accessible historic resource that is significant for association with a community, social group, or neighborhood, the project sponsor shall organize and fund a commemorative event recognizing the historic resource’s significance in the form of a public gathering. The project sponsor shall reach out to relevant community groups associated with the historic resource that may be interested in co-sponsoring the organization of the commemorative event. The purpose of the event would be to commemorate the site’s history and provide a public space to gather information, stories, or other histories relevant to the historic resource that may inform other mitigation measures including</p>	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update that would demolish or substantially alter an	Project sponsor	Prior to the issuance of demolition, building, or site permits	Planning Department preservation staff	Considered complete after community memorial event; community event form and content approved by Planning Department

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
documentation, oral histories, and interpretation. The form of the event shall be determined in coordination with department staff and may take on a variety of forms. This could include a publicly led tour or open house that takes place at the site of the historic resource, or an event held nearby the historic resource.	individual built-environment historic resource or historic district associated with significant social, cultural, architectural, or historical themes or narratives				preservation staff
<p>Mitigation Measure M-CR-11: Revise Historic District Documentation.</p> <p>The project sponsor shall coordinate with preservation planning staff to determine the project’s contribution towards any impairment of a historic district, review the historic district documentation, and determine if the district boundaries should be revised to retain a portion of the district that still expresses some aspects of its historical significance. Based on the extent of contribution, preservation planning staff may require the project sponsor to engage a professionally qualified architectural historian, as set forth by the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards (36 Code of Federal Regulations, part 61) to prepare documentation of the revised district boundary and justification of its retained integrity. The revised documentation shall be submitted to the appropriate reviewing agency, depending upon its previous level of evaluation or designation. Such documentation may include a historic district assessment report for review by the department’s preservation staff, or a National Register of Historic Places designation form for review by the State Historic Preservation Office.</p>	Required for future planning code amendments to implement the housing element update or future development consistent with the housing element update that would result in material impairment to a historic district listed in or eligible for listing in local, state, or national registers	Planning Department or project sponsor, professionally qualified architectural historian	Prior to implementation of future planning code amendments or for future development projects, prior to the issuance of occupancy permit	Planning Department preservation staff	Considered complete upon approval of revised documentation by Planning Department preservation staff

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<p>Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a: Procedures for Discovery of Archeological Resources for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance.</p> <p>The following mitigation measure shall be implemented for any project for which the preliminary archeological review conducted by department staff identifies the potential for significant archeological impacts. This measure applies to discoveries made in the absence of an archeologist and to discoveries during archeological monitoring or testing.</p> <p>ALERT sheet. The project sponsor shall distribute the planning department archeological resource “ALERT” sheet to the project prime contractor; to any project subcontractor (including demolition, excavation, grading, foundation, pile driving, etc. firms); or utilities firm involved in soils-disturbing activities within the project site. Prior to any soils-disturbing activities being undertaken, each contractor is responsible for ensuring that the “ALERT” sheet is circulated to all field personnel, including machine operators, field crew, pile drivers, supervisory personnel, etc. The project sponsor shall provide the environmental review officer (ERO) with a signed affidavit from the responsible parties (prime contractor, subcontractor(s), and utilities firm) confirming that all field personnel involved in soil-disturbing activities have received copies of the “ALERT” sheet.</p> <p>Procedures Upon Discovery of a Suspected Archeological Resource. The following measures shall be implemented in the event of a suspected archeological discovery during project soil-disturbing activities:</p> <p>Discovery Stop Work and Environmental Review Officer Notification. Should any indication of an archeological resource be encountered during any soils-disturbing activity of the project, the project sponsor shall immediately notify the ERO and shall immediately suspend any soils-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the discovery and protect the find in place until the significance of the find has been evaluated and the ERO has determined whether and what additional measures are warranted, and these measures have been implemented, as detailed below.</p>	<p>Required for future development consistent with the housing element update if the site has moderate archeological sensitivity, anticipated archeological site types that would be identifiable by construction crews, and construction methods that allow for archeological site identification (such as shallow excavation) or based on the outcome of preliminary archeological review conducted by department staff</p>	<p>Project sponsor</p>	<p>Prior to and during soils-disturbing activities</p>	<p>Planning Department cultural resources staff</p>	<p>Considered complete when Environmental Review Officer receives the signed affidavit</p>
<p>Archeological Consultant Identification. If the preliminary archeological review did not require archeological monitoring or testing, and an archeological discovery during construction occurs prior to the identification of a project archeologist, and the ERO determines that the discovery may represent a significant archeological resource, the project sponsor shall retain the services of an archeological</p>	<p>Required for future development consistent with the housing element update if the site has moderate archeological sensitivity, anticipated archeological site types that would be identifiable by construction crews, and construction methods that allow for archeological site identification (such as shallow excavation) or based on the outcome of preliminary archeological review conducted by department staff</p>	<p>Project sponsor, archeological consultant/ project</p>	<p>During soils-disturbing activities if archeological</p>	<p>Planning Department cultural resources staff</p>	<p>Considered complete when archeological consultant completes</p>

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/Completion Criteria
<p>consultant (hereinafter “project archeologist”) from a firm listed on the Qualified Archeological Consultant list maintained by the department to identify, document, and evaluate the resource, under the direction of the ERO. The project sponsor shall ensure that the project archeologist or designee is empowered, for the remainder of soil-disturbing project activity, to halt soil disturbing activity in the vicinity of potential archeological finds, and that work remains halted until the discovery has been assessed and a treatment determination made, as detailed below.</p> <p>Resource Evaluation and Treatment Determination. If an archeological find is encountered during construction or archeological monitoring or testing, the project archeologist shall redirect soil-disturbing and heavy equipment activity in the vicinity away from the find. If in the case of pile driving activity (e.g., foundation, shoring, etc.), the project archeologist has cause to believe that the pile driving activity may affect an archeological resource, the project sponsor shall ensure that pile driving is halted until an appropriate evaluation of the resource has been made. The ERO may also require that the project sponsor immediately implement a site security program if the archeological resource is at risk from vandalism, looting, or other damaging actions.</p> <p><u>Initial documentation and assessment.</u> The project archeologist shall document the find and make a reasonable effort to assess its identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archeological deposit through sampling or testing, as needed. The project sponsor shall make provisions to ensure that the project archeologist can safely enter the excavation, if feasible. The project sponsor shall ensure that the find is protected until the ERO has been consulted and has determined appropriate subsequent treatment in consultation with the project archeologist, and the treatment has been implemented, as detailed below.</p> <p>The project archeologist shall make a preliminary assessment of the significant and physical integrity of the archeological resource and shall present the findings to the ERO. If, based on this information, the ERO determines that construction would result in impacts to a significant resource, the ERO shall consult with the project sponsor and other parties regarding the feasibility and effectiveness of preservation-in-place of the resource, as detailed below.</p> <p><u>Native American Archeological Deposits and Tribal Notification.</u> All Native American archeological deposits shall be assumed to be significant unless determined otherwise in consultation with the ERO. If a Native American archeological deposit is</p>		archeologist, Environmental Review Officer	resources are encountered		additional measures as directed by the Environmental Review Officer as warranted

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<p>encountered, soil disturbing work shall be halted as detailed above. In addition, the ERO shall notify any tribal representatives who, in response to the project tribal cultural resource notification, requested to be notified of discovery of Native American archeological resources in order to coordinate on the treatment of archeological and tribal cultural resources. Further the project archeologist shall offer a Native American representative the opportunity to monitor any subsequent soil disturbing activity that could affect the find.</p> <p><u>Submerged Paleosols.</u> Should a submerged paleosol be identified, the project archeologist shall extract and process samples for dating, paleobotanical analysis, and other applicable special analyses pertinent to identification of possible cultural soils and for environmental reconstruction.</p> <p><u>Archeological Site Records.</u> After assessment of any discovered resources, the project archeologist shall prepare an archeological site record or primary record (DPR 523 series) for each documented resource. In addition, a primary record shall be prepared for any prehistoric isolate. Each such record shall be accompanied by a map and GIS location file. Records shall be submitted to the planning department for review as attachments to the archeological resources report (see below) and once approved by the ERO, to the Northwest Information Center.</p> <p><u>Plans and Reports.</u> All archeological plans and reports identified herein and in the subsequent measures, shall be submitted by the project archeologist directly to the ERO for review and comment and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. The project archeologist may submit draft reports to the project sponsor simultaneously with submittal to ERO.</p> <p><u>Limit on Construction Delays for Archeological Treatment.</u> Archeological testing and as applicable data recovery programs required to address archeological discoveries, pursuant to this measure, could suspend construction of the project for up to a maximum of four weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of construction can be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce to a less than significant level potential effects on a significant archeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines.</p> <p><u>Preservation-in-Place Consideration.</u> Should an archeological resource that meets California register significance criteria be discovered during construction, archeological testing, or monitoring, preservation-in-place (i.e., permanently protect the resource from further disturbance and take actions, as needed, to preserve</p>					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/Completion Criteria
<p>depositional and physical integrity) of the entire deposit or feature is the preferred treatment option. The ERO shall consult with the project sponsor and, for Native American archeological resources, with tribal representatives, if requested, to consider 1) the feasibility of permanently preserving the resource in place, feasible and effective, the project archeologist, in consultation with the ERO, shall prepare a Cultural Resources Preservation Plan. For Native American archeological resources, the project archeologist shall also consult with the tribal representatives, and the Cultural Resources Preservation Plan shall take into consideration the cultural significance of the tribal cultural resource to the tribes. Preservation options may include measures such as design of the project layout to place open space over the resource location; foundation design to avoid the use of pilings or deep excavations in the sensitive area; a plan to expose and conserve the resource and include it in an on-site interpretive exhibit; tribal representatives for review and for ERO approval. The project sponsor shall ensure that the approved plan is implemented and shall coordinate with the department to ensure that disturbance of the resource will not occur in future, such as establishing a preservation easement.</p> <p>If, based on this consultation, the ERO determines that preservation-in-place is infeasible or would be ineffective in preserving the significance of the resource, archeological data recovery and public interpretation of the resource shall be carried out, as detailed below. The ERO in consultation with the project archeologist shall also determine whether and what additional treatment is warranted, which may include additional testing, construction monitoring, and public interpretation of the resource, as detailed below.</p> <p><u>Coordination with Descendant Communities.</u> On discovery of an archeological site associated with descendant Native Americans, Chinese, or other identified descendant cultural group, the project archeologist shall contact an appropriate representative of the descendant group and the ERO. The representative of the descendant group shall be offered the opportunity to monitor archeological field investigations of the site and to offer recommendations to the ERO regarding appropriate archeological treatment of the site and data recovered from the site, and, if applicable, any interpretative treatment of the site. The project archeologist shall provide a copy of the Archeological Resources Report (ARR) to the representative of the descendant group.</p>					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<p>Compensation. Following on the initial tribal consultation, the ERO, project sponsor and project archeologist, as appropriate, shall work with the tribal representative or other descendant or descendant community representatives to identify the scope of work for a representative to fulfill the requirements of this mitigation measure, which may include participation in archeological monitoring, preparation and review of deliverables (e.g., plans, interpretive materials, art work). Tribal representatives or other descendant community representatives for archeological resources or tribal cultural resources, who complete tasks in the agreed upon scope of work project, shall be compensated for their work as identified in the agreed upon scope of work.</p>					
<p>Archeological Data Recovery Program. The project archeologist shall prepare an archeological data recovery plan if all three of the following apply: (1) a potentially significant resource is discovered, (2) preservation-in-place is not feasible, as determined by the ERO after implementation of the Preservation-in-Place Consideration procedures, and (3) the ERO determines that archeological data recovery is warranted. When the ERO makes such a determination, the project archeologist, project sponsor, ERO and, for tribal cultural archeological resources, the tribal representative, if requested by a tribe, shall consult on the scope of the data recovery program. The project archeologist shall prepare a draft archeological data recovery plan and submit it to the ERO for review and approval. If the time needed for preparation and review of a comprehensive archeological data recovery plan would result in a significant construction delay, the scope of data recovery may instead be agreed upon in consultation between the project archeologist and the ERO and documented by the project archeologist in a memo to the ERO. The archeological data recovery plan/memo shall identify how the proposed data recovery program will preserve the significant information the archeological resource is expected to contain. That is, the archeological data recovery plan/memo will identify what scientific/historical research questions are applicable to the expected resource, what data classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions. Data recovery, in general, should be limited to the portions of the property that could be adversely affected by the proposed project. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be applied to portions of the archeological resource that would not otherwise be disturbed by construction if nondestructive methods are practical.</p>		Project sponsor, project archeologist, Environmental Review Officer, tribal representative (if requested)	After determination by the Environmental Review Officer that an archeological data recovery program is required	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Considered complete upon approval of archeological data recovery program by Environmental Review Officer

