

COMMISSION ON COMMUNITY INVESTMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE

RESOLUTION NO. 11-2018

Adopted April 17, 2018

ADOPTING FINDINGS, INCLUDING AMENDING ADOPTED MITIGATION MEASURES, PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT RELATED TO APPROVAL OF THE 2018 MODIFIED PROJECT VARIANT FOR THE CANDLESTICK POINT AND PHASE 2 OF THE HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD DEVELOPMENT PROJECT; HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA AND BAYVIEW HUNTERS POINT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA

WHEREAS, In furtherance of the objectives of the California Community Redevelopment Law (Health and Safety Code, section 33000 et seq. the “**CRL**”), the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco (the “**Former Agency**”) undertook programs for the reconstruction and construction of blighted areas in the City and County of San Francisco (“**City**”), including the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area (“**BVHP Project Area**”) and the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area (“**HPS Project Area**”); and,

WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco (“**Board of Supervisors**”) adopted the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Plan (“**HPS Plan**”) on July 14, 1997 by Ordinance No. 285-97 and amended the HPS Plan on August 3, 2010 by Ordinance No. 211-10 and on June 22, 2017 by Ordinance No. 122-17; and,

WHEREAS, On May 23, 2006, the Board of Supervisors amended the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan (“**BVHP Plan**”) by Ordinance No. 113-06, on August 3, 2010 by Ordinance No. 210-10, and June 22, 2017 by Ordinance No. 123-17; and,

WHEREAS, Also on June 3, 2010, the Former Agency Commission by Resolution No. 58-2010 and the San Francisco City Planning Commission by Motion No. 18096, acting as co-lead agencies, prepared and certified the Final Environmental Impact Report (“**FEIR**”) for the Candlestick Point Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Project (“**Project**” or “**CP/HPS2 Project**”) in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.) (“**CEQA**”) and the CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations Sections 15000 *et seq.*; and,

WHEREAS, On the same date, the co-lead agencies adopted findings pursuant to the CEQA (“**CEQA Findings**”) including without limitation findings regarding the alternatives, mitigation measures and significant environmental effects analyzed in the FEIR, a statement of overriding considerations and a mitigation monitoring and reporting program (“**MMRP**”), for the Project by Agency Commission Resolution No. 59-2010 and Planning Commission Motion No. 18097 and took various

approval actions related to the Project. On July 14, 2010, the Board of Supervisors affirmed the certification of the FEIR by Resolution No. 347-010 and adopted CEQA Findings. The CEQA Findings are incorporated into this Resolution by this reference; and,

WHEREAS, Pursuant to California Health and Safety Code §§ 34170 *et seq.* (the “**Dissolution Law**”), the Former Agency was dissolved as of February 1, 2012; and,

WHEREAS, The Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco (commonly known as the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, herein “**Successor Agency**” or “**OCII**”) is completing the enforceable obligations of the Former Agency with regard to the BVHP and HPS Project Areas, including implementation of the CP/HPS2 Project, under the authority of the CRL as amended by the Dissolution Law, and under San Francisco Ordinance No. 215-12 (Oct. 4, 2012) (establishing the Successor Agency Commission (“**Commission**”) and delegating to it state authority under the Dissolution Law); and,

WHEREAS, Subsequent to the certification of the FEIR, the Commission, by Resolution No. 01-2014 on January 7, 2014, and Resolution No. 13-2016, on March 15, 2016, approved certain changes to the Project supported by Addendum No. 1 and Addendum No. 4., respectively. Successor Agency staff prepared the addenda in consultation with the Planning Department. Addendum No. 1 addressed changes to the schedules for implementation of transportation system improvements in the Transportation Plan, including the Transit Operating Plan, the Infrastructure Plan and other public benefits; and minor proposed revisions in two adopted mitigations measures, TR-16 Widen Harney Way, and UT-2 Auxiliary Water Supply System. Addendum No. 4 addressed modifications to the approved Candlestick Point Design for Development, Schedule of Performance, the Candlestick Point Infrastructure Plan, the Candlestick Point Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Transportation Plan, and proposed revisions to two adopted mitigation measures TR-16 Widen Harney Way, and TR-23.1 Maintain the Proposed Headways of the 29-Sunset. (Addenda Nos. 2 and 3 analyzed proposed changes to the Project, which are no longer being pursued); and,

WHEREAS, The Successor Agency now proposes to take several actions facilitating modifications to the CP/HPS2 Project, collectively the “**2018 Actions**”, comprised of amendments (“**Plan Amendments**”) to the HPS Plan and BVHP Plan, adopting a revised Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Design for Development; a Third Amendment to the Disposition and Development Agreement (Candlestick Point and Phase 2 of the Hunters Point Shipyard) (including all related binding plans and agreements attached to or referenced in the text thereof, the “**CP/HPS2 DDA**”) and conforming amendments to several of the plans included in the CP/HPS2 DDA, including the Development Plan, the Phasing Plan and Schedule of Performance, the Design Review and Document Approval Procedure (“**DRDAP**”), the Below-Market Rate Housing Plan, the Community Benefits Plan, the Financing Plan, the Infrastructure Plan, the Parks and Open Space Plan, the Sustainability Plan, and the

Transportation Plan (collectively, the “**Amended Plans**”), and a Seventh Amendment to the Disposition and Development Agreement (Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 1), which actions are proposed to be approved by the Commission together with its adoption of the Plan Amendments; and,

WHEREAS, OCII, in consultation with the Planning Department, has prepared Addendum No. 5 to the FEIR, dated April 9, 2018. Addendum No. 5 evaluates the potential environmental effects of the 2018 Actions (referred to in Addendum No. 5 as the 2018 Modified Project Variant); and,

WHEREAS, Addendum No. 5 also recommends modifications to 16 adopted mitigation measures for the reasons set out in Addendum No. 5 and as explained in Exhibit 1 to this Resolution; and,

