



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Planning Commission Resolution No. 18870 General Plan Amendment

HEARING DATE: MAY 16, 2013

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Date: May 9, 2013
Case No.: 2011.0397 M
Project Address: **General Plan Amendments to Bicycle Policies**
Initiated by: John Rahaim, Director of Planning
Staff Contact: Kimia Haddadan – (415) 575-9068
kimia.haddadan@sfgov.org
Reviewed by: AnMarie Rodgers, Manager, Legislative Affairs
anmarie.rodgers@sfgov.org
Recommendation: **Approval**

RECOMMENDING THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ADOPT AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE GENERAL PLAN RELATED TO THE SAN FRANCISCO BICYCLE PLAN INCLUDING REVISIONS TO THE TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT AND THE DOWNTOWN AREA PLAN, ANY CORRESPONDING REVISIONS TO THE LAND USE INDEX OF THE GENERAL PLAN, MAKING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS AND FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN AND PRIORITY POLICIES OF PLANNING CODE SECTION 101.1.

WHEREAS, Section 4.105 of the San Francisco Charter empowers the Planning Commission to establish and update the City's General Plan, and calls for the General Plan to contain "goals, policies and programs for the future physical development of the City and County of San Francisco." The Charter calls for the Planning Commission to periodically recommend for approval or rejection to the Board of Supervisors proposed amendments to the General Plan, in response to changing physical, social, economic, environmental or legislative conditions.

WHEREAS, General Plan Amendments related to the 2009 Bicycle Plan were originally recommended by the Planning Commission to the Board of Supervisors for the Board's approval on June 25, 2009 in Resolution 17914. On June 25, 2009 (in Resolution 17912), the Planning Commission certified an environmental impact report (EIR) prepared for the 2009 Bicycle Plan, and (in Resolution 17913), adopted findings pursuant to CEQA, including a mitigation monitoring and reporting program. On January 14, 2013, in *Anderson v. City and County of San Francisco*, A129910, the California Court of Appeal found that the EIR on the 2009 Bicycle Plan complied with CEQA in all respects but also found that the findings adopted

pursuant to the CEQA in connection with the General Plan Amendments did not adequately set forth the reasons for rejecting as infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR, and did not adequately discuss several significant environmental impacts caused by the Project that cannot be mitigated;

WHEREAS, On April 4, 2013, The Commission initiated amendments to re-adopt the previously adopted General Plan Amendments, including changes to the Transportation Element and the Downtown Area Plan of the General Plan; and

Whereas, On June 25, 2009, by Motion No. 17912, the Planning Commission certified as adequate, accurate and complete the Final Environmental Impact Report ("FEIR") for the 2009 San Francisco Bicycle Plan. On August 4, 2009 in Motion M09-136, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors affirmed the decision of the Planning Commission to certify the FEIR and rejected the appeal of the FEIR certification. In accordance with the actions contemplated herein, the Commission has reviewed the FEIR, and adopts and incorporates by reference, as though fully set forth herein, the findings, including a statement of overriding considerations and the mitigation monitoring and reporting program, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code section 21000, et seq), Attachment A to this Resolution;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Commission hereby rescinds Resolution No. 16942 and Motion No. 16943 concerning General Plan amendments related to the 2005 Bicycle Plan; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, The Commission, for the reasons set forth herein, finds that the proposed General Plan amendments are, on balance, consistent with the General Plan and the priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That pursuant to Planning Code Section 340, the Planning Commission does hereby find that the public necessity, convenience and general welfare require the approval of the attached ordinance, approved as to form by the City Attorney, and directs staff to make corresponding updates to the Land Use Index of the General Plan, and recommends approval of these amendments as though fully set forth herein to the Board of Supervisors; and

FINDINGS

The Commission re-affirms the following findings originally adopted in Resolution 17914:

The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) has been working on a plan to encourage increased bicycle use as an alternate mode of transportation and to make bicycle travel safer throughout the City. It published and is seeking adoption of the 2009 San Francisco Bicycle Transportation Plan to accomplish these objectives. While the San Francisco General Plan already contains objectives and policies that discuss bicycle use and other transportation modalities in use in San Francisco, the 2009

Bicycle Plan establishes proposals to encourage improved bicycle facilities, including a system of bicycle routes that are not reflected in the City's General Plan and calls for programs to install related bicycle facilities on public rights-of-way and other public and private improvements to encourage and facilitate increased bicycle use throughout the City.

In response to changing patterns of travel and increasing use of transit and bicycle use and walking as alternatives to travel by private automobile in the City, staff believes General Plan amendments are appropriate. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission consider amending the General Plan to more closely reflect this shift in travel mode choice and facilitate increasing levels of and safer bicycle use in the future.

The proposed General Plan amendments are related to the 2009 Bicycle Plan, which proposes to encourage increased bicycle use and improve bicycle safety in San Francisco. The General Plan amendments would revise Objectives, Policies, text, and figures/maps to the Transportation Element and the Downtown Area Plan of the General Plan. Bicycle use in San Francisco and across the nation is increasing and the proposed General Plan amendment acknowledges this shift in transportation mode. It would revise the General Plan to encourage additional bicycle use, particularly in the downtown and in other dense neighborhoods where parking is limited. The amendment call for transit providers to allow bicycle users to use transit to reach their destinations where appropriate, and to encourage alternatives to single-occupant vehicular use.

Although the General Plan already contains policies regarding bicycle use, more people are using bicycles to reach their destinations in the City and throughout the region and the General Plan does not appropriately address this travel mode shift. Though the objectives, policies and figures were accurate at the time that the General Plan was published, they no longer accurately characterize increasing use of alternative travel modes, including increased use of transit, bicycle and walking.

The goals of the 2009 Bicycle Plan are, on the whole, consistent with San Francisco General Plan Objectives and Policies. However, the General Plan contains a number of Objectives, Policies and figures that do not fully reflect the proposed goals and measures that may be used to implement the City's Bicycle Plan. Planning staff therefore recommends that the Planning Commission consider adopting an amendment to the General Plan, including a number of conforming revisions to the Transportation Element and the Downtown Area Plan. If adopted, the General Plan would more closely reflect current conditions and opportunities to improve bicycle facilities and increase bicycle safety in the City. A draft Board of Supervisors ordinance, attached hereto as Exhibit M-2, would amend the General Plan. the City Attorney's Office has reviewed the draft ordinance and approved it as to form. Staff recommends adoption of the Resolution concerning minor amendments to the General Plan.

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

1. The General Plan amendment will not negatively affect existing, neighborhood-serving retail.
2. The General Plan amendment will not affect existing housing or neighborhood character. Most new multi-unit housing would provide secure bicycle parking / storage space for residents.
3. The General Plan amendment will not decrease the City's supply of affordable housing.
4. The Project will not result in impacts to MUNI, as most MUNI vehicles including MUNI Coach service allows multi-modal use with bicyclists. The project would not re to improve the pedestrian qualities of streets by reducing neighborhood parking needs.
5. The General Plan amendment will not result in displacement of the City's industrial and service sectors for commercial office development.
6. The General Plan amendment will not negatively affect e the City's preparedness for an earthquake.
7. The General Plan amendment will not affect Historic Resources.
8. The General Plan amendment will not affect any City parks or open spaces or their access to sunlight.