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<p>The archeological data recovery plan shall include the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field Methods and Procedures: Descriptions of proposed field strategies, procedures, and operations • Cataloguing and Laboratory Analysis: Description of selected cataloguing system and artifact analysis procedures • Discard Policy: Description of and rationale for field and post-field discard and deaccession policies • Security Measures: Recommended security measures to protect the archeological resource from vandalism, looting, and non-intentionally damaging activities • Report of Data Recovery Results: Description of proposed report format and distribution of results • Public Interpretation: Description of potential types of interpretive products and locations of interpretive exhibits based on consultation with project sponsor • Curation: Description of the procedures and recommendations for the curation of any recovered data having potential research value, identification of appropriate curation facilities, and a summary of the accession policies of the curation facilities <p>The project archeologist shall implement the archeological data recovery program upon approval of the archeological data recovery plan/memo by the ERO.</p> <p>Coordination of Archeological Data Recovery Investigations. In cases in which the same resource has been or is being affected by another project for which data recovery has been conducted, is in progress, or is planned, the following measures shall be implemented to maximize the scientific and interpretive value of the data recovered from both archeological investigations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In cases where an investigation has not yet begun, project archeologists for each project impacting the same resource and the ERO, as applicable, shall consult on coordinating and collaborating on archeological research design, data recovery methods, analytical methods, reporting, curation and interpretation to ensure consistent data recovery and treatment of the resource. 					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In cases where archeological data recovery investigation is under way or has been completed for a project, the project archeologist for the subsequent project shall consult with the prior project archeologist, if available; review prior treatment plans, findings and reporting; and inspect and assess existing archeological collections/inventories from the site prior to preparation of the archeological treatment plan for the subsequent discovery, and shall incorporate prior findings in the final report for the subsequent investigation. The objectives of this coordination and review of prior methods and findings shall be to identify refined research questions; determine appropriate data recovery methods and analyses; assess new findings relative to prior research findings; and integrate prior findings into subsequent reporting and interpretation. 					
<p>Treatment of Human Remains and Funerary Objects. If human remains or suspected human remains are encountered during construction, the contractor and project sponsor shall ensure that ground-disturbing work within 50 feet of the remains is halted immediately and shall arrange for the protection in place of the remains until appropriate treatment and disposition have been agreed upon and implemented in accordance with this measure. The treatment of any human remains and funerary objects discovered during any soil- disturbing activity shall comply with applicable state laws, including Health and Safety Code section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code section 5097.98. Upon determining that the remains are human, the project archeologist shall immediately notify the Medical Examiner of the City and County of San Francisco, the ERO, and the project sponsor of the find.</p> <p>If the remains cannot be permanently preserved in place, the landowner or designee shall consult with the most likely descendant and may consult with the project archeologist, project sponsor and the ERO on recovery of the remains and any scientific treatment alternatives. The landowner shall then make all reasonable efforts to develop a burial agreement (agreement) with the most likely descendant, as expeditiously as possible, for the treatment and disposition, with appropriate dignity, of human remains and funerary objects (as detailed in CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(d)). Per Public Resources Code section 5097.98(c)(1), the agreement shall address, as applicable and to the degree consistent with the wishes of the most likely descendant, the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, scientific analysis, custodianship prior to reinterment or curation, and final disposition of the human remains and funerary objects. If the most likely descendant agrees to</p>		Project sponsor, archeological consultant in consultation with the San Francisco Medical Examiner, Environmental Review Officer, and Native American Heritage Commission and most likely descendant as warranted.	Discovery of human remains	Planning Department cultural resources staff, Medical Examiner, and Native American Heritage Commission and most likely descendant as warranted.	Considered complete on finding by the Environmental Review Officer that all state laws regarding human remains/burial objects have been adhered to, consultation with the most likely descendant is completed as warranted, and disposition of human remains has occurred as specified in agreement

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<p>scientific analyses of the remains and/or funerary objects, the project archeologist shall retain possession of the remains and funerary objects until completion of any such analyses, after which the remains and funerary objects shall be reinterred or curated as specified in the agreement.</p> <p>If the landowner or designee and the most likely descendant are unable to reach an agreement on scientific treatment of the remains and/or funerary objects, the ERO, in consultation with the project sponsor shall ensure that the remains and/or funerary objects are stored securely and respectfully until they can be reinterred on the project site, with appropriate dignity, in a location not subject to further or future subsurface disturbance, in accordance with the provisions of state law.</p> <p>Treatment of historic-period human remains and/or funerary objects discovered during any soil-disturbing activity shall be in accordance with protocols laid out in the research design in the project archeological monitoring plan, archeological testing plan, archeological data recovery plan, and other relevant agreements established between the project sponsor, medical examiner, and the ERO. The project archeologist shall retain custody of the remains and associated materials while any scientific study scoped in the treatment document is conducted and the remains shall then be curated or respectfully reinterred by arrangement on a case-by case-basis.</p>					
<p>Cultural Resources Public Interpretation Plan and Land Acknowledgement. If a significant archeological resource (i.e., a historical resource or unique archeological resources as defined by CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5) is identified and the ERO determines in consultation with Native American representatives for Native American archeological resources, that the public interpretation is warranted, the project archeologist shall prepare a Cultural Resources Public Interpretation Plan. The Cultural Resources Public Interpretation Plan shall describe the interpretive products, locations or distribution of interpretive materials or displays, the proposed content and materials, the producers or artists of the displays or installation, and a long-term maintenance program.</p> <p>If the resource to be interpreted is a tribal cultural resource, the department shall notify Native American tribal representatives that public interpretation is being planned. If requested by tribal representatives, the Cultural Resources Public Interpretation Plan shall be prepared in consultation with and developed with the participation of Native American tribal representatives. For public projects</p>		Archeological consultant at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer will prepare Cultural Resources Public Interpretation Plan. Measures laid out in Cultural Resources	Following completion of treatment and analysis of significant archeological resource by archeological consultant	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Cultural Resources Public Interpretation Plan is complete on review and approval of Environmental Review Officer. Interpretive program is complete on notification to Environmental Review Officer from the project

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<p>or projects that include dedicated public spaces, the interpretive materials may include an acknowledgement that the project is located upon traditional Ohlone lands. For interpretation of a tribal cultural resource, the interpretive program may include a combination of artwork, preferably by local Native American artists, educational panels or other informational displays, a plaque, or other interpretative elements including digital products that address Native American experience and the layers of history. As feasible, and where landscaping is proposed, the interpretive effort may include the use and the interpretation of native and traditional plants incorporated into the proposed landscaping.</p> <p>The project archeologist shall submit the cultural resources public interpretation plan and drafts of any interpretive materials that are subsequently prepared to the ERO for review and approval. The project sponsor shall ensure that the cultural resources public interpretation plan is implemented prior to occupancy of the project.</p>		Public Interpretation Plan are implemented by project sponsor			sponsor that program has been implemented
<p>Archeological Resources Report. If significant archeological resources, as defined by CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5, are encountered, the project archeologist shall submit a confidential draft Archeological Resources Report to the ERO. This report shall evaluate the significance of any discovered archeological resource, describe the archeological and historical research methods employed in the archeological programs undertaken, the results and interpretation of analyses, and discuss curation arrangements.</p> <p>Once approved by the ERO, the project archeologist shall distribute the approved Archeological Resources Report as follows: copies that meet current information center requirements at the time the report is completed to the California Archeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center, and a copy of the transmittal of the approved Archeological Resources Report to the Northwest Information Center to the ERO; one bound hardcopy of the Archeological Resources Report, along with digital files that include an unlocked, searchable PDF version of the Archeological Resources Report, GIS shapefiles of the site and feature locations, any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series), and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources, via USB or other stable storage device, to the environmental planning division of the planning department; and, if a descendant group was consulted, a</p>		Archeological consultant at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer	Following completion of treatment by archeological consultant as determined by the Environmental Review Officer	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Complete on certification to Environmental Review Officer that copies of the approved Archeological Resources Report have been distributed

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
digital or hard copy of the Archeological Resources Report to the descendant group, depending on their preference.					
Curation. If archeological data recovery is undertaken, the project archeologist and the project sponsor shall ensure that any significant archeological collections and paleoenvironmental samples of future research value shall be permanently curated at an established curatorial facility. The facility shall be selected in consultation with the ERO. Upon submittal of the collection for curation the project sponsor or archeologist shall provide a copy of the signed curatorial agreement to the ERO.		Project archeologist prepares collection for curation and project sponsor pays for curation costs	In the event a significant archeological resource is discovered and upon acceptance by the Environmental Review Officer of the Archeological Resources Report	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Considered complete upon acceptance of the collection by the curatorial facility
Mitigation Measure M-CR-2b: Archeological Monitoring Program. If required based on the outcome of preliminary archeological review conducted by department staff, to avoid and mitigate impacts from the proposed action on significant archeological resources found during construction, the project archeologist shall develop and implement an archeological monitoring program as specified herein, and shall conduct an archeological testing and/or data recovery program if required to address archeological discoveries or the assessed potential for archeological discoveries, pursuant to this measure and Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a. Qualified Archeologist Identification. After the first project approval action or as directed by the environmental review officer (ERO), the project sponsor shall contact the department archeologist to obtain the names and contact information for three qualified archeological consultants on the department’s list of qualified archeological consultants, and shall retain one of those archeological consultants (“project archeologist”) to develop and implement an archeological monitoring program under the direction of the ERO.	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update based on the outcome of preliminary archeological review conducted by department staff	Project sponsor/ archeological consultant at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer	After the first project approval action or as directed by the Environmental Review Officer, prior to issuance of construction permits and throughout the construction period	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Complete when project sponsor retains qualified archeological consultant

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<p>Construction Crew Archeological Awareness. Prior to any soil-disturbing activity, the project archeologist shall conduct a brief on-site archeological awareness training that describes the types of resources that might be encountered and how they might be recognized, and requirements and procedures for work stoppage, resource protection and notification in the event of a potential archeological discovery. The project archeologist also shall distribute an “Alert” wallet card (based on the department’s “ALERT” sheet) to all field personnel (e.g., machine operators, field crew, pile drivers, supervisory personnel) involved in soil disturbing activities, which summarizes stop work requirements and provides information on how to contact the project archeologist and ERO. The project archeologist shall repeat the training at intervals during construction, as determined necessary by the ERO, including when new construction personnel start work and prior to periods of soil disturbing work when the project archeologist will not be on site.</p> <p>Tribal Cultural Resources Sensitivity Training. In addition to the archeological awareness training, for sites at which the ERO has determined that there is the potential for the discovery of Native American archeological resources or if requested by a tribe pursuant to the department’s tribal cultural resources notification process, the project sponsor shall ensure that a Native American representative is afforded the opportunity to provide a Native American cultural resources sensitivity training to all construction personnel.</p>		Project archeologist for awareness training, Native American representative for Native American cultural resources sensitivity training (if requested)	Prior to any soil-disturbing activity	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Considered complete when all trainings conducted
<p>Archeological Monitoring Program. Based on the results of information provided in the preliminary archeological review and additional historical research as needed, the project archeologist shall consult with the ERO prior to the commencement of any project-related soils disturbing activities to determine the appropriate scope of archeological monitoring, allowing for required document preparation and review time. The archeological monitoring program shall be set forth in an Archeological Monitoring Plan, as detailed below.</p> <p>The project archeologist shall be present on the project site according to a schedule agreed upon by the project archeologist and the ERO until the ERO has, in consultation with the project archeologist, determined that project construction activities could have no effects on significant archeological deposits. The project archeologist shall prepare a daily monitoring log documenting activities and locations monitored, soil disturbance depth, stratigraphy, and findings.</p>		Project archeologist at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer	Prior to issuance of construction permits and throughout the construction period	Planning Department cultural resources staff	After implementation of Archeological Monitoring Plan approved by the Environmental Review Officer