WHEREAS, Addendum No. 5 prepared in compliance with CEQA reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Successor Agency and concludes that the 2018 Actions are within the scope of the Project analyzed in the FEIR and will not result in any new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects that alter the conclusions reached in the FEIR for the reasons stated in the Addendum No. 5; and,

WHEREAS, In making the necessary findings for the proposed 2018 Actions, OCII considered and reviewed the FEIR and prepared necessary documents in support of the Addendum No. 5, which documents it has made available for review by the Commission and the public, and these files are part of the record before the Commission. Copies of the FEIR, Addendum No. 5, the supporting documentation to Addendum No. 5, are on file with the Commission Secretary and incorporated in this Resolution by this reference; and,


WHEREAS, Based on the analysis in Addendum No. 5, OCII concludes that the analyses conducted and the conclusions reached in the FEIR on June 3, 2010, remain valid and the proposed 2018 Actions, including the proposed amendments to the mitigation measures as specified above, will not cause new significant impacts not identified in the FEIR, or substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures will be necessary to reduce significant impacts. Further, as described in Addendum No. 5, no Project changes have occurred, and no changes have occurred with respect to circumstances surrounding the proposed Project that will require major revisions of the FEIR due to the involvement of new significant effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects, and no new information has become available that shows that the Project will cause new or more severe significant environmental impacts. Therefore, no subsequent or supplemental environmental review is required under CEQA beyond Addendum No. 5 to approve the 2018 Actions; and,

RESOLVED, That the Commission has reviewed and considered the FEIR, the CEQA Findings that were previously adopted by the Agency Commission, including the statement of overriding considerations and mitigation monitoring and reporting program, Addendum No. 5, the findings as set forth in Addendum No. 5, the findings related to amendments to adopted mitigation measures set out in Exhibit 1 to this Resolution, and the supporting documentation in OCII's files related to Addendum No. 5. The Commission adopts the CEQA Findings as its own, the Addendum No. 5 findings, the findings in Exhibit 1 to this Resolution, and adopts the amendments to the 16 mitigation measures as proposed by Addendum No. 5 and identified in Exhibit 1; and be it further

RESOLVED, That Commission finds and determines that the Project as modified by the 2018 Actions is within the scope of the Project analyzed in the FEIR and require no further environmental review beyond the FEIR pursuant to CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines Section 15180, 15162, and 15163 for the following reasons:

- (1) implementation of the 2018 Actions does not require major revisions in the FEIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; and,
- (2) no substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the actions analyzed in the FEIR will be undertaken that would require major revisions to the FEIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects, or a substantial increase in the severity of effects identified in the FEIR; and,
- (3) no new information of substantial importance to the actions analyzed in the FEIR has become available which would indicate that (A) the Project as modified by the 2018 Actions will have significant effects not discussed in the FEIR; (B) significant environmental effects will be substantially more severe; (C) mitigation measures or alternatives found not feasible, which would reduce one or more significant effects, have become feasible; or (D) mitigation measures or alternatives, which are considerably different from those in the FEIR, will substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Successor Agency Commission at its meeting of April 17, 2018.



Commission Secretary

EXHIBIT 1: 2018 Modified Project Variant CEQA Findings

EXHIBIT 1
Commission RESOLUTION NO. XX-2018
2018 MODIFIED PROJECT VARIANT CEQA FINDINGS

FINDINGS RELATED TO PROPOSED CHANGES TO CP-HPS2 MITIGATION MEASURES

April 2018

MM TR-16: Widen Harney Way as shown in Figure 5 in the Transportation Study, CP-HPS2 FEIR

Reason for Changes in Mitigation Measure: Because the phasing of the 2018 Modified Project Variant is different from the phasing analyzed in the 2010 FEIR Addendum 4, which also proposed modification of MM TR-16 based on the phasing plan proposed at the time Addendum 4 was published, the 2018 proposed modifications are proposed to link construction of Harney Way Phase 1B with the revised “trigger” point for implementation of the BRT. The full length of Harney Way Phase 1 would be completed prior to implementation of the BRT service under the new phasing and revised language for MM TR-16. Additionally, MM TR-16 has been revised to correct the name of the San Francisco County Transportation Authority.

MM TR-16: Widen Harney Way as shown in Figure 5 in the Transportation Study. The Project Applicant shall widen Harney Way as shown in Figure 5 in the Transportation Study with the modification to include a two-way cycle track, on the southern portion of the project right-of-way. The portion between Arelious Walker Drive and Executive Park East (Phase 1-A) shall be widened to include a two-way cycle track and two-way BRT lanes, prior to issuance of an occupancy permit for Candlestick Sub-phase CP-02. The remaining portion, between Thomas Mellon Drive and Executive Park East (Phase 1-B), shall be widened prior to implementation of the planned BRT route which coincides with construction of ~~CP-07 and HP-04 in 2023~~, as outlined in the transit improvement implementation schedule identified in Addendum 1, based on the alignment recommendations from an ongoing feasibility study conducted by the San Francisco County Transportation ~~Agency~~ Authority.

Prior to the issuance of grading permits for Candlestick Point Major Phases 2, and 3, ~~and 4~~, the Project Applicant shall fund a study to evaluate traffic conditions on Harney Way and determine whether additional traffic associated with the next phase of development would result in the need to modify Harney Way to its ultimate configuration, as shown in Figure 6 in the Transportation Study, unless this ultimate configuration has already been built. This study shall be conducted in collaboration with the SFMTA, which would be responsible for making final determinations regarding the ultimate configuration. The ultimate configuration would be linked to intersection performance, and it would be required when study results indicate intersection LOS at one or more of the three signalized intersection on

Harney Way at mid-LOS D (i.e., at an average delay per vehicle of more than 45 seconds per vehicle). If the study and SFMTA conclude that reconfiguration would be necessary to accommodate traffic demands associated with the next phase of development, the Project Applicant shall be responsible to fund and complete construction of the improvements prior to occupancy of the next phase.