The proposal will promote the following relevant objectives and policies of the General Plan. Analysis of applicable General Plan Objectives and Policies has determined that the proposed action is, on balance, consistent with the General Plan, as it proposed to be amended. Below are specific policies and objectives that support the proposed actions.

AIR QUALITY ELEMENT

Objective 3:

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

The General Plan amendment and implementation of the Bicycle Plan will encourage increased bicycle use and reduced travel by private automobile, reducing air quality impacts.

COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY ELEMENT

Objectives and Policies

OBJECTIVE 1:

MANAGE ECONOMIC GROWTH AND CHANGE TO ENSURE ENHANCEMENT OF THE TOTAL CITY LIVING AND WORKING ENVIRONMENT.

OBJECTIVE 6:

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

Policy 6.2:

Promote economically vital neighborhood commercial districts which foster small business enterprises and entrepreneurship and which are responsive to the economic and technological innovation in the marketplace and society.

It is often difficult to find parking in the City's dense downtown and neighborhood commercial districts. Policies in the General Plan and the City's Bicycle Plan will tend to reduce the demand for parking by encouraging more individuals to travel by bicycle, and transit, thereby reducing the demand for increased on and off-street parking.

POLICY 6.7

Promote high quality urban design on commercial streets.

The General Plan amendment would encourage increased use of bicycles to access neighborhood commercial districts and neighborhoods throughout the City. This may tend to reduce vehicular traffic and demand on land resources for parking, freeing up space for bicyclists, pedestrians, and pedestrian improvements to be installed on public sidewalks.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES ELEMENT

OBJECTIVE 3

ASSURE THAT NEIGHBORHOOD RESIDENTS HAVE ACCESS TO NEEDED SERVICES AND A FOCUS FOR NEIGHBORHOOD ACTIVITIES.

Policy 3.4

Locate neighborhood centers so they are easily accessible and near the natural center of activity.

The project would encourage increased bicycle use and provide another travel mode to reach neighborhood facilities.

THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION 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 15.2

Provide incentives to increase the energy efficiency of automobile travel.

Policy 15.3

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

The project would encourage increased bicycle use and may thereby reduce automobile travel within the City for work, shopping and recreational trips.

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.

Policy 6.4

Encourage the location of neighborhood shopping areas throughout the city so that essential retail goods and personal services are accessible to all residents.

Policy 6.7

Promote high quality urban design on commercial streets.

The Project will facilitate travel to neighborhood commercial streets by encouraging use of bicycles rather than autos for shopping trips. Proposed amendment would support installation of bicycle parking and storage facilities in neighborhood commercial areas.

RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE ELEMENT

Objectives and Policies

Policy 2.8

Develop a recreational trail system that links city parks and public open space,

ridge lines and hilltops, the Bay and ocean, and neighborhoods, and ties into the regional hiking trail system.

The Project will not negatively impact existing public parks and will encourage bicycle use to, among other things, access public open space facilities throughout the City and beyond.

TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

Objectives and Policies

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.

Policy 2.4

Organize the transportation system to reinforce community identity, improve linkages among interrelated activities and provide focus for community activities.

The Project will also encourage bicycle use and reduced use of the private automobile.

Policy 2.5

Provide incentives for the use of transit, carpools, vanpools, walking and bicycling and reduce the need for new or expanded automobile and automobile parking facilities.

The Project will encourage bicycle and intermodal transit / bicycle use for increasing percentages of work, shopping and recreational travel, reducing the impact and need for additional automobile parking facilities.

Policy 18.2

Design streets for a level of traffic that serves, but will not cause a detrimental impact on adjacent land uses.

New streets will be designed to accommodate neighborhood traffic and incorporate traffic calming measures such as corner sidewalk bulbs to reduce the distance pedestrians have to cross the street, and incorporation of street trees and street furniture that will encourage an active pedestrian life.

The Project would support more multi-modal travel, including walking and bicycle use to access multi-modal transit centers and encourage transit connections.

OBJECTIVE 27

ENSURE THAT BICYCLES CAN BE USED SAFELY AND CONVENIENTLY AS A PRIMARY MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION, AS WELL AS FOR RECREATIONAL PURPOSES.

OBJECTIVE 28

PROVIDE SECURE AND CONVENIENT PARKING FACILITIES FOR BICYCLES.

Policy 28.1

Provide secure bicycle parking in new governmental, commercial, and residential developments.

The Project encourages bicycle use. New development will be required to provide secure bicycle parking, including new residential development and commercial uses.

OBJECTIVE 34:

RELATE THE AMOUNT OF PARKING IN RESIDENTIAL AREAS AND NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS TO THE CAPACITY OF THE CITY'S STREET SYSTEM AND LAND USE PATTERNS.

Policy 34.3:

Permit minimal or reduced off-street parking supply for new buildings in residential and commercial areas adjacent to transit centers and along transit preferential streets.

Policy 34.4:

Regulate off-street parking in new housing so as to guarantee needed spaces without requiring excesses and to encourage low auto ownership in neighborhoods that are well served by transit and are convenient to neighborhood shopping.

The Proposed amendment would help to implement and extend the reach of Transportation policies designed to reduce the amount of required parking when facilities are provided for alternate transportation modes, including better access to transit and increased bicycle use and facilities.

DOWNTOWN AREA PLAN

OBJECTIVE 18

ENSURE THAT THE NUMBER OF AUTO TRIPS TO AND FROM DOWNTOWN WILL NOT BE DETRIMENTAL TO THE GROWTH OR AMENITY OF DOWNTOWN.

Policy 18.3

Discourage new long-term commuter parking spaces in and around downtown. Limit long-term parking spaces serving downtown to the number that already exists.

OBJECTIVE 19

PROVIDE FOR SAFE AND CONVENIENT BICYCLE USE AS A MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION.

Policy 19.1

Include facilities for bicycle users in governmental, commercial, and residential developments.

Policy 19.3

Provide adequate and secure bicycle parking at transit terminals.

The amendment would encourage increased bicycle use for work and shopping trips to the Downtown C-3 Districts.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED by the San Francisco Planning Commission on May 16, 2013.

Jonas P. Ionin
Acting Commission Secretary

AYES: Antonini, Borden, Fong, Hillis, Sugaya

NOES:

ABSENT:

ADOPTED: 6-0

ATTACHMENT A

SAN FRANCISCO BICYCLE PLAN PROJECT AND RELATED ACTIONS

[REVISED] CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT FINDINGS: FINDINGS OF FACT, EVALUATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES AND ALTERNATIVES, AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION

In determining to approve the proposed San Francisco Bicycle Project and related approval actions (the “Preferred Project” or “Project”), the San Francisco Planning Commission (“Planning Commission” or “Commission”) makes and adopts the following findings of fact and statement of overriding considerations and adopts the following recommendations regarding mitigation measures and alternatives based on substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding and under the California Environmental Quality Act, California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq. (“CEQA”), particularly Sections 21081 and 21081.5, the Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, 14 California Code of Regulations Sections 15000 et seq. (“CEQA Guidelines”), particularly Sections 15091 through 15093, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administration Code.