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<p>The project archeologist has the authority to temporarily stop soil disturbing construction activity in the vicinity of a suspected find to document the resource, collect samples as needed, and assess its significance. The project sponsor shall ensure that the find is protected in place in accordance with the archeologist's direction, and that it remains protected until the archeologist, after consultation with the ERO, notifies the project sponsor that assessment and any subsequent mitigation are complete. The project sponsor shall also ensure that the construction foreperson or other on-site delegee, is aware of the stop work and protection requirements.</p> <p>In the event of a discovery of a potentially significant archeological resources during monitoring or construction, the project archeologist shall conduct preliminary testing of the discovery, including the collection of soil samples and artifactual/ ecofactual material, as needed to assess potential significance and integrity. Once this initial assessment has been made, the project archeologist shall consult with the ERO on the results of the assessment. If the resource is assessed as potentially significant, the project sponsor shall ensure that soil disturbance remains halted at the discovery location until appropriate treatment has been determined in consultation with the ERO and implemented, as detailed below.</p> <p>Archeological Monitoring Plan. The archeological monitoring plan shall include the following provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Description: Description of all anticipated soil disturbing activities (e.g., foundation and utility demolition, hazardous soils remediation, site grading, shoring excavations, piles or soil improvements, and foundation, elevator, car stacker, utility, and landscaping excavations), with project plans and profiles, as needed, to illustrate the anticipated soil disturbance. • Site Specific Environmental and Cultural Context: Pre-contact and historic environmental and cultural setting of the project site as pertains to potential Native American use and historic period development; any available information pertaining to subsequent soil disturbance, current knowledge of soil stratigraphy. As appropriate based on the scale and scope of the project, the Archeological Monitoring Plan should include historic maps, as a basis for predicting resource types that might be encountered and their potential locations. An overlay of the project site on the city's prehistoric sensitivity model 					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<p>mapping should be included, as should the locations of all known archeological sites within 0.25 mile of the project site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anticipated Resources or Resource Types: Likely resources that might be encountered and at what locations and depths, based on known resources in the vicinity, the site’s predevelopment setting and development history, and the anticipated depth and extent of project soil disturbances. Proposed Scope of Archeological Monitoring: Include soil-disturbing activities/ disturbance depths to be monitored. Synopsis of Required Procedures: For the assessment and treatment of discoveries, ERO and Native American consultation requirements; burial treatment procedures; and reporting and curation requirements, consistent with the specifications of Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a. 					
<p>Resource Evaluation and Treatment Determination. Upon discovery of a suspected archeological resource during construction or archeological monitoring, Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a’s Resource Evaluation and Treatment Determination stipulations shall be implemented as specified in that measure.</p> <p>Additional Applicable Measures. If a significant archeological resource is identified, and data recovery is required under Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a’s Resource Evaluation and Treatment Determination stipulations, the following additional measures identified in the Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a shall be implemented as specified in that measure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Archeological Data Recovery Program Treatment of Human Remains and Funerary Objects (as applicable) Coordination of Archeological Data Recovery Investigations Cultural Resources Public Interpretation Plan and Land Acknowledgement (as applicable) Archeological Resources Report Curation 		Project archeologist at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer	Upon discovery of suspected archeological resource	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Completed when Environmental Review Officer concurs that the status of the additional measures identified in Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a are completed

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<p>Mitigation Measure M-CR-2c: Archeological Testing Program.</p> <p>If required based on the outcome of preliminary archeological review conducted by department staff, to avoid and mitigate impacts from the proposed action on significant archeological resources found during construction, the project archeologist shall develop and implement an archeological testing program as specified herein, and shall conduct an archeological monitoring and/or data recovery program if required to address archeological discoveries or the assessed potential for archeological discoveries, pursuant to this measure and Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a: Procedures for Discovery of Archeological Resources for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance.</p> <p>Qualified Archeologist Identification. After the first project approval action or as directed by the ERO, the project sponsor shall contact the department archeologist to obtain the names and contact information for the next three qualified archeological consultants on the department’s list and shall retain a qualified archeologist (hereinafter “project archeologist”) from this list of three to develop and implement the archeological testing program.</p>	<p>Required for future development consistent with the housing element update based on the outcome of preliminary archeological review conducted by department staff</p>	<p>Project sponsor/ archeological consultant at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer</p>	<p>After the first project approval action or as directed by the Environmental Review Officer and prior to issuance of construction permits and throughout the construction period</p>	<p>Planning Department cultural resources staff</p>	<p>Complete when project sponsor retains qualified archeological consultant</p>
<p>Construction Crew Archeological Awareness. Prior to any soils-disturbing activities being undertaken, the project archeologist shall conduct a brief on-site archeological awareness training that describes the types of resources that might be encountered and how they might be recognized, and requirements and procedures for work stoppage, resource protection and notification in the event of a potential archeological discovery. The project archeologist also shall distribute an “Alert” wallet card, based on the department’s “ALERT” sheet, that summarizes stop work requirements and provides necessary contact information for the project archeologist, project sponsor and the to all field personnel involved in soil disturbing activities, including machine operators, field crew, pile drivers, supervisory personnel, etc., have received. The project archeologist shall repeat the training at intervals during construction, as determined necessary by the ERO, including when new construction personnel start work and prior to periods of soil disturbing work when the project archeologist will not be on site.</p> <p>Tribal Cultural Resources Sensitivity Training. In addition to and concurrently with the archeological awareness training, for sites at which the ERO has determined that there is the potential for the discovery of Native American archeological resources or if requested by a tribe pursuant to the department’s tribal cultural resources</p>		<p>Project archeologist for awareness training, Native American representative for Native American cultural resources sensitivity training (if requested)</p>	<p>Prior to any soil-disturbing activity</p>	<p>Planning Department cultural resources staff</p>	<p>Considered complete when all trainings conducted</p>

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
notification process, the project sponsor shall ensure that a Native American representative is afforded the opportunity to provide a Native American cultural resources sensitivity training to all construction personnel.					
<p>Archeological Testing Program. The project archeologist shall develop and undertake an archeological testing program as specified herein to determine to the extent possible the presence or absence of archeological resources in areas of project soil disturbance and to identify and to evaluate whether any archeological resource encountered on the site constitutes an historical resource under CEQA. In addition, the consultant shall be available to conduct an archeological monitoring and/or data recovery program if required to address archeological discoveries or the assessed potential for archeological discoveries, pursuant to this measure.</p> <p>Archeological Testing Plan. The project archeologist shall consult with the ERO reasonably prior to the commencement of any project-related soils disturbing activities to determine the appropriate scope of archeological testing. The archeological testing program shall be conducted in accordance with an approved Archeological Testing Plan, prepared by the project archeologist consistent with the approved scope of work. The Archeological Testing Plan shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment and shall be considered a draft subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Project-related soils disturbing activities shall not commence until the testing plan has been approved and any testing scope to occur in advance of construction has been completed. The project archeologist shall implement the testing as specified in the approved Archeological Testing Plan prior to and/or during construction.</p> <p>The Archeological Testing Plan shall include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Description: Description of all anticipated soil disturbing activities, with locations and depths of disturbance, including foundation and utility demolition, hazardous soils remediation, site grading, shoring excavations, piles or soil improvements, and foundation, elevator, car stacker, utility and landscaping excavations, with project plans and profiles, as needed, to illustrate the locations of anticipated soil disturbance. • Site Specific Environmental and Cultural Context: Pre-contact and historic environmental and cultural setting of the project site as pertinent to potential Native American use and historic period development, any available information 		Project archeologist at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer	Prior to issuance of construction permits and throughout the construction period	Planning Department cultural resources staff	After consultation with and approval by the Environmental Review Officer of Archeological Testing Plan and review and approval of archeological testing results memo by Environmental Review Officer.

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/Completion Criteria
<p>pertaining to past soil disturbance; soils information, such as stratigraphic and water table data from prior geotechnical testing. As appropriate based on the scale and scope of the project, the Archeological Testing Plan should include historic maps as a basis for predicting resource types that might be encountered and their potential locations. An overlay of the project site on the city’s prehistoric sensitivity model mapping should be included, as should the locations of all known archeological sites within 0.25 mile of the project site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brief Research Design: Scientific/historical research questions applicable to the expected resource(s), what data classes potential resources may be expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions. • Anticipated Resources or Resource Types: Likely resources that might be encountered and at what locations and depths, based on known resources in the vicinity, the site’s predevelopment setting and development history, and the anticipated depth and extent of project soil disturbances. • Proposed Scope of Archeological Testing and Rationale: Testing methods to be used (e.g., coring, mechanical trenching, manual excavation, or combination of methods); locations and depths of testing in relation to anticipated project soil disturbance; strata to be investigated; any uncertainties on stratigraphy that would affect locations or depths of tests and might require archeological monitoring of construction excavations subsequent to testing. • Resource Documentation and Significance Assessment Procedures: ERO and Native American consultation requirements upon making a discovery; pre-data recovery assessment process, burial treatment procedures, and reporting and curation requirements, consistent with the specifications of Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a. <p>Archeological Testing Results Memo. Irrespective of whether archeological resources are discovered, the project archeologist shall submit a written summary of the findings to the ERO at the completion of the archeological testing program. The findings report/memo shall describe each resource, provide an initial assessment of the integrity and significance of encountered archeological deposits encountered during testing, and provide recommendations for subsequent treatment of any resources encountered.</p>					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<p>Resource Evaluation and Treatment Determination. Upon discovery of a suspected archeological resource during construction or archeological testing, Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a's Resource Evaluation and Treatment Determination stipulations shall be implemented as specified in that measure.</p> <p>Additional Applicable Measures. If a significant archeological resource is identified, and data recovery is required under Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a's Resource Evaluation and Treatment Determination stipulations, the following additional measures identified in the Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a shall be implemented as specified in that measure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Archeological Data Recovery Program • Treatment of Human Remains and Funerary Objects (as applicable) • Coordination of Archeological Data Recovery Investigations • Cultural Resources Public Interpretation Plan and Land Acknowledgement (as applicable) • Archeological Resources Report • Curation 		Project archeologist at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer	Upon discovery of suspected archeological resource	Planning Department cultural resources staff	Completed when Environmental Review Officer concurs that the status of the additional measures identified in Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a are completed
<p>Mitigation Measure M-CR-2d. Treatment of Submerged and Deeply Buried Resources.</p> <p>This measure applies to projects that would include subgrade excavation to depths that would penetrate to native soil or below Young Bay Mud, or entail the use of piles, soil improvements or other deep foundations in landfill areas within former creeks, ponds, bay marshes or waters of the bay that may be sensitive for submerged or buried historical or Native American archeological resources; and shall be implemented in the event of the discovery of a submerged or deeply buried resource during archeological testing, archeological monitoring, or soil-disturbing construction activities that occur when an archeologist is not present.</p> <p>In addition to the measures detailed below, for any project during which a significant archeological resource is identified, a preservation or treatment determination shall be made consistent with the provisions of Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a: Procedures for Discovery of Archeological Resources for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance. If</p>	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update based on the outcome of preliminary archeological review conducted by department staff	Project sponsor, archeological consultant, the Environmental Review Officer, and tribal representative (for Native American archeological resources)	In the event of the discovery of a submerged or deeply buried archeological resource	Planning Department cultural resources staff	After completed implementation of treatment program by project sponsor identified in approved treatment program memo