MM TR-17: Implement the Project's Transit Operating Plan

Reason for Changes in Mitigation Measure: MM TR-17 has been changed to reflect changes to the Transit Operating Plan, which is Appendix A to the 2018 Modified Project Variant's Transportation Plan, and the revised project phasing.

MM TR-17: Implement the Project's Transit Operating Plan. The Project Applicant shall work with SFMTA to develop and implement the Project's Transit Operating Plan. Elements of the Project Transit Operating Plan shall include:

- Extension of the 24-Divisadero, the 44-O'Shaughnessy, and the 48-Quintara-24th Street into Hunters Point Shipyard.
- Increased frequency on the 24-Divisadero to 610 minutes in the AM and PM peak periods. Extension of the 29-Sunset from its current terminus near the Alice Griffith housing development, near Gilman Avenue and Giants Drive, into the proposed Candlestick Point retail area. The 29-Sunset would operate a short line between Candlestick Point and the Balboa Park BART station. This would increase frequencies on the 29-Sunset by reducing headways between buses from 10 minutes to 5 minutes during the AM and PM peak periods between Candlestick Point and the Balboa BART station. Every other bus would continue to serve the Sunset District (to the proposed terminus at Lincoln Drive and Pershing Drive in the Presidio) at 10-minute headways.
- Convert T-Third service between Bayview and Chinatown via the Central Subway from one-car to two-car trains or comparable service improvement. Extension of the 28L-19th Avenue Limited from its TEP-proposed terminus on Geneva Avenue, just east of Mission Street, into the Hunters Point Shipyard transit center. The 28L-19th Avenue Limited would travel along Geneva Avenue across US-101 via the proposed Geneva Avenue extension and new interchange with US-101, to Harney Way. East of Bayshore Boulevard, the 28L-19th Avenue Limited would operate as BRT, traveling in exclusive bus lanes into the Candlestick Point area. The BRT route would travel through the Candlestick Point retail corridor, and cross over Yosemite Slough into the Hunters Point Shipyard transit center.
- The 28L-19th Avenue Limited would operate a short line to the Balboa Park BART station. This would increase frequencies on the 28L-19th Avenue Limited by reducing headways between buses from 10 minutes to 5 minutes for the segment between Hunters Point Shipyard and the Balboa Park BART station. Every other

bus would continue to the Sunset District (to the proposed terminus at North Point Street and Van Ness Avenue) at 10-minute headways. If the TEP-proposed extension of the 28L has not been implemented by the SFMTA by the time implementation of this measure is called for in ~~the Transportation Study (Appendix D)~~ Addendum 5, based on the revised project phasing, the Project Applicant shall fund the extension of that line between its existing terminus and Bayshore Boulevard.

- New CPX-Candlestick Express to downtown serving the Candlestick Point site, traveling along Harney Way (with potential stops at Executive Park), before traveling on US-101 toward downtown, terminating at the Transbay Terminal.
- New HPX-Hunters Point Shipyard Express to downtown serving the Hunters Point Shipyard site, traveling from the Hunters Point Shipyard Transit Center, along Innes Avenue, with stops at the India Basin and Hunters View areas, before continuing along Evans Avenue to Third Street, eventually entering I-280 northbound at 25th/Indiana. The HPX would continue non-stop to the Transbay Terminal in Downtown San Francisco.

R&D Variant (Variant 1)/Housing/R&D Variant (Variant 2A)/2018 Modified Project Variant Mitigation Measure MM TR-VAR1

Reason for Changes in Mitigation Measure: MM TR-VAR1 Subsection (a) has been changed to address the 2018 Modified Project Variant's changes in movement volumes at the intersection of Crisp/Palou to ensure that the mitigation measure would allow this intersection to operate at an acceptable level of service with implementation of the project. Additionally, Subsection (b) of the mitigation measure has been changed to require the 2018 Modified Project Variant to implement the traffic signal requirement at Innes and Earl.

R&D Variant (Variant 1)/Housing/R&D Variant (Variant 2A)/2018 Modified Project Variant Mitigation Measure MM TR-VAR1:

- (a) Under the R&D and Housing/R&D Variants, the Project Applicant would be required to contribute its fair share to striping the southbound approach at Crisp and Palou to provide a dedicated left-turn lane and a shared through/right-turn lane and prohibiting on-street parking on Griffith Street between Palou and Oakdale Avenues. Under the 2018 Modified Project Variant, the Project Applicant would be required to contribute its fair share to striping the southbound approach at Crisp and Palou to provide a dedicated right-turn lane and a shared through/left-turn lane and prohibiting on-street parking on Griffith Street between Palou and Oakdale Avenues, and constructing the westbound approach on Crisp Avenue to provide two dedicated left-turn lanes and one shared through/right-turn lane. Implementation of this mitigation would reduce impacts from these variants to a less-than-significant level.

- (b) Under the R&D Variant (Variant 1) and the 2018 Modified Project Variant, the Project Applicant would be required to fund the installation of a traffic signal at the intersection of Innes and Earl when warranted by traffic conditions. Implementation of this mitigation would reduce impacts from this variant to a less-than-significant level.

MM NO-2a: Pre-construction Assessment to Minimize Pile Driving Impacts

Reason for Changes in Mitigation Measure: MM NO-2a has been changed to provide specific mitigation for the use of deep dynamic compaction (DDC) to stabilize loose soils throughout the site. DDC was identified in the 2010 FEIR as a potential method for stabilizing soil in MM GE-5a. Based on 2018 plans, use of DDC at the project site is likely. The changes to MM NO-2a will ensure that potential vibration impacts from DDC will be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

MM NO-2a: Pre-construction Assessment to Minimize Pile Driving and Deep Dynamic Compaction Impacts. The Project Applicant shall require its geotechnical engineering contractor to conduct a pre-construction assessment of existing subsurface conditions and the structural integrity of nearby buildings subject to pile driving and deep dynamic compaction (DDC) impacts prior to receiving a building permit. The building surveys will review existing conditions and confirm whether fractures in building footings or walls existed prior to pile driving and/or DDC activities.