I. Introduction; Project Description; Planning Commission Actions to be Taken

This document is organized as follows:

Section I provides a description of the Preferred Project, the environmental review process for the project, the Planning Commission actions to be taken, and the location of records;

Section II identifies the impacts found not to be significant that do not require mitigation;

Section III identifies potentially-significant impacts that can be avoided or reduced to less-than-significant levels through mitigation;

Section IV identifies significant impacts that cannot be avoided or reduced to less-than-significant levels;

Section V discusses why a subsequent or supplemental EIR is not required;

Section VI evaluates the different project alternatives, and sets forth the economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations, and incorporates by reference the reasons set forth in Section VII, that support the rejection as infeasible of the alternatives and design options analyzed, and presents the reasons for selecting preferred design options for the specified bicycle projects; and

Section VII presents a statement of overriding considerations setting forth specific reasons in support of the Planning Commission's actions despite the significant environmental impacts which remain. This section also sets forth additional reasons for rejecting as infeasible the Alternatives not incorporated into the Project, as described in Section VI.

Attached to these findings as Exhibit 1 is the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") for the mitigation measures that have been proposed for adoption for the Bicycle Plan. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program is required by CEQA Section 21081.6 and *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15091. It provides a table setting forth each mitigation measure listed in the Final EIR ("FEIR") that is required to reduce or avoid a significant adverse impact. Exhibit 1 also specifies the agency responsible for implementation of each measure and establishes monitoring actions and a monitoring schedule.

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.

a. Project Description

The San Francisco Bicycle Plan Project would provide for the approval of the 2009 Bicycle Plan and implementation of near-term bicycle route improvement projects (near-term improvements) and minor improvements such as signage and pavement marking changes. It also identifies long-term bicycle route network improvement projects (long-term improvements). The Bicycle Plan includes policy goals, objectives, and actions to support the implementation of these and related changes, at this time and in the future. By enacting these changes, the Preferred Project's overall goal is to increase safe bicycle use; the Bicycle Plan's specific goals are to (1) refine and expand the existing bicycle route network; (2) ensure plentiful, high-quality bicycle parking to complement the bicycle route network; (3) expand bicycle access to transit and bridges; (4) educate the public about bicycle safety; (5) improve bicycle safety through targeted enforcement; (6) promote and encourage safe bicycling; (7) adopt bicycle-friendly practices and policies; and (8) prioritize and increase bicycle funding. The primary Project sponsor is the Municipal Transportation Agency.

Policy Actions

In order to accomplish its goals, the 2009 Bicycle Plan would implement policy actions, near-term improvements, and minor improvements, and consider long-term improvements. The Bicycle Plan also proposes amendments to the *San Francisco General Plan* and *Planning Code*. Each proposed policy; near-term improvement, long-term improvement, and minor improvement is described in Chapter IV, Project Description, and analyzed in Chapter V,

Subsections V.A.2 through V.A.5, pp. V.A.2-1 through V.A.5-30, of the DEIR. Applicable changes to the *General Plan* and *Planning Code* are proposed to reflect the updated Bicycle Plan policies.

Minor Improvements

Minor improvements are treatments that may be implemented as necessary to improve conditions for bicycle use within the City on the bicycle network. They include the following design elements to improve bicycle travel: minor pavement marking and signage changes such as the installation of colored pavement materials or sharrows (shared lane markings) or minor changes to parking and traffic lane configurations; minor changes to intersection traffic signal timing plans; the installation of bicycle boxes at certain intersections; and bicycle parking within the public right-of-way, including bicycle racks on sidewalks meeting certain criteria and on-street bicycle parking. Environmental analysis for the minor improvements is presented in Subsection V.A.4, (p V.A.4-1), of the DEIR.

Long-Term Improvements

Long-term improvements are bicycle route network improvement projects that consist of either major improvements to segments of the existing bicycle route network or are potential future additions of new streets and pathways to the bicycle route network. These proposed long-term improvements include a wide range of potential design features that will improve the overall connectivity and safety of the bicycle route network. Currently, neither a schedule nor specific designs for these projects have been developed.

The anticipated long-term improvements may include, but are not limited to, the following design elements to improve bicycle travel along identified streets: signage changes; pavement marking such as the installation of colored pavement materials and the installation of sharrows; modifications to bus zones and parking configurations such as changes to the location, configuration, and number of metered or unmetered parking spaces and loading zones; changes to the locations and configurations of curbs, sidewalks and medians (including both planted and unplanted), including widening of roadways; reconfiguration of intersections to improve bicycle crossings, including installation of bicycle traffic signals; the installation of traffic calming devices, including designation of bicycle boulevards that prioritize bicycle travel over other transportation modes; installation of bicycle lanes, pathways or other bicycle facilities, including in conjunction with the narrowing or removal of traffic lanes; the removal of parking spaces, and the designation of shared bicycle and transit lanes.

The impacts of these future improvements are evaluated at a program level in this analysis with regard to the Preferred Project footprint (the affected street right-of-way and park land). Once fully developed, these future improvements, individually or collectively, may require further project-level environmental analysis that would consider the potential environmental effects of

these improvements. The program-level analysis for these long-term improvements is presented in Chapter V, Subsection V.A.5, p. V.A.5-1, of the DEIR.

b. Environmental Review

The Planning Department determined that an Environmental Impact Report (“EIR”) was required for the Project and issued a Notice of Preparation and Notice of Public Scoping Meeting on June 5, 2007. The Planning Department held a public scoping meeting on June 26, 2007 and published the initial study for the Bicycle Plan Project on March 15, 2008. The Planning Department published the Draft EIR and provided public notice of the availability of the Draft EIR for public review and comment on November 26, 2008.

On November 26, 2008, a Notice of Completion and copies of the Draft EIR were distributed to the State Clearinghouse. Notices of availability for the Draft EIR of the date and time of the public hearings were posted on the Planning Department’s website on November 26, 2008.

The Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing on the Draft EIR on January 8, 2009. At this hearing, opportunity for public comment was given, and public comment was received on the Draft EIR. The Planning Department accepted public comments on the Draft EIR from November 26, 2008 to January 13, 2009. The Department’s Comments and Responses document also responded to comments submitted as late as January 19, 2009.

The Planning Department published the Comments and Responses on the Draft EIR on June 11, 2009. This document includes responses to environmental comments on the Draft EIR made at the public hearing on January 8, 2009 as well as written comments submitted on the Draft EIR from November 26, 2008 to January 13, 2009 and comments submitted after the official close of public comment. The comments and responses document also contains text changes to the Draft EIR made by EIR preparers to correct or clarify information presented in the Draft EIR, including changes to the Draft EIR text made in response to comments.

c. Planning Commission Actions

The Planning Commission is being requested to take the following actions to approve and implement the Preferred Project.