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<p>data recovery is required, the following additional measures identified in measure M-CR-2a shall be implemented, as specified in that measure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Archeological Data Recovery Program • Treatment of Human Remains and Funerary Objects (as applicable) • Coordination of Archeological Data Recovery Investigations • Cultural Resources Public Interpretation Plan and Land Acknowledgement (as applicable) • Archeological Resources Report • Curation <p>The following additional measures shall be undertaken upon discovery of a potentially significant deeply buried or submerged resource to minimize significant effects from deep project excavations, soil improvements, pile construction, or construction of other deep foundation systems, in cases where the environmental review officer (ERO) has determined through consultation with the project sponsor, and with tribal representatives as applicable, that preservation –in place—the preferred mitigation— is not a feasible or effective option.</p> <p>Submerged or Buried Resource Treatment Determination. If the resource cannot feasibly or adequately be preserved in place, documentation and/or archeological data recovery shall be conducted, as described in Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a. However, by definition, submerged or deeply buried resources sometimes are located deeper than the maximum anticipated depth of project excavations, such that the resource would not be exposed for investigation, and/or under water or may otherwise pose substantial access, safety or other logistical constraints for data recovery; or the cost of providing archeological access to the resource may demonstrably be prohibitive.</p> <p>In circumstances where the constraints identified above limit physical access for documentation and data recovery, the ERO, project sponsor, project archeologist, and tribal representative (for Native American archeological resources), shall consult to explore alternative documentation and treatment options to be implemented in concert with any feasible archeological data recovery. The appropriate treatment elements, which would be expected to vary with the type of resource and the circumstances of discovery, shall be identified by the ERO based on the results of</p>					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<p>consultation from among the treatment measures listed below. Additional treatment options may be developed and agreed upon through consultation if it can be demonstrated that they would be equally or more effective in recovering or amplifying the value of the data recovered from physical investigation of the affected resources by addressing applicable archeological research questions and in disseminating data and meaningfully interpreting the resource to the public.</p> <p>Each treatment option below, or a combination of the treatment measures, in concert with any feasible standard data recovery methods applied as described above, would be effective in mitigating significant impacts to submerged and buried resources. The ERO, in consultation with the project archeologist and project sponsor, shall identify which of these measures that, individually or in combination, will be applicable and effective in recovering sufficient data, enhancing the research value of the data recovery, meaningfully interpreting the resource to the public, or otherwise effectively mitigating the loss of data or associations that will result from project construction. Multiple treatment measures shall be adopted in combination, as needed to adequately mitigate data loss and, as applicable, impacts to tribal cultural values, as determined in consultation with the ERO and, as applicable, tribal representatives.</p> <p>The project archeologist shall document the results of the treatment program consultation with respect to the agreed upon scope of treatment in a treatment program memo, for ERO review and approval. Upon approval by the ERO, the project sponsor shall ensure that treatment program is implemented prior to and during construction, as applicable. Reporting, interpretive, curation and review requirements are the same as delineated under the other cultural resources mitigation measures that are applicable to the project, as noted above. The project sponsor shall be responsible for ensuring the implementation of all applicable mitigation measures, as identified in the treatment program memo.</p> <p>Treatment Options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Remote Archeological Documentation.</u> Where a historic feature cannot be recovered or adequately accessed in place by the archeologist due to size, bulk or inaccessibility, the archeologist shall conduct all feasible remote documentation methods, such as 3-D photography using a remote access device, remote sensing (e.g., ground penetrating radar with a low range (150 or 200 MHz) antenna), or other appropriate technologies and methods, to document the 					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<p>resource and its context. The project sponsor and contractor shall support remote archeological documentation as needed, by assisting with equipment access (e.g., drone, lights and camera or laser scanner mounted on backhoe); providing personnel qualified to enter the excavation to facilitate remote documentation; and accommodating training of construction personnel by the project archeologist so that they can assist in measuring or photographing the resource from inside the excavation in cases when the archeologist cannot enter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Modification of Contractor’s Excavation Methods.</u> At the request of the ERO, the project sponsor shall consult with the project archeologist and the ERO to identify potential modifications to the contractor’s excavation and shoring methods to facilitate data recovery to prevent damage to the resource before it has been documented, to assist in exposure and facilitate observation and documentation, and to assist in data recovery. Examples include improved dewatering during excavation, use of a smaller excavator bucket or toothless bucket, providing a location where spoils can be spread out and examined by the archeologist prior to being offhauled, and phasing or benching of deep excavations to facilitate observation and/or deeper archeological trenching. • <u>Data Recovery through Open Excavation.</u> If a project will include mass excavation to the depth of the buried/submerged deposit, archeological data recovery shall include manual (preferred) or controlled mechanical sampling of the deposit. If project construction would not include mass excavation to the depth of the deposit but would impact the deposit through deep foundation systems or soil improvements, the ERO and the project sponsor shall consult to consider whether there are feasible means of providing direct archeological access to the deposit (e.g., excavation of portion of the site that overlies the deposit to the subject depth so that a sample can be recovered). The feasibility consideration shall include an estimate of the project cost of excavating to the necessary depth and of providing shoring and dewatering sufficient to allow archeological access to the deposit for manual or mechanical recovery. • <u>Mechanical Recovery.</u> If site circumstances limit access by archeologists to the find, the ERO, project archeologist, and project sponsor shall consult on the feasibility of mechanically removing the feature/ deposit or portion of it intact for off-site documentation and analysis, preservation, and interpretive use. The consultation above shall include consideration as to whether such recovery is 					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<p>logistically feasible and can be accomplished without major data loss. The specific means and methods and the type and size of the sample shall be identified, and the recovery shall be implemented as determined feasible by the ERO. The project sponsor shall assist with mechanical recovery and transport and curation of recovered materials and shall provide for an appropriate and secure off-site location for archeological documentation and storage as needed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Salvage of Historic Materials.</u> Samples or sections of historical features that cannot be preserved in place (e.g., structural members of piers or wharves, sections of wooden sea wall, rail alignments, or historic utility or paving features of particular data value or interpretive interest) shall be tested for contamination and, if not contaminated, shall be salvaged for interpretive use or other reuse, such as display of a reconstructed resource; use of timbers or planks for site furniture and signage structures; installation in publicly accessible open spaces; or other uses of public interest. Historic wood and other salvageable historic structural material not used for interpretation shall be recovered for reuse, consistent with the San Francisco Ordinance No. 27-06, which requires recycling or reuse of all construction and demolition debris material removed from a project. If the project has the potential to encounter such features, the project sponsor shall plan in advance for reuse of salvaged historic materials to the greatest extent feasible, including identification of a location for interim storage and identification of potential users and reuses. • <u>Data Recovery Using Geoarcheological Cores.</u> If it is deemed infeasible to expose a significant deposit resource for archeological data recovery, geoarcheological coring of the identified deposit shall be conducted at horizontal grid intervals of no greater than 15 feet within areas that will be impacted by project construction. The maximum feasible core diameter shall be used for data recovery coring. The objective of coring is to obtain a minimum of a five percent sample of the estimated total volume of the resource within areas that will be impacted by project construction. However, due to the small size of each core, this method alone generally cannot recover a 5 percent sample volume or a sufficient quantity of data to adequately characterize the range of activities that took place at the site. For this reason, if the coring sample constitutes less than five percent of the estimated total volume of the archeological deposit that will be directly impacted by project construction, the project sponsor may elect 					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<p>implementation of one or more of the following additional compensatory measures to amplify the value of the recovered data.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Compensatory Treatment Measures:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – <i>Scientific Analysis of Data from Comparable Archeological Sites/ “Orphaned Collections.”</i> The ERO and the project archeologist shall consult to identify a known archeological site or historical feature, or curated collections or samples recovered during prior investigation of similar sites or features are available for further analysis; and for which site-specific or comparative analyses would be expected to provide data relevant to the interpretation or context reconstruction for the affected site. Examples would include reanalysis or comparative analysis of artifacts or archival records; faunal or paleobotanical analyses; dating; isotopes studies; or such other relevant studies based on the research design developed for the affected site and on data sets available from the impacted resource and comparative collections. The scope of analyses shall be determined by the ERO based on consultation with the project archeologist, the project sponsor and, for sites of Native American origin Native American representatives. <p><i>Additional Off-Site Data Collection and/or Analysis for Historical and Paleoenvironmental Reconstruction.</i> The ERO and project archeologist shall identify existing geoaicheological data and geotechnical coring records on file with the city; and/or cores extracted and preserved during prior geotechnical or geoaicheological investigations that could contribute to reconstruction of the environmental setting in the vicinity of the identified resource, to enhance the historical and scientific value of recovered data by providing additional data about Native American archeological environmental setting and stratigraphic sensitivity; and/or provide information pertinent to the public interpretation of the significant resource. Relevant data may also be obtained through geoaicheological coring at accessible sites identified by the ERO through consultation with San Francisco public agencies and private project sponsors.</p>					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES					
<p>Mitigation Measure M-TCR-1: Tribal Notification and Consultation.</p> <p>Applicability: This measure applies to both archeological tribal cultural resources and non-archeological tribal cultural resources. This measure shall be implemented for the following types of future development consistent with the proposed action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For each project for which preliminary archeological review, conducted by department archeologists, identifies the potential for impacts on a Native American archeological resource, which is presumed to be a tribal cultural resource, and • At the initiation of planning for public interpretation of a significant Native American archeological resource, and • For projects with one or more of the following characteristics where the project is located in an area identified as a potential tribal cultural resource: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Development footprint greater than or equal to 10,000 square feet and any soil disturbance greater than or equal to 10 feet deep – Use of piles or other deep foundation or deep soil improvements – Total soil excavation volume in excess of 1,500 cubic yards – Development for which the city requires the inclusion of public open space, public art, or other public interpretative programs – Development that includes habitat restoration, creek daylighting, or channelization that could affect native plants – Development for which the department requires a streetscape plan under the Better Streets Plan (planning code section 138.1) <p>Notification. The department shall distribute a notification for projects that meet any of the characteristics above to parties on its local Native American tribal distribution list, including the Association of Ramaytush Ohlone and other interested Ohlone parties list. The notification shall include the project description; project location; anticipated depth and extent of soil disturbance necessary for construction; information on changes to public access, removal or addition of native plantings or habitat, and any proposed public interpretation, as relevant; the conclusions of the preliminary archeological review regarding potential impacts on Native American</p>	<p>Required for future planning code amendments to implement the housing element update or required for future development consistent with the housing element update that meet one or more of the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preliminary archeological review identifies potential impacts on a Native American archeological resource • Initiation of planning for public interpretation of a significant Native 	<p>Planning Department cultural resources staff, Planning Department or project sponsor, Native American tribal representative</p>	<p>Prior to implementation of future planning code amendments; or for future development projects, during environmental review for notification and consultation; prior to issuance of demolition permit for identified measures</p>	<p>Planning Department cultural resources staff</p>	<p>Considered complete if no tribal cultural resource is identified, or tribal cultural resource is identified and implementation of identified tribal cultural resource measures.</p>

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/Completion Criteria
<p>archeological tribal cultural resources; anticipated next steps, including proposed archeological identification and/or treatment for archeological tribal cultural resources; an invitation to consult on the project; and a timeline for requesting consultation, which is within 30 days after receipt of a notification.</p> <p>Consultation. The department and project sponsor shall ensure that Native American tribal representatives who respond to the notification shall be provided the opportunity to consult on the proposed project. Consultation shall follow requirements identified in CEQA section 21080.3.2; if the Native American tribal representatives request consultation regarding alternatives to the project, recommended mitigation measures, or significant effects, the consultation shall include those topics. Consultation meetings shall occur primarily between department staff members and Native American representatives, with department staff members coordinating with the project sponsor. Project sponsors may join in consultation meetings if requested and agreed to by the Native American representative. Native American representatives shall be provided with project plans and details to review and given an opportunity to provide input with respect to whether the project as designed would affect a tribal cultural resource and, if so, how such an impact might be avoided or mitigated. For archeological tribal cultural resources, the department shall ensure that Native American representatives are informed of the sensitivity of the project site, as assessed by the department, and the presence of any known or discovered resources so that they can provide input on the archeological steps to be implemented, per Mitigation Measures M-CR-2a: Archeological Resources Requirements for Projects Involving Soil Disturbance and, as applicable, Mitigation Measure M-CR-2b: Archeological Monitoring Program; Mitigation Measure M-CR-2c: Archeological Testing Program; and Mitigation Measure M-CR-2d: Treatment of Submerged and Deeply Buried Resources, if requested by those tribal representatives. Additional measures on the treatment of tribal cultural resources may be developed through consultation. Consultation shall be concluded as defined in CEQA section 21080.3.2(b).</p> <p>Site-specific measures identified through consultation to reduce or eliminate impacts would be implemented by the project sponsor in coordination with department staff members. Site-specific measures could include, but would not be limited to:</p>	<p>American archeological resource</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projects located in an area identified as a potential tribal cultural resource and have one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Development footprint greater than or equal to 10,000 square feet and any soil disturbance greater than or equal to 10 feet deep – Use of piles or other deep foundation or deep soil improvements – Soil excavation in excess of 				