If recommended by the geotechnical engineer, for structures or facilities within 50 feet of pile driving, the Project Applicant shall require groundborne vibration monitoring of nearby structures. Such methods and technologies shall be based on the specific conditions at the construction site such as, but not limited to, the following:

- Pre-pile driving surveying of potentially affected structures
- Underpinning of foundations of potentially affected structures, as necessary
- The construction plan shall include a monitoring program to detect ground settlement or lateral movement of structures in the vicinity of an excavation. Monitoring results shall be submitted to DBI. In the event of unacceptable ground movement, as determined by DBI inspections, all pile driving work shall cease and corrective measures shall be implemented. The pile driving program and ground stabilization measures shall be reevaluated and approved by DBI.

For DDC work, the Project Applicant shall prepare and implement a construction plan that includes a monitoring program to detect ground settlement or lateral movement of structures in the vicinity of DDC activity. Structures in the vicinity of DDC work shall be defined as reinforced-concrete, steel, or timber structures within 125 feet, engineered concrete or masonry structures within 150 feet, non-engineered timber and masonry structures within 225 feet, or other structures that are extremely susceptible to vibration damage within 275 feet of DDC activities as determined by the Project Applicant's

geotechnical engineer or structural engineer. The DDC program shall be evaluated and approved by OCII and results of the monitoring program shall be submitted to OCII. In the event of unacceptable ground movement, as determined by DBI inspection and review, all DDC work shall cease and corrective measures shall be implemented. The Project Applicant's geotechnical engineer, subject to OCII review and approval, shall determine which of the following ground stabilization measures or alternate measures would be necessary to avoid structural impacts related to DDC activities:

- Underpinning of foundations of potentially affected structures, as necessary to avoid structural impacts
- If deemed necessary by the geotechnical engineer, based on either proximity of DDC to a structure and/or on potential for damage to a structure, a cutoff trench shall be installed between the DDC activity and the structure. The cutoff trench should be at least 10 feet deep and 2 feet wide.¹ The trench should be long enough to effectively shield the structure from DDC vibrations.

MM CP-2a: Mitigation to Minimize Impacts to Archaeological Resources at Candlestick Point

Reason for Changes in Mitigation Measure: The archaeological sensitivity assessment and testing program (ATP) required in the 2010 FEIR mitigation measure has been prepared and was approved by the San Francisco Department Environmental Planning in June 2017.

MM CP-2a has been changed to require augmenting the approved ATP to account for the geothermal boreholes proposed in the 2018 Modified Project Variant. This change will ensure that the potential impacts of ground disturbing components of the geothermal heating and cooling system would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Changes to the section on "Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects" reflect current City practices and requirements.

MM CP-2a: Mitigation to Minimize Impacts to Archaeological Resources at Candlestick Point. Based on a reasonable presumption that archaeological resources may be present within the Project site, the following measures shall be undertaken to avoid any potentially significant adverse effect from the Project on buried or submerged historical resources.

Overview: The Project Applicant shall retain the services of a qualified archaeological consultant having expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical ~~archeology~~ archaeology. The archaeological consultant shall ~~undertake an~~ augment the approved archaeological testing program as specified herein. In addition, the archaeological consultant shall be available to conduct an archaeological monitoring and/or data recovery program if required pursuant to this measure. The archaeological consultant's

¹ ENGEO Incorporated, *Potential Constraints on Implementation of Deep Dynamic Compaction*, December 14, 2017, p. 1.

work shall be conducted in accordance with this measure and with the requirements of the Project Archaeological Research Design and Treatment Plan (Archeo-Tec, *Archaeological Research Design and Treatment Plan for the Bayview Waterfront Project, San Francisco, California, 2009*) at the direction of the City's Environmental Review Officer (ERO). In instances of inconsistency between the requirement of the Project Archaeological Research Design and Treatment Plan and of this archaeological mitigation measure, the requirement of this archaeological mitigation measure shall prevail. All plans and reports prepared by the consultant as specified herein shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment, and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Archaeological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction of the 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 potential effects on a significant archaeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a) (c) to a less-than-significant level.

Archaeological Testing Program: The archaeological consultant shall prepare and submit to the ERO for review and approval an addendum to the approved HPS2 archaeological testing plan (ATP). The archaeological testing program shall be conducted in accordance with the approved ATP addendum. The ATP addendum shall identify the property types of the expected archaeological resource(s) that potentially could be adversely affected by ground-disturbing components of the 2018 Modified Project Variant, including ground source geothermal heating and cooling system geothermal boreholes; the testing method to be used; and the locations recommended for testing. The purpose of the archaeological testing program will be to determine to the extent possible the presence or absence of archaeological resources and to identify and to evaluate whether any archaeological resource encountered on the site constitutes an historical resource under CEQA.

At the completion of the archaeological testing program, the archaeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings for submittal to the ERO. If, based on the archaeological testing program, the archaeological consultant finds that significant archaeological resources may be present, the ERO (in consultation with the archaeological consultant) shall determine if additional measures are warranted. Additional measures that may be undertaken include, but are not necessarily limited to, additional archaeological testing, archaeological monitoring, and/or an archaeological data recovery program. If the ERO determines that a significant archaeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the Project, the Project Applicant shall either:

- a. Re-design the Project so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archaeological resource; or

- b. Implement a data recovery program, unless the ERO determines that the archaeological resource is of greater interpretive than research significance and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible.