-
- Adopt Revised CEQA findings and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.
- Approve and recommend adoption of amendments to the General Plan related to the San Francisco Bicycle Plan, by the Board of Supervisors.
- Approve and recommend to the Board of Supervisors related amendments to the *San Francisco Planning Code*.

d. Location of Records

The record upon which all findings and determinations related to the Project are based includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- The San Francisco Bicycle Plan;
- The EIR and all documents referenced in or relied upon by the EIR;
- All information (including written evidence and testimony) provided by City staff to the Planning Commission relating to the EIR, the proposed approvals and entitlements, the Project, and the alternatives (“Options”) set forth in the EIR;
- All information (including written evidence and testimony) presented to the Planning Commission by the environmental consultant and subconsultants who prepared the EIR, or incorporated into reports presented to the Planning Commission;
- All information (including written evidence and testimony) presented to the City from other public agencies relating to the Project or the EIR;
- All applications, letters, testimony and presentations presented to the City by the project sponsor and its consultants in connection with the Project;
- All information (including written evidence and testimony) presented at any public hearing or workshop related to the Project and the EIR;
- For documentary and information purposes, all locally-adopted land use plans and ordinances, including, without limitation, general plans, specific plans and ordinances, together with environmental review documents, findings, mitigation monitoring programs and other documentation relevant to planned growth in the area;
- The MMRP; and
- All other documents comprising the record pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 2116.76(e)

The public hearing transcript, a copy of all letters regarding the Draft EIR received during the public review period, the administrative record, and background documentation for the Final EIR are located at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco. Linda Avery, Commission Secretary, is the custodian of these documents and materials.

II. Impacts Found Not To Be Significant, Thus Requiring No Mitigation

Finding: Based on substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding, the Commission finds that the implementation of the Preferred Project would not result any significant environmental impacts in the following areas: Land Use; Aesthetics; Population and Housing; Parking; Wind and Shadow; Recreation; Utilities and Service Systems; Public Services; Geology and Soils, Hydrology/Water Quality; Hazards/Hazardous Materials; Mineral/Energy Resources; Agricultural Resources. Each of these topics is analyzed and discussed in detail including, but not limited to, in the Initial Study (IS).

III. Findings of Potentially-Significant Impacts that can be Avoided or Reduced to a Less-Than-Significant Level

Finding: The California Environmental Quality Act (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 IS and FEIR. These findings discuss mitigation measures as proposed in the IS and FEIR and recommended for adoption by identified parties, including the primary Project sponsor, the MTA Board, which can be implemented by City agencies or departments.

As explained previously, **Exhibit 1**, attached, contains the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program required by CEQA Section 21081.6 and *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15091. It provides a table setting forth each mitigation measure listed in Chapter V of the EIR that is required to reduce or avoid a significant adverse impact. **Exhibit 1** also specifies the agency responsible for implementation of each measure, establishes monitoring actions and a monitoring schedule.

Mitigation Measures as part of Project Approval: The Planning Commission finds that, based on the record before it, the mitigation and improvement measures proposed for adoption in the FEIR are feasible, and that they can and should be carried out by the identified agencies at the designated time. There also are mitigation measures that address those impact areas where the measure may reduce an impact, yet not to a level of insignificance. These impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Such impacts and the mitigation proposed for adoption that would reduce, but not eliminate these impacts, are discussed in more detail in the following section of these Findings. The record demonstrates that the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, subject to approval from its Board of Directors, has agreed to adopt all mitigation and improvement measures identified in the FEIR. This Planning Commission urges other agencies to adopt and implement applicable mitigation measures set forth in the FEIR that are within the jurisdiction and responsibility of such entities. The Planning Commission acknowledges that if such mitigation measures are not adopted and implemented, the Project may result in additional

significant unavoidable impacts. For this reason, and as discussed in Section VI, the Planning Commission is adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations as set forth in Section VII.

All mitigation measures identified in the FEIR that would reduce or avoid significant adverse environmental impacts and improvement measures that would lessen environmental impacts which are less-than-significant are proposed for adoption and are set forth in **Exhibit 1**, in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

Initial Study

4. Cultural and Paleontological Resources

1. Impact – Potential disturbance to archeological resources, historic resources, paleontological resources, and human remains

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Implementation of the Preferred Project would involve ground disturbance that could result in potential impacts to archeological resources, historic resources, paleontological resources, and human remains.

- b) Mitigation Measure 1: Archaeological Resources: Accidental Discovery and Conclusion

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure 1, which would require the project sponsor to distribute the Planning Department archeological resource “ALERT” sheet to prime contractors. Should any indication of an archeological resource be encountered during any soils disturbing activity of the Project, the project Head Foreman and/or Project Sponsor shall immediately notify an Environmental Review Officer (ERO) and shall immediately suspend any soils disturbing activities in the vicinity of the discovery until the ERO has determined what additional measures should be undertaken.

If the ERO determines that an archeological resource may be present within the project site, the Project Sponsor shall retain the services of a qualified archeological consultant. The archeological consultant shall make a recommendation as to what action, if any, is warranted. Based on this information, the ERO may require, if warranted, specific additional measures to be implemented by the Project Sponsor.

Measures might include: preservation in situ of the archeological resource; an archaeological monitoring program; or an archeological testing program. The project archeological consultant shall submit a Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archeological

resource and describing the archeological and historical research methods employed in the archeological monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken.

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 or interpretive value, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.

12. Biological Resources

1. Impact – Potential disturbance to biological resources

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

The Preferred Project would not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, reduce fish or wildlife habitat, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. Biological resources that could be affected by the Preferred Project would be trees located along streets or sidewalks where improvements would be implemented and any migratory birds nesting in such trees at the time of tree removal. Existing requirements regarding tree removal and California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) regulations with respect to migratory nesting birds would ensure that impacts would be less than significant.

b) Mitigation Measure 3: Biological Resources and Conclusion

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure 3. To implement California Fish and Game Code Section 3503, the Project Sponsor would conduct a field survey 14 to 21 days prior to construction activities that would result in vegetation removal during the breeding season (February 1 through August 31). A qualified biologist shall determine if active nests of native birds are present in the construction zone. In the event an active nest is discovered in areas to be disturbed, removal of the nesting substrate shall be postponed until the nest is vacated and juveniles have fledged (typically 3 to 4 weeks for most small passerines), as determined by the biologist, and there is no evidence of second nesting attempts, unless the California Department of Fish

and Game (and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for migratory birds) authorize otherwise. No surveys are required and no impact would occur if vegetation removal, grading or other heavy construction activities would occur between September 1 to January 31, outside the nesting season.