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sampling and paleoenvironmental analysis of soils that would be affected by project piles or excavation for reconstruction of the Native American environmental setting • Native planting and vegetation treatments in publicly accessible open spaces and community gathering areas that emphasize native and/or environmentally sustainable shoreline plants, such as those traditionally used by the Ohlone • Public interpretive exhibits that educate the public and/or reflect tribal cultural heritage and values and address local Native American experience and history • Ohlone land acknowledgements • Public art by local Native American artists • For projects that include public open spaces or onsite public access spaces within the project site (such as a community room), make the spaces available for events organized by the local Native American community, by arrangement with event space organizers • Other educational tools and applications identified by tribal representatives through consultation with the tribe and determined by the environmental review officer (ERO) and the project sponsor to be feasible for inclusion in the project. <p>Different or additional project-specific mitigation measures may be identified through Native American consultation if, in consultation with the tribal representative, the project sponsor, and the ERO, they are determined to be equally effective as or more effective than the measures identified above in mitigating the specific impacts of development on tribal cultural resources.</p> <p>Project-specific mitigation measures applicable to the specific proposal shall be agreed upon by the tribal consultants and the department in coordination with the project sponsor and implemented by the project sponsor, if determined feasible by the ERO.</p> <p>If no tribal group requests consultation but the ERO determines that a proposed project may have a potential significant adverse effect on a tribal cultural resource, based on prior consultation, then the site-specific measures and treatments listed above, as applicable, may be required at the discretion of the ERO.</p>	<p>1,500 cubic yards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Requires public open space, public art, or other public interpretative programs – Habitat restoration, creek daylighting, or channelization that could affect native plants – Streetscape plan under the Better Streets Plan 				

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<p>Compensation. Following on the initial tribal consultation, the ERO, project sponsor, and project archeologist, as appropriate, shall work with the tribal representative to identify the scope of work to fulfill the requirements of this mitigation measure, which may include participation in archeological monitoring, preparation and review of deliverables (e.g., plans, interpretive materials, art work). Tribal representatives shall be compensated for their work as identified in the agreed upon scope of work.</p>					
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION					
<p>Mitigation Measure M-TR-4a: Parking Maximums and Transportation Demand Management.</p> <p>The city shall reduce vehicle trips from future planning code amendments (e.g., future rezonings or housing sustainability district designations) to implement the proposed action or future development projects that contribute considerably to or result in a significant transit delay impact, as defined in the Housing Element 2022 Update EIR’s transit analysis for future development. This mitigation measure shall not apply to future planning code amendments, or future development projects implementing the proposed action, that do not contribute considerably to or result in a significant transit delay impact.</p> <p>The city may achieve this vehicle trip reduction through one of the following measures A, B, or C:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measure A: Amend planning code parking maximums for residential uses (sections 151 and 151.1) by a 50 percent or more reduction than such maximums as of April 2022; OR • Measure B: Amend planning code transportation demand management requirements (section 169) for residential uses or its associated program standards for residential uses by an equivalent amount to achieve the vehicle trip reduction estimated by implementation of a 50 percent reduction in planning code parking maximums, compared to parking maximums as of April 2022; OR • Measure C: The department shall apply vehicle trip reduction measures A or B on future development projects consistent with the housing element on project-by-project basis until the city amends the planning code consistent with measures A or B. 	Required for future planning code amendments to implement the housing element update or future development consistent with the housing element update until such planning code amendments are made	City (e.g., SFMTA, Planning Department) or project sponsors of future development projects	Prior to implementation of future planning code amendments or prior to the commencement of any project-related soils disturbing activities	Planning Department	Considered complete when planning code sections 151 and 151.1 or section 169 is amended or issuance of an applicable future development project’s entitlement

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<p>Mitigation Measure M-TR-4b: Driveway and Loading Operations Plan and Curb Cut Restrictions.</p> <p>The city shall reduce potential conflicts between driveway and loading operations, including passenger and freight loading activities, and people walking, bicycling, riding transit, and driving, from future planning code amendments to implement the proposed action (e.g., future rezonings or housing sustainability district designations) or future development projects that would contribute considerably to or result in a significant transit delay or significant loading impacts, as defined in the Housing Element 2022 Update EIR’s transit and loading analysis for future development. This mitigation measure shall not apply to future planning code amendments, or future development projects implementing the proposed action, that do not contribute considerably to or result in a significant transit delay or significant loading impacts.</p> <p>The city may achieve this through one of the following measures A or B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measure A.1: Amend planning code section 155(r) to not permit curb cuts for garage entries, driveways, or other vehicular access to off-street parking or loading along the street(s) of the significant transit delay and significant loading impacts (may not apply to streets with protected center-running transit-only lanes); AND • Measure A.2: Amend the geographic applicability of planning code section 155(u) for projects to prepare and implement a Driveway and Loading Operations Plan (DLOP). Applicable projects shall prepare and submit a draft DLOP to the department for their review and approval, in consultation with the SFMTA. The DLOP shall be written in accordance with any guidelines issued by the department and shall respond to any applicable SFMTA curb management plans (e.g., see Mitigation Measure M-TR-6: Curb Management Plans); OR • Measure B: The department shall apply measures A.1 and A.2 on a development project by development project basis until the city amends the planning code consistent with measures A.1 and A.2. 	<p>Required for future planning code amendments to implement the housing element update or future development consistent with the housing element update with significant transit delay or loading impacts as described in the EIR</p>	<p>City (e.g., SFMTA, Planning Department) or project sponsors of applicable future development projects</p>	<p>Prior to implementation of future planning code amendments or prior to the commencement of any project-related soils disturbing activities</p>	<p>Planning Department</p>	<p>Considered complete when planning code section 155 is amended or issuance of an applicable future development project’s DLOP in accordance with any guidelines issued by the Planning Department</p>

Mitigation Measure M-TR-4c: Implement Transit Travel Times Measures to Reduce Transit Delay.

The city (e.g., SFMTA, department) shall implement measures to reduce transit delay on the Geary and 19th Avenue corridors. This measure shall also apply to other transit corridors where future planning code amendments (e.g., future rezonings or housing sustainability district designations) to implement the proposed action would contribute considerably to or result a significant transit delay impact (thresholds of significance), as defined in the Housing Element 2022 Update EIR.

The city will consider the improvements in the below table. The table presents the three levels (i.e., tiers) or transit improvements in terms of infrastructure changes that would be applicable to the different street network types and transit operating characteristics, depending on the nature of transit delay. The Tier 1 and 2 improvements include traffic engineering measures that are consistent with San Francisco’s Muni Forward (such measures may include transit stop changes, traffic lane modifications, parking and turn restrictions, traffic signal and stop sign changes, and pedestrian improvements) and are organized to distinguish between measures that do not restrict private vehicle movements (Tier 1) and those that do restrict private vehicle movements (Tier 2). The Tier 3 improvements are consistent with those major capital projects (e.g., subways) various government agencies are considering as a part of San Francisco’s ConnectSF and Bay Area Rapid Transit and Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority Link21.

Table: Improvements to Reduce Transit Delay Based on Street Network and Transit Operating Characteristics

Street Network/Transit Operating Characteristics	Tier 1 Improvements	Tier 2 Improvements	Tier 3 Improvements
	Transit bulbs, boarding islands, prepaid boarding, stop consolidation, transit signal priority, traffic signals	Side-running transit-only or HOV lanes, or protected center-running transit-only lanes	Grade separation of transit service (subway)
Bus routes that operate primarily	X	X	X

Required for future planning code amendments to implement the housing element update with significant transit delay impacts as described in the EIR

City (e.g., SFMTA, Planning Department)

Within two years of the final approval of any future planning code amendments (e.g., future rezonings or housing sustainability district designations) to implement the proposed action

Planning Department

Considered complete when the city implements identified measures

Adopted Mitigation Measure				Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
					Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
in mixed-traffic lanes								
Bus routes or light rail lines that operate in a mix of transit-only lanes and mixed-traffic lanes	X	X	X					
Bus routes or light rail lines that operate primarily in transit-only lanes		X	X					
<p>Note: The city's selection of which specific transit network improvements to implement as a part of this measure would depend on the future transit network and roadway conditions within the rezoning area. If transit is not already protected, the city would start with tier 1 improvements and move toward tier 2 and then tier 3 when these features are already in place.</p> <p>The city shall implement measures consistent with Muni Forward and ConnectSF plans, studies, and toolkits to reduce transit delay associated with traffic congestion and passenger boarding. The city may develop transit network improvement plans for routes that would be affected by future planning code amendments to implement the proposed action, which could include identifying the specific measures and implementation timing of the measures. Potential measures could include, but are not limited to, those shown in the table above.</p> <p>The city shall identify the specific measures within two years of the final approval of any future planning code amendments (e.g., future rezonings or housing sustainability district designations) to implement the proposed action that will exceed the thresholds of significance.</p> <p>Additionally, the city shall make every effort to seek and obtain new funding sources to fund transit delay improvements identified in the above table. This may include increasing the existing transportation sustainability fee or assessing a new transit impact fees to future development projects consistent with the proposed action as</p>								

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
part of future planning code amendments. This may also include seeking applicable state or federal funding sources.					
<p>Mitigation Measure M-TR-6: Curb Management Plans.</p> <p>The SFMTA shall develop a curb management plan(s) for the geographic area(s) under future planning code amendments (e.g., future rezonings or housing sustainability district designations) to implement the proposed action that result in significant loading impacts as defined in the Housing Element 2022 Update EIR's loading analysis for future development. The SFMTA shall develop the plan to be consistent with the recommendations in the SFMTA's adopted Curb Management Strategy. Such a plan may include, but would not be limited to, components such as identifying the necessary curb regulations based on curb function priorities and parking and loading needs, and issues related to transit, accessibility, and safety.</p> <p>The SFMTA shall develop the plan within two years after the department has received project applications under future planning code amendments to implement the proposed action that cumulatively total greater than 200,000 gross square feet in the plan's geographic area. The SFMTA shall implement applicable components of the plan prior to the city's issuance of certificate of occupancy for the project applications. Project sponsors for project applications for individual development projects may also implement applicable components of the plan, including if identified with any driveway and loading operations guidelines issued by the department. The SFMTA shall monitor conditions in the geographic area and update the plan, as needed.</p>	Required for future planning code amendments to implement the housing element update	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency	Within two years after the Planning Department has received project applications under future planning code amendments to implement the proposed action that cumulatively total greater than 200,000 gross square feet in the plan's geographic area; and prior to the city's issuance of certificate of occupancy for the project applications	Planning Department	Considered complete when the curb management plan(s) are implemented
NOISE AND VIBRATION					
<p>Mitigation Measure M-NO-1: Construction Noise Control.</p> <p>The project sponsor shall submit a project-specific construction noise control plan to the environmental review officer (ERO) for approval prior to issuance of any demolition or building permit. 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 ensure that construction noise</p>	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update if project-level	Project sponsor, project sponsor's qualified acoustical consultant	Prior to issuance of demolition or building permit	Planning Department	Considered complete upon implementation of Planning Department approved project-specific

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/Completion Criteria
<p>levels shall not exceed 90 dBA 1-hour L_{eq}, 10 dBA above the ambient noise level, nor an interior level of 45 dBA during nighttime hours at noise sensitive receptors (residences, hospitals, convalescent homes, schools, churches, hotels, and motels). The project sponsor shall ensure that requirements of the construction noise control plan are included in contract specifications.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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"> • Use construction equipment that is in good working order, and inspect mufflers for proper functionality; • Select “quiet” construction methods and equipment (e.g., improved mufflers, use of intake silencers, engine enclosures); • Use construction equipment with lower noise emission ratings whenever possible, particularly for air compressors; • Prohibit the idling of inactive construction equipment for more than five minutes; • Locate stationary noise sources (such as compressors) as far from nearby noise sensitive receptors as possible, muffle such noise sources, and construct barriers around such sources and/or the construction site. • 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. • Enclose or shield stationary noise sources from neighboring noise-sensitive properties with noise barriers to the extent feasible. To further reduce noise, locate stationary equipment in pit areas or excavated areas, if feasible; and • Install temporary barriers, barrier-backed sound curtains and/or acoustical panels around working powered impact equipment and, if necessary, around the project site perimeter. When temporary barrier units are joined together, the 	<p>analysis finds that the frequency, duration, and intensity of construction noise would result in a significant construction noise impact or a considerable contribution to a significant cumulative construction noise impact</p>				<p>construction noise control plan and following completion of all construction activities</p>