Archaeological Monitoring Program: If the ERO, in consultation with the archaeological consultant, determines that an Archaeological Monitoring Program (AMP) shall be implemented, the AMP shall include the following provisions, at a minimum:

- The archaeological consultant, Project Applicant, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the AMP prior to the commencement of any Project-related soils-disturbing activities. The ERO, in consultation with the archaeological consultant, shall determine what Project activities shall be archaeologically monitored. In most cases, any soils-disturbing activities, such as demolition, foundation removal, excavation, grading, utilities installation, foundation work, driving of piles (foundation, shoring, etc.), and site remediation, shall require archaeological monitoring because of the risk these activities pose to potential archaeological resources and to their depositional context.
- The archaeological consultant shall train all Project construction personnel who could reasonably be expected to encounter archaeological resources of the expected resource(s), how to identify the evidence of the expected resource(s), and the appropriate protocol in the event of apparent discovery of an archaeological resource.
- The archaeological monitor(s) shall be present on the Project site according to a schedule agreed upon by the archaeological consultant and the ERO until the ERO has, in consultation with the archaeological consultant, determined that Project construction activities could have no effects on significant archaeological deposits.
- The archaeological monitor shall record and be authorized to collect soil samples and artifactual/ecofactual material as warranted for analysis.
- If an intact archaeological deposit is encountered, all soils-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit shall cease. The archaeological monitor shall be authorized to temporarily halt demolition/excavation/pile driving/construction activities and equipment until the deposit is evaluated. If, in the case of pile driving activity (foundation, shoring, etc.), the archaeological monitor has cause to believe that the pile driving activity may affect an archaeological resource, the pile driving activity shall be terminated until an appropriate evaluation of the resource has been made in consultation with the ERO. The archaeological consultant shall immediately notify the ERO of any encountered archaeological deposit. The archaeological consultant shall make a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archaeological deposit and present the findings of this assessment to the ERO as expeditiously as possible.

- Whether or not significant archaeological resources are encountered, the archaeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings of the monitoring program to the ERO.

Archaeological Data Recovery Program: The archaeological data recovery program shall be conducted in accord with an Archaeological Data Recovery Plan (ADRP). The archaeological consultant, Project Applicant, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the ADRP prior to preparation of a draft ADRP. The archaeological consultant shall submit a draft ADRP to the ERO. The ADRP shall identify how the proposed data recovery program will preserve the significant information the archaeological resource is expected to contain. That is, the ADRP will identify what scientific/historical research questions are applicable to the expected resource, what data classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions. Data recovery, in general, should be limited to the portions of the historical property that could be adversely affected by the Project. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be pursued if nondestructive methods are practical.

The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements:

- Field Methods and Procedures. Descriptions of proposed field strategies, procedures, and operations.
- Cataloguing and Laboratory Analysis. Description of selected cataloguing system and artifact analysis procedures.
- Discard and Deaccession Policy. Description of and rationale for field and post-field discard and deaccession policies.
- Interpretive Program. Consideration of an on-site/off-site public interpretive program during the course of the archaeological data recovery program.
- Security Measures. Recommended security measures to protect the archaeological resource from vandalism, looting, and other potentially damaging activities.
- Final Report. Description of proposed report format and distribution of results.
- Curation. Description of the procedures and recommendations for the curation of any recovered data having potential research value, identification of appropriate curation facilities, and a summary of the accession policies of the curation facilities.

Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects: The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils-disturbing activity shall comply with applicable state and federal laws. ~~This shall include~~ including immediate notification of the ~~Coroner~~ Office of the Chief Medical Examiner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the ~~Coroner's~~ Medical Examiner's determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission

(NAHC), which shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (PRC Sec. 5097.98). The ERO shall also be immediately notified upon discovery of human remains. The archaeological consultant, Project Applicant Sponsor, ERO, and MLD shall have up to but not beyond six days after the discovery to make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects with appropriate dignity (CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15064.5(d)). The agreement shall should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, ~~custodianship~~, curation, possession, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects. Nothing in existing state regulations or in this mitigation measure compels the Project Sponsor and the ERO to accept recommendations of an MLD. The archeological consultant shall retain possession of any Native American human remains and associated or unassociated burial objects until completion of any scientific analyses of the human remains or objects as specified in the treatment agreement if such an agreement has been made or, otherwise, as determined by the archeological consultant and the ERO. If no agreement is reached, state regulations shall be followed including the reinternment of the human remains and associated burial objects with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance (PRC Sec. 5097.98).

Final Archaeological Resources Report: The archaeological consultant shall submit a Draft Final Archaeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archaeological resource and describes the archaeological and historical research methods employed in the archaeological testing/monitoring/data recovery program(s). Information that may put at risk any archaeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the final report.

Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one (1) copy and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Major Environmental Analysis division of the Planning Department shall receive three copies of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest in or the high interpretive value of the resource, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than presented above.

MM GE-5a: Site-Specific Geotechnical Investigation with Analyses of Liquefaction, Lateral Spreading and/or Settlement

Reason for Changes in Mitigation Measure: MM GE-5a has been changed to add deep displacement grout columns as a potential method to densify loose soil and provide additional bearing support beneath foundations. This method would be subject to all applicable mitigation measures related to ground disturbance, including the mitigation measures for hazards and

hazardous materials, and would provide an additional option for selecting the ground improvement technique most appropriate for the site that would effectively minimize the impact of liquefaction, lateral spreading and seismic settlement hazards.

MM GE-5a: Site-Specific Geotechnical Investigation with Analyses of Liquefaction, Lateral Spreading and/or Settlement. Prior to issuance of building permits for the Project site:

- The Applicant shall submit to the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection (DBI) for review and approval a site-specific, design-level geotechnical investigation prepared by a California Certified Engineering Geologist (CEG) or California Registered Geotechnical Engineer (GE), as well as project plans prepared in compliance with the requirements of the San Francisco Building Code (SFBC), the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act, and requirements contained in CGS Special Publication 117A “Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California.” In addition, all engineering practices, and analyses of structural design shall be consistent with SFBC standards to ensure seismic stability, including reduction of potential liquefaction hazards.
- DBI shall employ a third-party CEG and California Registered Professional Engineer (Civil) (PE) to form a Geotechnical Peer Review Committee (GPRC), consisting of DBI and these third-party reviewers. The GPRC shall review the site-specific geotechnical investigations and the site-specific structural, foundation, infrastructure, and other relevant plans to ensure that these plans incorporate all necessary geotechnical mitigation measures. No permits shall be issued by DBI until the GPRC has approved the geotechnical investigation and the Project plans, including the factual determinations and the proposed engineering designs and construction methods.
- All Project structural designs shall incorporate and conform to the requirements in the site-specific geotechnical investigations.
- The site-specific Project plans shall incorporate the mitigation measures contained in the approved site-specific geotechnical reports to reduce liquefaction hazards. The engineering design techniques to reduce liquefaction hazards shall include proven methods generally accepted by California Certified Engineering Geologists, subject to DBI and GPRC review and approval, including, but not necessarily limited to:

Structural Measures

- Construction of deep foundations, which transfer loads to competent strata beneath the zone susceptible to liquefaction, for shallow foundations
- Structural mat foundations to distribute concentrated load to prevent damage to structures

Ground Improvement Measures

- Additional over-excavation and replacement of unstable soil with engineering-compacted fill
- Dynamic compaction, such as Deep Dynamic Compaction (DDC) or Rapid Impact Compaction (RIC), to densify loose soils below the groundwater table
- Vibro-compaction, sometimes referred to as vibro-floatation, to densify loose soils below the groundwater table
- Stone columns to provide pore pressure dissipation pathways for soil, compact loose soil between columns, and provide additional bearing support beneath foundations
- Soil-cement columns to densify loose soils and provide additional bearing support beneath foundations
- Deep displacement grout columns to densify loose soil and provide additional bearing support beneath foundations
- The Project CEG or GE shall be responsible for ensuring compliance with these requirements.

MM HY-6a.1: Regulatory Stormwater Requirements

Reason for Changes in Mitigation Measure: In 2016, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission issued the Stormwater Management Requirements and Design guidelines (SMR) consistent with the updated Stormwater Management Ordinance. These documents supersede the Stormwater Design Guidelines referred in the 2010 FEIR, including MM HY-6a. The text of MM HY-6a has been changed to reflect the current guidance document, the SMR, because this document will apply to the project and ensure that potential impacts are reduced to a less-than-significant level.

MM HY-6a.1: Regulatory Stormwater Requirements. The Project Applicant shall comply with requirements of the Municipal Stormwater General Permit and associated City SWMP, appropriate performance standards established in the Green Building Ordinance, and performance standards established by the SFPUC in the San Francisco Stormwater Management Requirements and Design Guidelines (SMR).

~~The Draft San Francisco Stormwater Design Guidelines have been developed to satisfy the Municipal Stormwater General Permit requirements for new development and redevelopment projects in areas served by separate storm sewers, and are expected to be adopted by December 2009. SMR includes regulatory requirements for post-construction stormwater management controls for new and redevelopment projects and helps design teams implement these stormwater controls.~~ The Project Applicant shall comply with requirements of the ~~Draft San Francisco Stormwater Design Guidelines~~ SMR. ~~Upon adoption of the Final Stormwater Design Guidelines, the Project shall comply with the~~

~~Final San Francisco Stormwater Design Guidelines unless discretionary permits have been approved.~~

Per the ~~Draft San Francisco Stormwater Design Guidelines~~ SMR, the Project Applicant shall submit a Stormwater Control Plan (SCP) to the SFPUC, as part of the development application submitted for approval. The SCP shall demonstrate how the following measures would be incorporated into the Project:

- Low impact development site design principles (e.g., preserving natural drainage channels, treating stormwater runoff at its source rather than in downstream centralized controls)
- Source control BMPs in the form of design standards and structural features for the following areas, as applicable:
 - Commercial areas
 - Restaurants
 - Retail gasoline outlets
 - Automotive repair shops
 - Parking lots
- Source control BMPs for landscaped areas shall be documented in the form of a Landscape Management Plan that relies on Integrated Pest Management² and also includes pesticide and fertilizer application guidelines.
- Treatment control measures (e.g., bioretention, porous pavement, vegetated swales) targeting the Project-specific COCs: sediment, pathogens, metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus compounds), oxygen-demanding substances, organic compounds (e.g., PCBs, pesticides), oil and grease, and trash and debris. The SCP shall demonstrate that the Project has the land area available to support the proposed BMP facilities sized per the required water quality design storm. Volume-based BMPs shall be sized to treat runoff resulting from 0.75 inch of rainfall (~~LEED® SS6.2~~), and flow-based BMPs shall be sized to treat runoff resulting from a rainfall intensity of 0.24 inch per hour. Treatment trains shall be used where feasible.

Additional requirements:

- ~~LEED® SS6.2: BMPs used to treat runoff shall be designed to remove 80 percent of the average annual post development total suspended solids loads. BMPs are~~

² IPM is a strategy that focuses on long-term prevention or suppression of pest problems (i.e., insects, diseases and weeds) through a combination of techniques including: using pest-resistant plants; biological controls; cultural practices; habitat modification; and the judicious use of pesticides according to treatment thresholds, when monitoring indicates pesticides are needed because pest populations exceed established thresholds.

~~considered to meet these criteria if they are designed in accordance with SFPUC requirements.~~

- The SCP shall include an Operations and Maintenance Plan that demonstrates how the treatment control BMPs would be maintained in the long term, what entities would be responsible for BMP maintenance within the public and private rights-of-way, funding mechanisms, and what mechanisms would be used to formalize maintenance and access agreements.
- The Project Applicant shall also prepare a Stormwater Drainage Master Plan (SDMP) for approval by the SFPUC. The SDMP shall include plans for the storm drain infrastructure and plans for stormwater management controls (e.g., vegetated swales, dry wells). The storm drain infrastructure shall illustrate conveyance of the 5-year storm event in a separate storm drain piped system, and conveyance of the 100-year storm event in the street and drainage channel rights-of-way.