Final EIR

A. Transportation

1. Transportation Impact to passenger loading on the south side of Broadway between Franklin Street and Van Ness Avenue from Project 1-1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P1-1a).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Implementation of Project 1-1, would construct bicycle lanes on Broadway between Polk Street and Webster Street. This would result of the parking lane removal on the south side of Broadway between Franklin Street and Van Ness Avenue, school children loading activities in front of Saint Brigid School could continue to occur in the afternoon (before 4 p.m.), but passenger loading activities would have to be prohibited during the weekday AM peak period (7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m.) because of City of San Francisco *Transportation Code* Section 38N which prohibits blocking of a bicycle lane during peak periods. This prohibition would represent a significant impact on passenger loading for the students of Saint Brigid School under Existing plus Project conditions for the AM peak hour as a result of Project 1-1.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to passenger loading on the south side of Broadway between Franklin Street and Van Ness Avenue from Project 1-1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P1-1a) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P1-1a, which would require that an alternative school passenger drop-off location would have to be identified to accommodate passenger loading demand, such as expanding the existing passenger drop-off location along the east side of Franklin Street between Pacific Avenue and Broadway on the west side of the school building. Alternatively, the passenger drop off zone on Broadway could be maintained by eliminating the proposed eastbound bicycle lane between Franklin Street and Van Ness Avenue and having bicyclists share the curb lane with motor vehicles, similar to existing conditions. With the implementation of either of these mitigation measures, the significant impact on loading for the students of Saint Brigid School would be reduced to less than significant under Existing plus Project conditions for Project 1-1.

2. Transportation Impact to passenger loading on the south side of Broadway between Franklin Street and Van Ness Avenue from Project 1-1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P1-1b).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Implementation of Project 1-1 would result in a significant impact to passenger loading for students of Saint Brigid School under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions as a result of Project 1-1.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to passenger loading on the south side of Broadway between Franklin Street and Van Ness Avenue from Project 1-1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P1-1b) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P1-1b. Refer to Mitigation Measure 1-1a, above for mitigation of this impact. With the implementation of either of these mitigation measures, the significant impact on loading for the students of Saint Brigid School would be reduced to less than significant under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Project 1-1.

3. Transportation Impact to passenger loading on the north side of Broadway between Buchanan and Webster Streets from Project 1-1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P1-1c).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Implementation of Project 1-1 would result in the elimination of one westbound travel lane on the north side of Broadway between Buchanan and Webster Streets. School children loading activities in front of Hamlin School would also be prohibited during the weekday AM peak period. This prohibition would represent a significant impact on passenger loading for the students of Hamlin School under Existing plus Project conditions.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to passenger loading on the north side of Broadway between Buchanan and Webster Streets from Project 1-1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P1-1c) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P1-1c, which will extend the existing passenger loading zone on the north side of Broadway near Webster Street towards the east, all the way to Buchanan Street. The passenger zone

extension would be located to the right of the proposed bicycle lane and would be operational during school arrival and dismissal periods only (typically from 7:00 to 8:30 a.m. and from 2:00 to 3:30 p.m.). This mitigation would reduce or eliminate incidents of double parking related to passenger loading and alleviate any associated congestion. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, the significant impact regarding loading for the students of Hamlin School would be reduced to less than significant under Existing plus Project conditions for Project 1-1.

4. Transportation Impact to passenger loading on the north side of Broadway between Buchanan and Webster Streets from Project 1-1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P1-1d).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Similar to that described above for Significant Impact TR-P1-1c, above, Project 1-1 would result in a significant impact to passenger loading for students of the Hamlin School under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions as a result of Project 1-1.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to passenger loading on the north side of Broadway between Buchanan and Webster Streets from Project 1-1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P1-1d) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P1-1d. Refer to Mitigation Measure M-TR-P1-1c, above, for mitigation of this impact. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, the significant impact on loading for the students of Hamlin School would be reduced to less than significant under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Project 1-1.

5. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Van Ness Avenue and North Point from Project 1-3 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P1-3a).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Implementation of Project 1-3, would construct bicycle lanes on North Point Street between The Embarcadero and Van Ness Avenue. This would result in the three-way controlled intersection at Van Ness Avenue/North Point Street would operate at LOS E under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Project 1-3.

- b) Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Van Ness Avenue and North Point from Project 1-3 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P1-3a) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P1-3a. Per the California *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (MUTCD), a signal warrant analysis was conducted to determine the feasibility of signalization of the Van Ness/North Point Street intersection. Signalization of the intersection would improve the intersection operations from LOS E to LOS B, and therefore would result in no significant impacts under 2025 Cumulative conditions for Project 1-3.

6. Transportation Impact to Muni line 10 from combined Project 2-1 and Project 2-16 Modified Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-1o).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Implementation of combined Project 2-1 and Project 2-16 Modified Option 1 would construct bicycle lanes on 2nd Street between King Street and Market Street and would construct bicycle lanes on Townsend Street between 8th Street and The Embarcadero. This would result in Muni bus line 10 experiencing significant delays.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to Muni line 10 from combined Project 2-1 and Project 2-16 Modified Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-1o) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P2-1o. The implementation of combined Projects 2-1 and 2-16 Modified Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions would add approximately 863 seconds (14.4 minutes) of delay for Muni bus line 10. With mitigation as described for the 2nd Street/Harrison Street, and 2nd Street/Folsom Street intersections (Mitigation Measures M-TR-P2-1c, M-TR-P2-1e, M-TR-P2-1f, M-TR-P2-1g, M-TR-P2-1h, M-TR-P2-1i, and M-TR-P2-1j), approximately 27 seconds of delay southbound and 266 seconds (4.4 minutes) of delay northbound would be added to Muni bus line 10. The total added delay of 293 seconds (4.8 minutes) would be less than the transit delay threshold of six minutes. Therefore, impacts to Muni bus line 10 for combined Projects 2-1 and 2-16 Modified Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

7. Transportation Impact to Muni line 10 from Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-1s).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Project 2-1 Modified Option 1, would construct bicycle lanes on 2nd Street between King Street and Market Street. A significant transit impact to Muni bus line 10 would occur as a result of individual Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to Muni line 10 from Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-1s) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P2-1s. The implementation of individual Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions would add approximately 845 seconds (14.1 minutes) of delay for Muni bus line 10. With mitigation as described for the 2nd Street/Harrison Street, and 2nd Street/Folsom Street intersections (Mitigation Measures M-TR-P2-1c, M-TR-P2-1e, M-TR-P2-1f, M-TR-P2-1g, M-TR-P2-1h, M-TR-P2-1i, and M-TR-P2-1j), approximately 27 seconds of delay southbound and 249 seconds (4.2 minutes) of delay northbound would be added to Muni bus line 10. The total added delay of 276 seconds (4.6 minutes) would be less than the transit delay threshold of six minutes. Therefore, impacts to Muni bus line 10 for individual Project 2-1 with Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

8. Transportation Impact to Muni line 10 from Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-1u).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

A significant transit impact would occur to Muni bus line 10 as a result of individual Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to Muni line 10 from Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-1u) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P2-1u. The implementation of individual Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus

Project conditions would add approximately 450 seconds (7.5 minutes) of delay for Muni bus line 10. With mitigation as described for the 2nd Street/Harrison Street, and 2nd Street/Folsom Street intersections, delay would be reduced by approximately 170 seconds (2.8 minutes) southbound with approximately 403 seconds (6.7 minutes) of delay added northbound to Muni bus line 10. The total added delay of 233 seconds (3.8 minutes) would be less than the transit delay threshold of six minutes. Therefore, impacts to Muni bus line 10 for individual Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

9. Transportation Impact to commercial freight loading on 2nd Street between Market Street and Bryant Street from Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-1aa).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

A significant impact on commercial freight loading would occur along 2nd Street between Market and Bryant Streets as a result of Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to commercial freight loading on 2nd Street between Market Street and Bryant Street from Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-1aa) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified to mitigate this commercial freight loading impact. Hence, a significant commercial freight loading impact would result along 2nd Street, between Market Street and Bryant Street, with implementation of Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions.