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<p>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.</p> <p>The construction noise control plan shall include the following measures for notifying the public of construction activities, complaint procedures and monitoring of construction noise levels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designation of an on-site construction noise manager for the project; • Notification of 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; • A sign posted on-site describing noise complaint procedures and a complaint hotline number that shall always be answered during construction; • A procedure for notifying the planning department of any noise complaints within one week of receiving a complaint; • 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; and • 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. <p>The construction noise control plan shall include the following additional measures during pile-driving activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<p>preferable to reduce impacts to sensitive receptors]) where feasible, in consideration of geotechnical and structural requirements and conditions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 Conduct noise monitoring (measurements) before, during, and after the pile driving activity. 					
<p>Mitigation Measure M-NO-2: Noise Analysis and Attenuation.</p> <p>The project sponsor shall undertake a detailed noise analysis of noise-generating activities or equipment (e.g., heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning equipment; outdoor gathering areas; places of entertainment). This analysis shall be conducted prior to the first project approval action.</p> <p>This analysis shall include a site survey to identify potential noise-sensitive uses (residences, hospitals, convalescent homes, schools, churches, hotels and motels) and include at least one 24-hour noise measurement to determine ambient noise levels throughout the day and nighttime hours.</p> <p>The analysis shall be prepared by persons qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering and shall demonstrate with reasonable certainty that the proposed use would not adversely affect nearby noise-sensitive uses, would not substantially increase ambient noise levels, and would not result in a noise level in excess of any applicable standards, such as those in section 2909 of the noise ordinance. All recommendations from the acoustical analysis necessary to ensure that noise sources would meet applicable requirements of the noise ordinance and/or not result in substantial increases in ambient noise levels shall be incorporated into the building design and operations. Should concerns remain regarding potential excessive noise, completion of a detailed noise control analysis (by a person qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering), and incorporation of noise reduction measures (including quieter equipment, construction of barriers or enclosures, etc.) into the building design and operations prior to the first project approval action shall be required. Acoustical treatments may include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enclosing noise-generating mechanical equipment 	<p>Required for future development consistent with the housing element update, as applicable</p>	<p>Project sponsor's qualified acoustical or engineering consultant</p>	<p>Prior to the commencement of any project-related soils disturbing activities</p>	<p>Planning Department</p>	<p>Considered complete upon completion of noise analysis and installation of noise attenuation features into future building design and operations.</p>

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Installing relatively quiet models of air handlers, exhaust fans, and other mechanical equipment Using mufflers or silencers on equipment exhaust fans Orienting or shielding equipment to protect noise sensitive receptors to the greatest extent feasible Increasing the distance between noise-generating equipment and noise-sensitive receptors Placing barriers around the equipment to facilitate the attenuation of noise 					
<p>Mitigation Measure M-NO-3a: Protection of Adjacent Buildings/Structures and Vibration Monitoring During Construction.</p> <p>Prior to issuance of any demolition or building permit, the project sponsor shall submit a project-specific Pre-construction Survey and Vibration Management and Monitoring Plan to the ERO or the ERO’s designee for approval. The plan shall identify all feasible means to avoid damage to potentially affected buildings. The project sponsor shall ensure that the following requirements of the Pre-Construction Survey and Vibration Management and Monitoring Plan are included in contract specifications, as necessary.</p> <p>Pre-construction Survey. Prior to the start of any ground-disturbing activity, the project sponsor shall engage a consultant to undertake a pre-construction survey of potentially affected buildings. If potentially affected buildings and/or structures are not potentially historic, a structural engineer or other professional with similar qualifications shall document and photograph the existing conditions of the potentially affected buildings and/or structures. The project sponsor shall submit the survey to the ERO or the officer’s designee for review and approval prior to the start of vibration-generating construction activity.</p> <p>If nearby affected buildings are potentially historic, the project sponsor shall engage a qualified historic preservation professional and a structural engineer or other professional with similar qualifications to undertake a pre-construction survey of potentially affected historic buildings. The pre-construction survey shall include descriptions and photograph of all identified historic buildings including all façades, roofs, and details of the character-defining features that could be damaged during construction, and shall document existing damage, such as cracks and loose or</p>	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update, as applicable	Project sponsor, qualified historic preservation professional (for effects on historic buildings and/or structures) and/or structural engineer (for effects on historic and non-historic buildings and/or structures)	Prior to issuance of any demolition, building, or site permit and monitoring and reporting throughout construction, as necessary	Planning Department	Considered complete when the final Vibration Monitoring Results Report is approved by the Environmental Review Officer and following completion of all construction activities (including repairs of adjacent buildings damaged during construction)

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/Completion Criteria
<p>damaged features (as allowed by property owners). The report shall also include pre-construction drawings that record the pre-construction condition of the buildings and identify cracks and other features to be monitored during construction. The qualified historic preservation professional shall be the lead author of the pre-construction survey if historic buildings and/or structures could be affected by the project. The pre-construction survey shall be submitted to the ERO for review and approval prior to the start of vibration-generating construction activity.</p> <p>Vibration Management and Monitoring Plan. The project sponsor shall undertake a monitoring plan to avoid or reduce project-related construction vibration damage to adjacent buildings and/or structures and to ensure that any such damage is documented and repaired. Prior to issuance of any demolition or building permit, the project sponsor shall submit the Plan to the ERO for review and approval.</p> <p>The Vibration Management and Monitoring Plan shall include, at a minimum, the following components, as applicable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximum Vibration Level. Based on the anticipated construction and condition of the affected buildings and/or structures on adjacent properties, a qualified acoustical/vibration consultant in coordination with a structural engineer (or professional with similar qualifications) and, in the case of potentially affected historic buildings/structures, a qualified historic preservation professional, shall establish a maximum vibration level that shall not be exceeded at each building/structure on adjacent properties, based on existing conditions, character-defining features, soil conditions, and anticipated construction practices (common standards are a peak particle velocity [PPV] of 0.25 inch per second for historic and some old buildings, a PPV of 0.3 inch per second for older residential structures, and a PPV of 0.5 inch per second for new residential structures and modern industrial/commercial buildings). • Vibration-generating Equipment. The plan shall identify all vibration-generating equipment to be used during construction (including, but not limited to: site preparation, clearing, demolition, excavation, shoring, foundation installation, and building construction). • Alternative Construction Equipment and Techniques. The plan shall identify potential alternative equipment and techniques that could be implemented if construction vibration levels are observed in excess of the established standard 					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<p>(e.g., drilled shafts [caissons] could be substituted for driven piles, if feasible, based on soil conditions, or smaller, lighter equipment could be used in some cases).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Pile Driving Requirements. For projects that would require pile driving, the project sponsor shall incorporate into construction specifications for the project a requirement that the construction contractor(s) use all feasible means to avoid or reduce damage to potentially affected buildings. Such methods may include one or more of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Incorporate “quiet” pile-driving technologies into project construction (such as drilled shafts, using sonic pile drivers, auger cast-in-place, or drilled-displacement), as feasible; and/or – Ensure appropriate excavation shoring methods to prevent the movement of adjacent structures. ● Buffer Distances. The plan shall identify buffer distances to be maintained based on vibration levels and site constraints between the operation of vibration-generating construction equipment and the potentially affected building and/or structure to avoid damage to the extent possible. ● Vibration Monitoring. The plan shall identify the method and equipment for vibration monitoring to ensure that construction vibration levels do not exceed the established standards identified in the plan. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Should construction vibration levels be observed in excess of the standards established in the plan, the contractor(s) shall halt construction and put alternative construction techniques identified in the plan into practice, to the extent feasible. – The qualified historic preservation professional (for effects on historic buildings and/or structures) and/or structural engineer (for effects on historic and non-historic buildings and/or structures) shall inspect each affected building and/or structure (as allowed by property owners) in the event the construction activities exceed the vibration levels identified in the plan. – The structural engineer and/or historic preservation professional shall submit monthly reports to the ERO during vibration-inducing activity 					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/Completion Criteria
<p>periods that identify and summarize any vibration level exceedances and describe the actions taken to reduce vibration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – If vibration has damaged nearby buildings and/or structures that are not historic, the structural engineer shall immediately notify the ERO and prepare a damage report documenting the features of the building and/or structure that has been damaged. – If vibration has damaged nearby buildings and/or structures that are historic, the historic preservation consultant shall immediately notify the ERO and prepare a damage report documenting the features of the building and/or structure that has been damaged. – Following incorporation of the alternative construction techniques and/or planning department review of the damage report, vibration monitoring shall recommence to ensure that vibration levels at each affected building and/or structure on adjacent properties are not exceeded. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Periodic Inspections. The plan shall identify the intervals and parties responsible for periodic inspections. The qualified historic preservation professional (for effects on historic buildings and/or structures) and/or structural engineer (for effects on historic and non-historic buildings and/or structures) shall conduct regular periodic inspections of each affected building and/or structure on adjacent properties (as allowed by property owners) during vibration-generating construction activity on the project site. The plan will specify how often inspections shall occur. ● Repair Damage. The plan shall also identify provisions to be followed should damage to any building and/or structure occur due to construction-related vibration. The building(s) and/or structure(s) shall be remediated to their pre-construction condition (as allowed by property owners) at the conclusion of vibration-generating activity on the site. For historic resources, should damage occur to any building and/or structure, the building and/or structure shall be restored to its pre-construction condition in consultation with the qualified historic preservation professional and planning department preservation staff. <p>Vibration Monitoring Results Report. After construction is complete the project sponsor shall submit to the ERO a final report from the qualified historic preservation professional (for effects on historic buildings and/or structures) and/or structural</p>					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<p>engineer (for effects on historic and non-historic buildings and/or structures). The report shall include, at a minimum, collected monitoring records, building and/or structure condition summaries, descriptions of all instances of vibration level exceedance, identification of damage incurred due to vibration, and corrective actions taken to restore damaged buildings and structures. The ERO shall review and approve the Vibration Monitoring Results Report.</p>					
<p>Mitigation Measure M-NO-3b: Prevent Interference with Vibration-Sensitive Equipment.</p> <p>Prior to construction, the project sponsor and its contractors shall designate and make available a community liaison to respond to vibration complaints from occupants at the building containing vibration-sensitive equipment. Through the community liaison, the project sponsor’s team shall provide notification to property owners and occupants of the building 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. If feasible, the project sponsor team shall identify potential alternative equipment and techniques that could reduce construction vibration levels. For example, alternative equipment and techniques may include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Pre-drilled piles ● Caisson drilling ● Oscillating or rotating pile installation ● 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 ● Static rollers could be substituted for vibratory rollers in some cases <p>If concerns are raised prior to construction or complaints received during construction related to equipment interference, the community liaison shall work with the project sponsor’s team and the affected building occupants to resolve the concerns. Vibration control measures shall meet the performance target (i.e., threshold of 65 VdB for vibration-sensitive equipment) set forth by the Federal Transit Administration. To resolve concerns raised by building occupants, the community</p>	<p>Required for future development consistent with the housing element update, as applicable</p>	<p>Project sponsor</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of any demolition, building, or site permit project sponsor will identify community liaison: notification at least 10 days prior to construction activities involving equipment that can generate vibration capable of interfering with vibration-sensitive equipment</p>	<p>Planning Department</p>	<p>Considered complete after construction activities involving equipment that can generate vibration capable of interfering with vibration-sensitive equipment is completed</p>

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/Completion Criteria
<p>liaison shall convey the details of the complaints to the project sponsor team, planning department, and the complainant.</p> <p>The liaison shall convey the details of the measures being implemented to ensure that the vibration level is not exceeded. These measures may include evaluation by a qualified noise and vibration consultant; scheduling certain construction activities outside the hours of operation for vibration-sensitive equipment or when specific vibration-sensitive equipment is in use, if feasible; and/or conducting groundborne vibration monitoring to document that an individual project can meet the performance target of 65 VdB at specific distances or locations. Groundborne vibration monitoring, if appropriate to resolve concerns, shall be conducted by a qualified noise and vibration consultant.</p>					
AIR QUALITY					
<p>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3: Clean Construction Equipment.</p> <p>The project sponsor shall comply with the following:</p> <p>A. Engine Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> All off-road equipment greater than 25 horsepower and operating for more than 20 total hours over the entire duration of construction activities shall have engines that meet or exceed either U.S. EPA or air resources board Tier 4 Final off-road emission standards. Where access to alternative sources of power are available, portable diesel engines shall be prohibited. 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 shall post legible and visible signs in English, Spanish, and Chinese in designated queuing areas and at the construction site to remind operators of the two-minute idling limit. If the majority of the project sponsor's construction staff speak a language other than these, then the signs shall be posted in that language as well. The project sponsor shall instruct construction workers and equipment operators on the maintenance and tuning of construction equipment and 	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update, as applicable	Project sponsor	Prior to issuance of demolition, building, or site permits project sponsor to submit: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Construction emissions minimization plan for review and approval, and Signed certification statement 	Planning Department	Considered complete upon Environmental Review Officer review and acceptance of construction emissions minimization plan, implementation of the plan, and submittal of final report summarizing use of construction equipment pursuant to the plan