MM HY-12a.1: Finished Grade Elevations Above Base Flood Elevation

Reason for Changes in Mitigation Measure: As described in the “New Regulations” section of Addendum 5 Section II.B.12 (Hydrology and Water Quality), in 2012 the National Research Council (NRC) published *Sea Level Rise for the Coasts of California, Oregon, and Washington: Past, Present, and Future*, which provides the most recent regional sea level rise predictions through 2100. In 2013, the California Ocean Protection Council updated its 2010 statewide sea level rise guidance to adopt the NRC report as the best available science on sea level rise for California. Other California agencies, including the San Francisco Planning Department, also considers the NRC report to be the best available science on sea level rise for San Francisco Bay. Consequently, MM HY-12a.1 and MM HY-12a.2 have been changed to reflect the worst case sea level rise estimated (5.5 feet) by end of century.

MM HY-12a.1: Finished Grade Elevations Above Base Flood Elevation. The Project site shall be graded such that finished floor elevations are a minimum of 35.5 feet above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE), ~~and streets and pads are 3 feet above BFE to allow for~~ accommodate worst-case, future sea level rise projections for the end of the century, thereby elevating all housing and structures above the existing and potential future flood hazard area. If the FIRM for San Francisco is not finalized prior to implementation of the Project, the Project Applicant shall work with the City Surveyor or other applicable City department to revise the City’s Interim Floodplain Map, as needed. If the FIRM for San Francisco is finalized prior to implementation of the Project, the Project Applicant shall request that the Office of the City Administrator (Floodplain Manager) request a Letter of Map Revision based on Fill (LOMR-F) from FEMA that places the Project outside a SFHA and requires that the FIRM is updated by FEMA to reflect revised regulatory floodplain designations.

MM HY-12a.2: Shoreline Improvements for Future Sea-Level Rise

Reason for Changes in Mitigation Measure: See explanation above for MM HY-12a.1.

Additionally, because the open space area along the shoreline has a higher adaptive capacity and resilience compared to the development area, MM HY-12a.2 requires accommodation of the worst case forecast for 2050 (24 inches) with horizontal setbacks designed to provide for future elevation increases along the shoreline in response to up to 5.5 feet of sea level rise.

MM HY-12a.2: Shoreline Improvements for Future Sea-Level Rise. Shoreline and public access improvements shall be designed to allow for future increases in elevation sea level rise above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) that includes wave run-up (often called Total Water Level [TWL]) along the shoreline. In addition, adequate horizontal setback shall be provided to allow future increases in elevation along the shoreline edge to keep up with higher sea level rise values, should they occur. Design elements shall include providing adequate setbacks to allow for future elevation increases ~~of at least 3 feet from the existing elevation along the shoreline~~ in response to up to 5.5 feet of sea level rise above the TWL, which is projected as the worst-case estimate at the end of the century. Before the first Small Lot Final Map is approved, the Project Applicant must petition the appropriate governing body to form (or annex into if appropriate) and administer a special assessment district or other funding mechanism to finance and construct future improvements necessary to ensure that the shoreline protection system, storm drain system, public facilities, and public access improvements will be protected should sea level rise exceed ~~16 inches at the perimeter of the Project~~ 2 feet. Prior to the sale of the first residential unit within the Project, the legislative body shall have acted upon the petition to include the property within the district boundary. The newly formed district shall also administer a Monitoring and Adaptive Management Plan to monitor sea level and implement and maintain the protective improvements.

MM HY-14: Shoreline Improvements to Reduce Flood Risk

Reason for Changes in Mitigation Measure: MM HY-14 has been changed to acknowledge that the 2009 Shoreline Improvement Reports may be updated as necessary to fulfill the goals of flood protection, including protecting the structural integrity of existing shoreline features.

MM HY-14: Shoreline Improvements to Reduce Flood Risk. To reduce the flood impacts of failure of existing shoreline structures, the Project Applicant shall implement shoreline improvements for flood control protection, as identified in the Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Development Project Proposed Shoreline Improvements report:³ (or updated Shoreline Improvements Reports). Where feasible, elements of living shorelines shall be incorporated into the shoreline protection improvement measures.

³ Moffatt & Nichols, 2009, *Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Proposed Shoreline Improvements*, prepared for Lennar Urban, September 2009.

MM BI-19b.1: Work Windows to Reduce Maintenance Dredging Impacts to Fish during Operation of the Marina

Reason for Changes in Mitigation Measure: MM BI-19b.1 has been changed to correct the dates for Pacific herring spawning and the corresponding date for the designated work window.

MM BI-19b.1: Work Windows to Reduce Maintenance Dredging Impacts to Fish during Operation of the Marina. According to the Long-Term Management Strategy (LTMS), dredging Projects that occur during the designated work windows do not need to consult with NMFS under the federal *Endangered Species Act* (FESA).⁴ The window in which dredging is allowed for the protection of steelhead in the central Bay is June 1 to November 30. The spawning season for the Pacific herring is ~~March 1 to November 30~~ December 1 to February 28.⁵ Therefore, the window that shall be applied to minimize impacts to sensitive fish species (during which dredging activities cannot occur) is ~~March~~ June 1 to November 30.

MM BI-20a.1: Lighting Measures to Reduce Impacts to Birds

Reason for Changes in Mitigation Measure: MM BI-20a.1 and MM BI-20a.2 originally applied to buildings more than 100 feet tall based on the assumption that impacts to migratory birds would result primarily from collisions by high-flying migrants. Current thinking is that most bird collisions occur within 60 feet off the ground and thus current practice concentrates bird-safe building design at lower elevations. These mitigation measures have been changed to provide design requirements consistent with current practices.

MM BI-20a.1 Lighting Measures to Reduce Impacts to Birds. During building design ~~of any building greater than 100 feet tall~~, the Project Applicant and architect shall consult with a qualified biologist experienced with bird strikes and building/lighting design issues (as approved by the City/Agency) to identify lighting-related measures to minimize the effects of the building's lighting on birds. Such measures, which may

⁴ U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Implementation Commission, and San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board. *Long-Term Management Strategy for the Placement of Dredge Material in the San Francisco Bay, Management Plan*, 2001.

⁵ U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Implementation Commission, and San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board. *Long-Term Management Strategy for the Placement of Dredge Material in the San Francisco Bay, Management Plan*, 2001; Appendix F.

include the following and/or other measures, will be incorporated into the building's design and operation.