10. Transportation Impact to commercial freight loading on 2nd Street between Market Street and Bryant Street from Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-1cc).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

A significant impact on commercial freight loading would occur along 2nd Street between Market and Bryant Streets as a result of Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to commercial freight loading on 2nd Street between Market Street and Bryant Street from Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-1cc) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified to mitigate this commercial freight loading impact. Hence, a significant commercial freight loading impact would result along 2nd Street, between Market Street and Bryant Street, with implementation of Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions.

11. Transportation Impact to the intersection of 7th Street and Townsend from Project 2-16 Modified Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-16c).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Project 2-16 Modified Option 1 would construct bicycle lanes on Townsend Street between 8th Street and The Embarcadero. The 7th Street/Townsend Street intersection would operate at LOS F under Existing plus Project conditions and a significant impact would occur at 7th Street/Townsend Street intersection with the implementation of Project 2-16 Modified Option 1.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of 7th Street and Townsend from Project 2-16 Modified Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-16c) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P2-16c. Six seconds of green time shall be added to the eastbound Townsend Street approach and six seconds of green time shall be reduced from the northbound 7th Street approach, to improve the 7th Street/Townsend Street intersection operations from LOS F to LOS D. Hence, this mitigation measure would reduce the project impacts of Project 2-16 Modified Option 1 to a less-than-significant level.

12. Transportation Impact to the intersection of 4th Street and Townsend from Project 2-16 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-16g).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions the 4th Street/Townsend Street intersection would operate at LOS E and a significant impact would occur at this intersection with the implementation of Project 2-16 Modified Option 1.

- b) Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of 4th Street and Townsend Street from Project 2-16 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-16g) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P2-16g. The westbound Townsend Street approach shall be modified from a permitted phase to a protected signal phase. In addition, five seconds of green time shall be added to the westbound Townsend Street approach and five seconds of green time shall be reduced from the southbound 4th Street approach. This would improve the 4th Street/Townsend Street intersection operations from LOS E to LOS D. Hence, this mitigation measure would reduce the project impacts of Project 2-16 Modified Option 1 to a less-than-significant level for 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions.

13. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Masonic Avenue and Fell Street from combined Project 3-1 Option 1 and Project 3-2 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P3-1a).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Project 3-1 would involve intersection improvements at Fell Street and Masonic Avenue intersection. Project 3-2 would construct bicycle lanes on Masonic Avenue between Fell Street and Geary Boulevard. Implementation of Option 1 of Projects 3-1 and 3-2 combined under Existing plus Project conditions would result in the intersection of Masonic Avenue/Fell Street operating at LOS E.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Masonic Avenue and Fell Street from combined Project 3-1 Option 1 and Project 3-2 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P3-1a) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P3-1a. Four seconds of green time shall be added to the northbound and southbound directions of Masonic Avenue and four seconds of green time shall be reduced from the westbound Fell Street direction. With these adjustments, Masonic Avenue/Fell Street intersection operations would improve to LOS D. Hence, this mitigation measure would reduce impacts from combined Project 3-1 and 3-2 Option 1 to a less-than-significant level under Existing plus Project conditions.

14. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Masonic Avenue and Fell Street from Project 3-2 Option 2 under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P3-2f).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Project 3-2 would construct bicycle lanes on Masonic Avenue between Fell Street and Geary Boulevard. Under Existing plus Project conditions the Masonic Avenue/Fell Street intersection would operate at LOS E and a significant impact would occur at the Masonic Avenue/Fell Street intersection with the implementation of Project 3-2 Option 2

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Masonic Avenue and Fell Street from Project 3-2 Option 2 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P3-2f) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P3-2f. Four seconds of green time shall be added to the northbound and southbound Masonic Avenue directions, with a corresponding reduction in green time in the westbound Fell Street direction of four seconds. With these adjustments, the Masonic Avenue/Fell Street intersection operations would improve to LOS D. Hence, this mitigation measure would reduce the project impacts to a less-than-significant level for Project 3-2 with Option 2 under Existing plus Project conditions.

15. Transportation Impact to Muni lines 9, 9X, 9AX and SamTrans 292 from combined Modified Project 5-2 and Project 5-4 Modified Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P5-4f).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Implementation of combined Modified Project 5-2 and Project 5-4 Modified Option 2 would install a combination of bicycle lanes and sharrows in both directions on Alemany Boulevard between Bayshore Boulevard and Rousseau Street and would install a combination of bicycle lanes and sharrows on Bayshore Boulevard between Cesar Chavez Street and Silver Avenue. This would result in Muni bus lines 9, 9X, 9AX and SamTrans 292 experiencing significant delays.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to Muni lines 9, 9X, 9AX and SamTrans 292 from combined Modified Project 5-2 and Project 5-4 Modified Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-4f) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P5-4f. The implementation of Modified Project 5-2 and Project 5-4 Modified Option 2 combined under 2025 Cumulative plus Project Conditions would add approximately 417 seconds (7.0 minutes) of total delay for Muni bus lines 9, 9X, 9AX and SamTrans 292. With mitigation as described above in Mitigation Measure 5.4f, transit delay would be reduced to approximately 70 seconds (1.2 minutes) of delay northbound and 13 seconds of delay southbound. The total added delay of approximately 83 seconds (1.4 minutes) would be less than the transit delay threshold of six minutes. Therefore, impacts to transit for Muni bus lines 9, 9X, 9AX and SamTrans 292 for Modified Project 5-2 and Project 5-4 Modified Option 2 combined under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

16. Transportation Impact to Muni lines 9, 9X, 9AX and SamTrans 292 from Project 5-4 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P5-4g).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Implementation of Project 5-4 Modified Option 2 would install a combination of bicycle lanes and sharrows on Bayshore Boulevard between Cesar Chavez Street and Silver Avenue. This would result in Muni bus lines 9, 9X, 9AX and SamTrans 292 experiencing significant delays.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to Muni lines 9, 9X, 9AX and SamTrans 292 from Project 5-4 Modified Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-4g) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P5-4g. The implementation of Modified Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Project 5-4 only would add approximately 417 seconds (7.0 minutes) of total delay for Muni bus lines 9, 9X, 9AX and SamTrans 292. With mitigation as described above in Mitigation Measure 5.4e, transit delay would be reduced to approximately 70 seconds (1.2 minutes) of delay northbound and 13 seconds of delay southbound. The total added delay of approximately 83 seconds (1.4 minutes) would be less than the transit delay threshold of six minutes. Therefore, impacts to transit for Muni bus lines 9, 9X, 9AX and

SamTrans 292 for Project 5-4 only with Modified Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

B. Air Quality

No significant impacts were identified in relation to air quality.

C. Noise

No significant impacts were identified in relation to noise.