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/Completion Criteria
<p>require that such workers and operators properly maintain and tune equipment in accordance with manufacturers' specifications.</p> <p>5. Any other best available technology in the future may be included, provided that the project sponsor submits documentation to the department demonstrating that (1) the technology would result in emissions reductions and (2) it would not increase other pollutant emissions or result in other additional impacts, such as noise. This may include new alternative fuels or engine technology for off-road or other construction equipment (such as electric or hydrogen fuel cell equipment) that is not available as of 2022.</p> <p>B. Waivers:</p> <p>The environmental review officer (ERO) may waive the requirement of subsection (A)(2) regarding an alternative source of power if an alternative source is limited or infeasible at the project site. If the ERO grants the waiver, the project sponsor must submit documentation that the equipment used for onsite power generation meets the engine requirements of subsection (A)(1).</p> <p>The ERO may waive the equipment requirements of subsection (A)(1) if a particular piece of Tier 4 Final off-road equipment is technically not feasible, the equipment would not produce the desired emissions reduction because of expected operating modes, or a compelling emergency requires the use off-road equipment that is not Tier 4 compliant. In seeking an exception, the project sponsor shall demonstrate that the project shall use the cleanest piece of construction equipment available and feasible and submit documentation that average daily construction emissions of ROG, NOx, PM2.5 would not exceed 54 pounds per day, and PM10 emissions would not exceed 82 pounds per day.</p> <p>C. Construction Emissions Minimization Plan:</p> <p>Before starting onsite construction activities, the project sponsor 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 will meet the engine requirements of Section A.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 					

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<p>number, engine model year, engine certification (tier rating), horsepower, engine serial number, and expected fuel use and hours of operation. For off-road equipment using alternative fuels, the description shall also specify the type of alternative fuel being used.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project sponsor shall ensure that all applicable requirements of the Plan have been incorporated into the project sponsor's contract specifications. The Plan shall include a certification statement that the project sponsor agrees to comply fully with the Plan. The project sponsor shall make the Plan available to the public for review onsite during working hours. The project sponsor 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 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>D. Monitoring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> After start of construction activities, the project sponsor shall submit reports every six months to the ERO documenting compliance with the Plan. After completion of construction activities and prior to receiving a final certificate of occupancy, the project sponsor shall submit to the ERO a final report summarizing construction activities, including the start and end dates, duration of each construction phase, and the specific information required in the Plan. 					
<p>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-5: Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Engines.</p> <p>All diesel engines used for building operations shall have engines that meet U.S. EPA (1) Tier 4 Final emissions standards, (2) Tier 4 interim emissions standards, or (3) Tier 2 or Tier 3 emission standards and are equipped with an air resources board Level 3 verified diesel emissions control strategy. For each new diesel engine submitted for future projects subject to this mitigation measure, including any associated generator pads, engine and filter specifications shall be submitted to the ERO for review and approval prior to issuance of a permit for the engine from the building</p>	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update if a project-level analysis finds that a future	Project sponsor	Prior to issuance of building permit. Maintenance, ongoing	Planning Department	Equipment specifications portion considered complete when equipment specifications approved by the

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
department. Once operational, all diesel generators shall be maintained in good working order in perpetuity, and any future replacement for the diesel engines shall be required to be consistent with emissions specifications. The operator of the facility shall maintain records of the testing schedule for each diesel engine for the life of that engine and provide the information for review to the ERO within three months of requesting such information.	development project would result in a significant health risk impact or make a considerable contribution to a health risk impact.				Environmental Review Officer. Maintenance is ongoing and records are subject to Planning Department review upon request.
WIND					
<p>Mitigation Measure M-WI-1a: Wind Minimization.</p> <p>If the screening-level assessment conducted by the department determines wind tunnel testing is required due to the potential for one or more proposed buildings to create or exacerbate a wind hazard exceedance, such testing shall be conducted by a professionally qualified firm. The proposed buildings tested in the wind tunnel may incorporate wind baffling features or landscaping. Such features must be tested in the wind tunnel and discussed in a wind report in the order of preference discussed below, with the overall intent being to reduce ground-level wind speeds such that the project shall not cause equivalent wind speeds to reach or exceed the 26-mph wind hazard criterion for a single hour of the year in areas of substantial use by people walking (e.g., sidewalks, plazas, building entries, etc.):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Building Massing. New buildings and additions to existing buildings shall be shaped to minimize ground-level wind speeds. Examples of these shapes include setbacks, stepped façades, and vertical steps in the massing to help disrupt wind flows. Wind Baffling Measures on the Building or on the Project Site. Wind baffling measures shall be included on future buildings and/or on the project site to disrupt vertical wind flows along tower façades and through the project site. Examples of these may include staggered balcony arrangements on main tower façades, screens and canopies attached to the buildings, rounded building corners, covered walkways, colonnades, art, free-standing canopies, or wind screens. 	Required for future development consistent with the housing element update if wind screening-level assessment determines a wind tunnel test is required, and the wind-tunnel testing determines the project has the potential for a new or worsened wind hazard exceedance	Project sponsor, professionally qualified wind consultant	During permit review of future development project consistent with the housing element update	In coordination with San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency and San Francisco Public Works, the Planning Department to review and approve wind testing	Considered complete upon approval of final demolition, building, or site permit

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<p>Only after incorporating all feasible features to reduce wind impacts via building massing and wind baffling, and documenting any such features deemed infeasible shall the following be considered:</p> <p>3. Landscaping on or off the Project Site and/or Wind Baffling Measures in the Public Right-of-Way. Landscaping and/or wind baffling measures shall be installed in the public right-of-way to slow winds along sidewalks and protect places where people walking are expected to gather or linger. Landscaping and/or wind baffling measures shall be installed on the windward side (i.e., the direction from which the wind is blowing) of the areas of concern. Examples of wind baffling measures may include street art to provide a sheltered area for people to walk and free-standing canopies and wind screens in areas where people walking are expected to gather or linger. If landscaping on or off the project site or wind baffling measures in the public right-of-way are required as one of the features to mitigate wind impacts, Mitigation Measure M-WI-1b shall also apply.</p>					
<p>Mitigation Measure M-WI-1b: Maintenance Plan for Landscaping on or off the Project Site and Wind Baffling Measures in the Public Right-of-Way.</p> <p>If it is determined infeasible to fully mitigate wind hazards via massing and wind baffling measures on the subject building pursuant to Mitigation Measure M-WI-1a1 and M-WI-1a2, the project sponsor shall prepare a maintenance plan for review and approval by the department to ensure maintenance of the features required pursuant to Mitigation Measure M-WI-1a3 in perpetuity. The maintenance plan shall also be reviewed and approved by public works for landscaping or wind baffling measures in the public right-of-way.</p>	<p>Required for future development consistent with the housing element update if it is determined infeasible to fully mitigate wind hazards via massing and wind baffling measures on the subject building pursuant to Mitigation Measure M-WI-1a1 and M-WI-1a2</p>	<p>Project sponsor with a roof height greater than 85 feet</p>	<p>During the permit review of a future development project consistent with the housing element update</p>	<p>In coordination with San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency and San Francisco Public Works, Planning Department to review and approve</p>	<p>Ongoing and in perpetuity for the lifetime of the building</p>

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
SHADOW					
<p>Mitigation Measure M-SH-1: Shadow Minimization.</p> <p>If it is determined that a future project consistent with the housing element update would create new shadow that would substantially and adversely affect the use and enjoyment of publicly accessible open space, the project sponsor shall redesign the proposed project to reduce or avoid significant shadow impacts to the extent feasible, as determined by the environmental review officer (ERO). Redesign could include changes to building height, massing, and/or orientation.</p>	<p>Required for future development consistent with the housing element update if it is determined that a future project would create new shadow that would substantially and adversely affect the use and enjoyment of publicly accessible open space</p>	<p>Project sponsor</p>	<p>During the permit review of a future development project consistent with the housing element update</p>	<p>Planning Department</p>	<p>Considered complete upon Environmental Review Officer's approval of revised design or concurrency that redesign is not feasible</p>
PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES					
<p>Mitigation Measure M-GE-5: Inadvertent Discovery of Paleontological Resources during Construction.</p> <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 engage a qualified paleontologist meeting the standards specified by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (Society of Vertebrate Paleontology 2010) to train all project construction workers regarding how to recognize paleontological resources and on the contents of the paleontological resources alert sheet, as provided by the department. The paleontological resources alert sheet shall be prominently displayed at the construction site during ground-disturbing activities for reference regarding potential paleontological resources. In addition, the paleontologist shall inform the project sponsor, contractor, and construction personnel of the immediate stop work procedures and other procedures</p>	<p>Required for future development consistent with the housing element update if the project-specific evaluation finds that the scope of project construction activities are</p>	<p>Project sponsor, qualified paleontologist</p>	<p>Prior to the start of construction, and ongoing throughout ground-disturbing activities</p>	<p>Planning Department</p>	<p>Ongoing during construction. Considered complete once ground disturbing activities are complete or once the Environmental Review Officer approves the Paleontological</p>

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Completion Criteria
<p>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 paleontologist shall complete the standard form/affidavit confirming the timing of the worker awareness training and submit it 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 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 Vertebrate Paleontology standards (Society of Vertebrate Paleontology 2010) and best practices in mitigation paleontology (Murphey et al. 2019). The paleontologist shall consult the ERO. 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, 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 calendar days of the discovery.</p> <p>If in consultation with the ERO the qualified paleontologist determines that a paleontological resource is of scientific importance, the qualified paleontologist shall make a recommendation as to what action, if any, is warranted and prepare a paleontological mitigation program. The mitigation program shall include measures to fully document the resource of scientific importance. The qualified paleontologist shall submit the mitigation program to the ERO for review and approval within ten</p>	<p>greater than screening thresholds and would adversely affect geologic units with moderate sensitivity for paleontological resources</p>				<p>Resources Report, if required.</p>

Adopted Mitigation Measure	Applicable Actions that Require Mitigation	Monitoring and Reporting Program ^a			
		Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/Completion Criteria
<p>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 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>					

NOTES:

^a Definitions of MMRP Column Headings:

Adopted Mitigation and Improvements Measures: Full text of the mitigation measure(s) copied verbatim from the final CEQA document.

Implementation Responsibility: Entity who is responsible for implementing the mitigation measure. Project sponsor for a future development project consistent with the housing element update may also include the project's sponsor's contractor/consultant.

Mitigation Schedule: Identifies milestones for when the actions in the mitigation measure need to be implemented. Occupancy permit may refer to a temporary certificate and/or a final permit.

Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility: Identifies who is responsible for monitoring compliance with the mitigation measure and any reporting responsibilities. In most cases it is the planning department that is responsible for monitoring compliance with the mitigation measure. 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 of the future development project consistent with the housing element update, their contractor, or their consultant is responsible for any reporting requirements.

Monitoring Actions/Completion Criteria: Identifies the milestone at which the mitigation measure is considered complete. This may also identify requirements for verifying compliance.

PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

ATTACHMENT C

San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update

Findings of Consistency with the San Francisco General Plan and with the 8 Priority Policies of the San Francisco Planning Code Section 101.1

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION

In determining to approve the San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update, the San Francisco Planning Commission “Planning Commission” makes and adopts the following findings regarding consistency with the San Francisco General Plan and with the 8 Priority Policies of the San Francisco Planning Code Section 101.1.

SECTION I. Consistency with the San Francisco General Plan

The Housing Element 2022 Update was developed in coordination with existing General Plan Objectives and Policies. Analysis of applicable Objectives and Policies has determined that the Housing Element 2022 Update is, on balance, consistent with the General Plan. Below are specific policies and objectives that support this finding.

Air Quality Element

Objective 3 DECREASE THE AIR QUALITY IMPACTS OF DEVELOPMENT BY COORDINATION OF LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION DECISIONS.