- Where lighting is necessary on rooftops, Use strobe or flashing lights in place of continuously burning lights for obstruction lighting. Use flashing white lights rather than continuous light, red light, or rotating beams.
- Install shields onto light sources not necessary for air traffic to direct light towards the ground and away from areas that provide high-quality bird habitat.
- Extinguish all exterior lighting (i.e., rooftop floods, perimeter spots) not required for public safety.
- No uplighting will be installed.
- When interior or exterior lights must be left on at night, the developer and/or operator of the buildings shall examine and adopt alternatives to bright, all-night, floor-wide lighting, which may include:
 - Installing motion-sensitive lighting.
 - Using desk lamps and task lighting.
 - Reprogramming timers.
 - Use of lower-intensity lighting.
- Windows or window treatments that reduce transmission of light out of the building will be implemented to the extent feasible.
- Educational materials will be provided to building occupants encouraging them to minimize light transmission from windows, especially during peak spring and fall migratory periods, by turning off unnecessary lighting and/or closing drapes and blinds at night.
- A report of the lighting alternatives considered and adopted shall be provided to the City/Agency for review and approval prior to construction. The City/Agency shall ensure that lighting-related measures to reduce the risk of bird collisions have been incorporated into the design of such buildings to the extent practicable.

MM BI-20a.2: Building Design Measures to Minimize Bird Strike Risk

Reason for Changes in Mitigation Measure: See explanation for MM BI-20a.2 above.

MM BI 20a.2 Building Design Measures to Minimize Bird Strike Risk. During design of any building ~~greater than 100 feet tall~~ within 300 feet of a potential "urban bird refuge" (an open space 2 acres and larger dominated by vegetation, including vegetated landscaping, forest, meadows, grassland, or wetlands, or open water) or any structure containing free-standing glass walls, wind barriers, skywalks, balconies, and greenhouses on rooftops that have unbroken glazed segments 24 square feet and larger

in size, the Project Applicant and architect will consult with a qualified biologist experienced with bird strikes and building/lighting design issues (as approved by the City/Agency) to identify measures related to the external appearance of the building/structure to minimize the risk of bird strikes. Such measures, which may include the following and/or other measures, will be incorporated into the building's design.

- Minimize the use of glass, particularly within the portion of the building between ground level and 60 feet above the ground.
- Use non-reflective tinted glass.
- Use window films to make windows visible to birds from the outside.
- Use external surfaces/designs that “break up” reflective surfaces. These patterns should include vertical elements at least 0.25 inch wide at a maximum spacing of 4 inches or horizontal elements at least 0.125 inch wide at a maximum spacing of 2 inches.
- Place bird attractants, such as bird feeders and baths, at least 3 feet and preferably 30 feet or more from windows in order to reduce collision mortality.
- A report of the design measures considered and adopted shall be provided to the City/Agency for review and approval prior to construction. If, in the opinion of a qualified biologist, modification or waiver of these bird-safe design measures would not result in substantial increases in bird collision risk, the report should include the justification for such an opinion, for consideration by the City/Agency. The City/Agency shall ensure that building design-related measures to reduce the risk of bird collisions have been incorporated to the extent practicable.

MM RE-2: Phasing of parkland with respect to residential and/or employment generating uses

Reason for Changes in Mitigation Measure: MM RE-2 has been changed to reflect changes in the project phasing plan while maintaining the requirement that adequate parkland must be provided when residential and employment generating uses are occupied.

MM RE-2: Phasing of parkland with respect to residential and/or employment-generating uses. Development of the Project and associated parkland shall ~~proceed in~~ four phases, as illustrated by Figure II 16 (~~Proposed Site Preparation Schedule~~) of ~~Chapter II (Project Description) of this EIR.~~ To ensure that within each phase or sub-phase, parks and population increase substantially concurrently, and development shall be scheduled such that adequate parkland is constructed and operational when

residential and employment-generating uses are occupied. The following standards shall be met:

- No project development shall be granted a temporary certificate of occupancy if the City determines that the new population associated with that development would result in a parkland-to-population ratio within the Project site lower than 5.5 acres per 1,000 residents/population, as calculated by the Agency.
- For the purposes of this mitigation measure, in order for a park to be considered in the parkland-to-population ratio, the Agency must determine that within 12 months of the issuance of the temporary certificate of occupancy, it will be fully constructed and operational, and, if applicable, operation and maintenance funding will be provided to the Agency.

MM UT-2: Auxiliary Water Supply System

Reason for Changes in Mitigation Measure: MM UT-2 has been changed to reflect the 2018 Modified Project Variant which proposes to connect the project Auxiliary Water Supply System (AWSS) to the existing AWSS at the Palou Avenue and Griffith Avenue intersections with a looped service along Spear Avenue/Crisp Road.

MM UT-2: Auxiliary Water Supply System. Prior to issuance of occupancy permits, as part of the Infrastructure Plan to be approved, the Project Applicant shall construct an Auxiliary Water Supply System (AWSS) within Candlestick Point to connect to the City's planned extension of the off-site system on Gilman Street from Ingalls Street to Candlestick Point. The Project Applicant shall construct an additional AWSS on HPS Phase II to connect to the existing system ~~at Earl Street and Innes Avenue and~~ at Palou and Griffith Avenues, with service along Spear Avenue/Crisp Road.

MM GC-2

Reason for Changes in Mitigation Measure: MM GC-2 has been changed to reflect that the 2008 standards have been replaced by the 2016 Standards for Title 24 Part 6. As explained in Addendum 5 Section II.B.17 (Energy), the 2016 standards exceed the requirements of the 2010 MM GC-2 requirements in terms of building energy efficiency.

MM GC-2: ~~Exceed the 2008~~ Comply with the 2016 Standards for Title 24 Part 6 energy efficiency standards for homes and businesses ~~would by at least 15 percent.~~

n:\legana\as2018\1800496\01266401.docx

Commission Secretary