IV. Significant Impacts That Cannot Be Avoided or Reduced to a Less Than Significant Level

Finding: Based on substantial evidence in the whole record of these proceedings, the Planning Commission finds that, where feasible, changes or alterations have been required, or incorporated into, the Project to reduce the significant environmental impacts listed below as identified in the FEIR. Based on substantial evidence in the whole record, including the expert opinion of Planning Department staff, the Planning Commission also finds that for some impacts identified in the FEIR, as noted below in this Section IV, no feasible mitigation measure were identified in the FEIR, and those impacts remain significant and unavoidable. The Commission determines that the following significant impacts on the environment, as reflected in the FEIR, are unavoidable, and under Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(3) and (b), and *CEQA Guidelines* 15091(a)(3), 15092(b)(2)(B), and 15093, the Commission determines that the alternatives are infeasible, as described in Section VI below, but that the impacts are acceptable due to the overriding considerations, which are described in Section VII below. This finding is supported by substantial evidence in the record of this proceeding. Also, as set forth above, the mitigation measures identified in this section and in Exhibit 1, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, are adopted as part of the Project even though the impacts will remain significant and unavoidable.

A. Transportation

Program Level

Bicycle Route Network Goals, Objectives and Action Items

17. Predictable indirect Transportation Impacts in the project area from the approval of a policy to implement improvements to streets and paths proposed as near-term improvements (Impact TR-A1.1).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Action 1.1 of the Bicycle Plan is to implement improvements to streets and paths identified as proposed near-term bicycle improvement projects and implement minor improvements to other streets and paths on the existing bicycle route network, if feasible. Impact TR-A1.1, the indirect impacts from approval of a policy to implement improvements to streets and paths proposed as near-term improvements, and to implement minor improvements to other streets and paths on the existing bicycle route network, or in the case of bicycle parking, to implement minor improvements within the street right-of-way, would include construction of the aforementioned improvements. The indirect results of this action would, therefore, include all of those environmental impacts identified under the sections of the transportation study for the Bicycle Plan related to the project-level impacts of the near-term improvements and the program-level impacts resulting from implementation of the minor improvements. The results of this analysis are summarized in Subsections V.A.3 and V.A.4 of the Draft EIR. The mitigation measures identified in Subsection V.A.3 of the Draft EIR would lessen some of the impacts that may result from implementation of the near-term improvements. No significant impacts were identified from the minor improvements in Subsection V.A.4 of the Draft EIR. However, there would be some environmental impacts from the near-term improvements that would remain significant and unavoidable as described in Subsection V.A.3 of the Draft EIR.

b) Mitigation Measures for the 60 near-term improvements that would be implemented by the San Francisco Bicycle Plan (M-TR-A1.1) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced but would remain at a significant level with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-A1.1, which includes all the mitigation measures that would be implemented in association with the 60 near-term projects. These are discussed in greater detail below. Mitigation Measures defined in Subsection V.A.3 of the Draft EIR shall be implemented in association with the 60 near-term improvements proposed and implemented under the Bicycle Plan. As set forth elsewhere herein, some of the impacts would be reduced to a

less-than-significant level within implementation of identified mitigation measures. In other instances, mitigation measures have been identified which would improve conditions, but not reduce impacts to a less than significant level. For those identified significant impacts with respect to traffic, transit, and loading in Subsection V.A.3 of the Draft EIR for which no feasible mitigation measures have been identified, the impacts remain significant and unavoidable.

18. Predictable indirect Transportation Impacts in the project area from the approval of a policy to implement improvements to streets and paths proposed as long-term improvements (Impact TR-A1.2).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Action 1.2 of the Bicycle Plan is to complete the required design and engineering for improvements to streets and paths identified as proposed long-term bicycle improvement projects and implement, if feasible. Predictable indirect impacts from approval of a policy to implement improvements to streets and paths proposed as long-term improvements on the existing bicycle route network as well as additions to the network would include construction of the aforementioned improvements. The indirect results of this action would, therefore, include all of those environmental impacts identified under the sections of the transportation impact study for the Bicycle Plan related to the program-level impacts of the long-term improvements. The results of this analysis are summarized in Subsection V.A.5 of the Draft EIR and include potentially-significant and significant and unavoidable impacts. As has been previously stated, the specific designs for the long-term improvements are unknown at this time. The mitigations measures identified in Subsection V.A.5 of the Draft EIR would lessen some of the impacts that may result from implementation of the long-term improvements. However, there would be some that would remain significant and unavoidable.

- b) Mitigation Measures for the long-term improvements that would be implanted by the San Francisco Bicycle Plan (M-TR-A1.2) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure A1.2, which includes all the mitigation measures that would be implemented in association with the long-term improvements of the Bicycle. These are discussed in greater detail below (M-TR-LT1.1, M-TR-LT1.2, M-TR-LT1.3, M-TR-LT1.4, M-TR-LT2.1, M-TR-LT2.2, M-TR-LT2.3, M-TR-LT2.4, M-TR-LT3.1, and M-TR-LT3.2). Mitigation Measures discussed and defined in Subsection V.A.5 of the Draft EIR shall be implemented in association with long-term improvements proposed and implemented under the Bicycle Plan.

Specific designs for the long-term improvements are unknown at this time. Once specific project designs for the long-term improvements are developed and analyzed for potential environmental impacts with respect to traffic, transit, parking, pedestrian, bicycles and loading, mitigation measures may be identified and implemented. Consequently, the impacts remain potentially significant and unavoidable at this time.

19. Predictable indirect Transportation Impacts in the project area from the collaboration between the SFMTA and other agencies to ensure that San Francisco continues to implement the Transit-First Policy (Impact TR-A1.4).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Action 1.4 of the Bicycle Plan is to work with other City agencies to ensure that San Francisco continues to implement the Transit First Policy. Predictable indirect impacts from the collaboration between the SFMTA and other agencies to ensure that San Francisco continues to implement the Transit-First Policy could include the construction of improvements or implementation of other changes to meet Transit-First Policy goals. The indirect impacts of Action 1.4 would, therefore, include potential impacts identified under the environmental review for all sections of the Bicycle Plan such as those discussed in the analysis of the potential impacts of the near-term improvements, long-term improvements, and minor improvements, as well as impacts that may result from future projects which would be similar to those discussed in this analysis. Physical improvements known at this time are analyzed in Subsections V.A.3, V.A.4, and V.A.5 of the Draft EIR. As discussed in Subsection V.A.4 of the Draft EIR, no significant impacts would result from implementation of the minor improvements. Mitigation measures have been identified in Subsections V.A.3 and V.A.5 of the Draft EIR that would address some of the significant impacts for near-term and long-term improvements. However, there are some impacts that would remain significant and unavoidable, and those are also discussed in the above referenced Subsections.

- b) Mitigation Measures that would be implemented for the San Francisco Bicycle Plan (M-TR-A1.4) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced but would remain at a significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure A1.4, which includes all the mitigation measures that would be implemented in association with the near-term, long-term, and minor improvements of the Bicycle Plan. These are discussed in greater detail below. The indirect impacts of Action 1.4 could result in the implementation of improvements to support the City's Transit First Policy. Therefore, it would include potential impacts identified under all sections of this environmental review for the Bicycle Plan such as those discussed in the transportation impact analysis

of the potential impacts of the near-term improvements, long-term improvements, and minor improvements as well as impacts that may result from future projects which would be similar to those discussed in this analysis. Physical improvements known at this time are analyzed in Subsections V.A.3, V.A.4, and V.A.5 of the Draft EIR. As discussed in Subsection V.A.4 of the Draft EIR, no significant impacts would result from implementation of the minor improvements. Mitigation measures have been identified in Subsections V.A.3 and V.A.5 of the Draft EIR that would address some of the significant impacts for near-term and long-term improvements. However, there are some impacts that would remain significant and unavoidable and those are also discussed in the above referenced sections.