Policy 3.1 Take advantage of the high density development in San Francisco to improve the transit infrastructure and also encourage high density and compact development where an extensive transportation infrastructure exists.

Policy 3.6 Link land use decision making policies to the availability of transit and consider the impacts of these policies on the local and regional transportation system.

The Housing Element 2022 Update is consistent with these Objectives and Policies in that it would direct an increased share of the city’s future housing growth to transit corridors including the SFMTA Rapid Network (Policy 20) and increase housing near job centers and transit (Implementation Program Area 7.3). This land use pattern would minimize transportation needs and facilitate the use of transit and walking for many trips, thus decreasing air quality impacts of future residential development.

Commerce and Industry Element

Objective 6 MAINTAIN AND STRENGTHEN VIABLE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL AREAS EASILY ACCESSIBLE TO CITY RESIDENTS

Policy 6.1 Ensure and encourage the retention and provision of neighborhood-serving goods and services in the city’s neighborhood commercial districts, while recognizing and encouraging diversity among the districts.

The Housing Element 2022 Update is consistent with these Objectives and Policies in that it would direct an increased share of the city's future housing growth to transit corridors and well-resourced areas, where many of the City's existing neighborhood commercial districts are located (Policy 20 and Policy 25), thus providing additional potential customers to neighborhood-serving businesses. The Update would support the inclusion of affordable community serving uses such as grocery stores, child-care facilities or others in affordable housing projects, would provide resources for tenant improvements for businesses, and grow a range of business and career-building opportunities in Priority Equity Geographies (Implementation Program Area 4.3).

Environmental Protection Element

Objective 4 ASSURE THAT THE AMBIENT AIR OF SAN FRANCISCO AND THE BAY REGION IS CLEAN, PROVIDES MAXIMUM VISIBILITY, AND MEETS AIR QUALITY STANDARDS.

Policy 4.2 Encourage the development and use of urban mass transportation systems in accordance with the objectives and policies of the Transportation Element.

Objective 15 INCREASE THE ENERGY EFFICIENCY OF TRANSPORTATION AND ENCOURAGE LAND USE PATTERNS AND METHODS OF TRANSPORTATION WHICH USE LESS ENERGY.

Policy 15.1 Increase the use of transportation alternatives to the automobile.

Policy 15.3 Encourage an urban design pattern that will minimize travel requirements among working, shopping, recreation, school and childcare areas.

The Housing Element 2022 Update is consistent with these Objectives and Policies in that it would direct an increased share of the city's future housing growth to transit corridors and well-resourced areas, which are more likely to include shopping, recreation, school and childcare facilities (Policy 20 and Policy 25). The Update would facilitate neighborhoods with proximity to daily needs and high-quality community services and amenities (Policy 37) and increase housing near job centers and transit (Implementation Program Area 7.3). This land use pattern would minimize travel requirements and facilitate the use of sustainable modes such as transit and walking for many trips.

Recreation and Open Space Element

Objective 1 ENSURE A WELL-MAINTAINED, HIGHLY UTILIZED, AND INTEGRATED OPEN SPACE SYSTEM

The Housing Element 2022 Update is consistent with this Objective in that it would direct an increased share of the city's future housing growth to well-resourced areas that include a large proportion of the City's open space system (Policy 20 and Policy 25). Locating new housing near existing parks will help ensure that the open space system is highly utilized and increases access for more people of all incomes to

the city's largest open spaces and recreational amenities. The Housing Element 2022 Update would prioritize improving parks in Priority Equity Geographies (Implementation Program Area 9.3).

Transportation Element

Objective 2 USE THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM AS A MEANS FOR GUIDING DEVELOPMENT AND IMPROVING THE ENVIRONMENT.

Policy 2.1 Use rapid transit and other transportation improvements in the city and region as the catalyst for desirable development, and coordinate new facilities with public and private development.

Objective 11 ESTABLISH PUBLIC TRANSIT AS THE PRIMARY MODE OF TRANSPORTATION IN SAN FRANCISCO AND AS A MEANS THROUGH WHICH TO GUIDE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPROVE REGIONAL MOBILITY AND AIR QUALITY.

Policy 11.3 Encourage development that efficiently coordinates land use with transit service, requiring that developers address transit concerns as well as mitigate traffic problems.

Policy 14.8 Implement land use controls that will support a sustainable mode split, and encourage development that limits the intensification of automobile use.

The Housing Element 2022 Update is consistent with these Objectives and Policies in that it would use the City's rapid transit system including the SFMTA Rapid Network as to guide to development and direct an increased share of the city's future housing growth to transit corridors and well-resourced areas with close proximity to services, facilities and amenities (Policy 20). The Update would facilitate neighborhoods with proximity to daily needs and high-quality community services and amenities (Policy 37) and increase housing near job centers and transit (Implementation Program Area 7.3). This land use pattern would minimize travel requirements, reduce the need for private auto travel, and facilitate the use of sustainable modes such as transit and walking for many trips.

Safety & Resilience Element *(as proposed to be adopted on December 13, 2022)*

Objective 2.1 PURSUE SYNERGISTIC EFFORTS THAT BOTH ELIMINATE GREENHOUSE GASES (CLIMATE MITIGATION) AND PROTECT PEOPLE, THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT, AND NATURE FROM UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS OF THE CLIMATE CRISES (CLIMATE ADAPTATION).

Policy 2.1.2 Direct City actions to reduce local contributions towards the climate crisis by mitigating greenhouse gasses and by increasing carbon sequestration.

Objective 3.3 ENSURE THE CITY’S LIFELINE SYSTEMS, TRANSPORTATION AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE FACILITIES, UTILITIES, STREETS, PUBLIC SPACES, AND COASTAL PROTECTION CAN WITHSTAND AND ADAPT TO ALL HAZARDS.

Policy 3.3.7 Support the development and updates to building, planning and other municipal code requirements that meet City climate and seismic resilience performance goals.

OBJECTIVE 6.1 MAXIMIZE THE OPPORTUNITIES TO RESTORE AND REBUILD THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT WITH RESILIENCE TO ALL HAZARDS.

Policy 6.1.1 Support actions to mitigate the spread of homelessness pre-disaster and increase the likelihood that the City’s stock of lowest-cost housing will survive post-disaster.

Policy 6.1.4 Protect individuals and families experiencing homelessness in the wake of disaster.

The Housing Element 2022 Update supports healthy, connected and resilient neighborhoods and housing. Policies and implementing action support building new resilient infrastructure and housing as well as upgrading existing infrastructure and repair and rehabilitation of existing housing to meet the challenges of all hazards and climate change. The Update would facilitate development that minimizes transportation needs and encourages the use of sustainable travel modes such as transit and walking that have lower emissions (Policy 20 and Policy 37). The Update would increase resources of the most housing insecure by pursuing permanently affordable housing investments that are specific to the geographic, cultural, and support needs of recently arrived or newly independent residents or residents from marginalized groups, including transgender and LGBTQ+ people. The Update would expand permanently supportive housing and services for individuals and families experiencing homelessness, expand permanently affordable housing investments in Priority Equity Geographies, increase the number of permanently affordable housing units in Well-resourced Neighborhoods (Policy 19), and seek to create dedicated and consistent local funding sources and advocate for regional, State, and Federal funding to support building permanently affordable housing for very low-, low-, and moderate-income households (Policy 22). Over 45 implementing programs of the Housing Element 2022 Update would address the preservation, funding, permitting, and construction of affordable housing and how affordable housing programs operate. The Update would minimize evictions and expand direct rental assistance as a renter stabilization strategy. It would acquire and rehabilitate existing privately-owned housing as permanently affordable, facilitate the legalization of existing unauthorized dwelling units while improving their safety and habitability, and support the repair and rehabilitation of existing housing.

SECTION II. Consistency with the Priority Policies of the San Francisco Planning Code

Planning Code Section 101.1(b) establishes eight priority policies and is the basis by which differences between competing policies in the General Plan are resolved. The Housing Element 2022 Update is consistent with the eight priority policies, in that:

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

The Housing Element 2022 Update would direct an increased share of the city's future housing growth to transit corridors and well-resourced areas, where many of the City's existing neighborhood commercial districts are located, providing an expanded customer base for existing and future businesses in these corridors. The Update would improve access to business ownership for American Indian, Black and other communities of color (Policy 16) and facilitate proximity to daily needs in neighborhoods (Policy 37).

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

A primary goal of the Housing Element 2022 Update is the preservation of the city's cultural and economic diversity, including through the conservation and protection of existing housing and neighborhood character. The Update would minimize evictions and expand direct rental assistance as a renter stabilization strategy (Policy 1). It would acquire and rehabilitate existing privately-owned housing as permanently affordable (Policy 3), facilitate the legalization of existing unauthorized dwelling units while improving their safety and habitability (Policy 4), and support the repair and rehabilitation of existing housing (Policy 39). The Update would conserve neighborhood character by promoting and facilitating aging in place for seniors and multi-generational living that supports extended families and communal households (Policy 32). It would shape urban design policy, standards, and guidelines to enable cultural and identity expression, advance architectural creativity and durability, and foster neighborhood belonging (Policy 41) and support cultural uses, activities, and architecture that sustain San Francisco's diverse cultural heritage (Policy 42).

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

The Housing Element 2022 Update would preserve and enhance the City's supply of affordable housing. The Update would preserve affordability of existing subsidized housing, government-owned or cooperative-owned housing, or SRO hotel rooms where the affordability requirements are at risk or soon to expire (Policy 2). It would pursue permanently affordable housing investments that are specific to the geographic, cultural, and support needs of recently arrived or newly independent residents or residents from marginalized groups, including transgender and LGBTQ+ people (Policy 7), Expand permanently supportive housing and services for individuals and families experiencing homelessness (Policy 8), expand permanently affordable housing investments in Priority Equity Geographies (Policy 15), increasing the number of permanently affordable housing units in Well-resourced Neighborhoods (Policy 19), and seek to create dedicated and consistent local funding sources and advocate for regional, State, and Federal funding to support building permanently affordable housing for very low-, low-, and moderate-income households (Policy 22). Over 45 implementing programs of the Housing Element 2022 Update would address the preservation, funding, permitting, and construction of affordable housing and how affordable housing programs operate.

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

The Housing Element 2022 Update would direct an increased share of the city's future housing growth to transit corridors which provide alternatives to traffic-generating automobile use. Transportation planning for the City and County of San Francisco will reference land use patterns and growth projections of the Housing Element 2022 Update. The Update calls for transportation investments that create equitable access to transit and are planned in parallel with increase in housing capacity to advance well-connected neighborhoods consistent with the City's Connect SF vision, and encourage sustainable trips in new housing (Policy 38). Implementing programs of the Housing Element 2022 Update include strengthening interagency coordination for transportation and adopting requirements that encourage trips using priority modes which generate less traffic and parking demand.

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 Housing Element 2022 Update would not adversely affect the industrial or service sectors. The Update would not permit office development where it is not currently permitted and would direct an increased share of the city's future housing growth to transit corridors in Well-resourced neighborhoods, which are not typical locations for industrial and service sector establishments. The Update contains objectives, policies, and programs that preserve and enhance housing affordable to residents at all income levels, benefiting residents employed in the industrial and service sectors.

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

The Housing Element 2022 Update advance this policy by supporting the repair and rehabilitation of housing to ensure life safety, health, and wellbeing of residents (Policy 39).

7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved.

The Housing Element 2022 Update would invest in and expand access to cultural anchors, land, and spaces that are significant to various San Francisco communities (Policy 12), and would support cultural uses, activities, and architecture that sustain San Francisco's diverse cultural heritage (Policy 42). The Update would designate historically and culturally significant buildings, landscapes, and districts for preservation to ensure appropriate treatment of historic properties, develop objective design standards for the treatment of historic buildings and districts to provide consistent and efficient regulatory review that facilitates housing development approvals and protects the City's cultural and architectural heritages, and promote historic preservation and cultural heritage incentives for use in residential rehabilitation projects (Implementation Program Area 4.5).

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

The Housing Element 2022 Update would continue to protect parks and open space. Individual residential projects would continue to be subject to Planning Code Sections 147 and 295 which protect access to sunlight for parks and open spaces. The Update would revise current hearing procedures for these Sections to ensure project approvals meet hearing requirements (Implementation Program Area 8.4) but would not remove them. The Update would direct an increased share of the city's future housing growth to transit corridors and well-resourced areas which will help ensure that the open space system is highly utilized.