General Plan Amendments, Environmental Review, and Citywide Coordination Goals, Objectives and Action Items

20. Impacts from the incorporation of the Bicycle Plan into the General Plan, and amendment of sections of the Area Plans relevant to bicycling (Impact TR-A7.1).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Action 7.1 of the Bicycle Plan is to acknowledge this Bicycle Plan in the General Plan and amend sections of the General Plan that are relevant to bicycling, including the Transportation Element and relevant Area Plans, according to the goals of this Bicycle Plan. Incorporation of the Bicycle Plan into the *General Plan*, and amendment of sections of the Area Plans relevant to bicycling would accomplish the goals otherwise described in this Bicycle Plan. An indirect result of this action would, therefore, support the construction of improvements or implementation of other changes presented as part of the Bicycle Plan and analyzed in Subsections V.A.3, V.A.4, and V.A.5 of the Draft EIR. Some of these improvements would have a significant impact on the physical environment. The indirect impacts of these actions would include the significant impacts identified for the near-term and long-term improvements in Subsections V.A.3 and V.A.5 of the Draft EIR, including potential worsening of traffic levels-of-service, potential slowing of transit movement in the City, and potential reduction of truck loading spaces. Some of these significant impacts have been determined to be significant and unavoidable.

b) Mitigation Measures that would be implemented for near-term and long-term improvements associated with the San Francisco Bicycle Plan (M-TR-A7.1) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced but would remain at a significant and unavoidable level even with implementation of

mitigation measure M-TR-A7.1 which includes all the mitigation measures that would be implemented in association with the near-term, long-term, and minor improvements of the Bicycle Plan. As described under the mitigation measures M-TR-A1.1 and M-TR-A1.2 above for potential significant impacts TR-A1.2 and TR-A 1.2 resulting from Actions A1.1 and A1.2, Mitigation Measures defined in Subsections V.A.3 and V.A.5 of the Draft EIR shall be implemented in association with improvements proposed and implemented under the Bicycle Plan for potential indirect impacts resulting from Action 7.1.

21. Impacts from the collaboration between the SFMTA and Planning Department to coordinate updates to the *General Plan* in accord with subsequent updates and amendments to the Bicycle Plan and bicycle route network (Impact TR-A7.3).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Action 7.3 of the Bicycle Plan is to work with the Planning Department to coordinate in making General Plan amendments as subsequent amendments and updates to the Bicycle Plan and bicycle route network occur. Collaboration between the SFMTA and Planning Department to coordinate updates to the *General Plan* in accord with subsequent updates and amendments to the Bicycle Plan and bicycle route network could accomplish the goals otherwise described in this Bicycle Plan. An indirect result of this action may be the construction of improvements or implementation of other changes similar to those presented as part of the Bicycle Plan and analyzed here with respect to potential impacts on traffic, transit, parking, pedestrians, bicycles, and loading in Subsection V.A.3, V.A.4, and V.A.5 of the Draft EIR. Future improvements resulting from Action 7.3 may result in significant impacts on the physical environment similar to those described in the Draft EIR with respect to traffic, transit, and loading for the near-term and long-term improvements in Subsections V.A.3 and V.A.5 of the Draft EIR, including potential worsening of traffic levels-of-service, potential slowing of transit movement in the City, and potential reduction of truck loading spaces. Some of these significant impacts have been determined to be significant and unavoidable. Therefore, there may be indirect significant impacts as a result of Action 7.3.

- b) Mitigation Measures that would be implemented for the San Francisco Bicycle Plan (M-TR-A7.3) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced but would remain at a significant and unavoidable level even with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-A7.3, which like includes all the mitigation measures that would be implemented in association with the near-term and long-term improvements of the Bicycle Plan. As described under the mitigation measure M-TR-A1.4 above for potential significant impact TR-A1.4 resulting from Action A1.4, Mitigation Measures

defined in Subsections V.A.3 and V.A.5 of the Draft EIR shall be implemented in association with improvements proposed and implemented under the Bicycle Plan for potential indirect impacts resulting from Action 7.3.

22. Impacts from the process to develop an Area Plan or update an existing Area Plan to reflect Bicycle Plan policies (Impact TR-A7.4).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Action 7.4 of the Bicycle Plan is ensure that all current and proposed Area Plans' objectives and policies on balance are consistent with the goals of the San Francisco Bicycle Plan. Whenever updates or revisions are considered to existing Area Plans, especially those that do not now contain sections on bicycling, these Area Plans should include sections on bicycling consistent with the goals of the Bicycle Plan. The process to develop an Area Plan or update an existing Area Plan to reflect Bicycle Plan policies as appropriate may indirectly result in the construction of bicycle facility improvements or implementation of other changes within an Area. These improvements could result in impacts similar to those summarized in Subsection V.A.3, V.A.4, and V.A.5 of the Draft EIR with respect to potential impacts on traffic, transit, parking, pedestrians, bicycles, and loading. Some of these improvements may have a significant impact on the physical environment. The indirect impacts of these actions would include environmental impacts similar to the identified significant impacts that may result from implementation of the near-term and long-term improvements in Subsections V.A.3, and V.A.5 of the Draft EIR, including potential worsening of traffic levels-of-service, potential slowing of transit movement in the City, and potential reduction of truck loading spaces. Mitigation measures have been identified to address some of these significant impacts. However, there are some for which no feasible mitigation measures have been identified. Therefore, there may be indirect and unavoidable significant impacts as a result of Action 7.4.

b) Mitigation Measures that would be implemented for the San Francisco Bicycle Plan (M-TR-A7.4) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced but would remain at a significant and unavoidable level even with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-A7.4, which includes all the mitigation measures that would be implemented in association with the near-term and long-term improvements of the Bicycle Plan. As described under the mitigation measure M-TR-A1.4 for potential indirect impact TR-A1.4 resulting from Action A1.4, Mitigation Measures defined in Subsections V.A.3 and V.A.5 of the Draft EIR shall be implemented in association with improvements proposed and implemented under the Bicycle Plan to address potential indirect impacts

resulting from Action 7.4, which is to develop an Area Plan or update existing Area Plan to reflect Bicycle plan policies.

Bicycle Funding Goals and Objectives

23. Impacts from the collaboration between the SFMTA and other agencies to identify funding to assist in achieving the Bicycle Plan goals and objectives (Impact TR-A8.1).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Action 8.1 of the Bicycle Plan is to work with appropriate agencies to identify funding to assist in achieving the goals and objectives set forth in this Bicycle Plan. Collaboration between the SFMTA and other agencies to identify funding to assist in achieving the Bicycle Plan goals and objectives would involve the exchange of information which would have no direct impact on the physical environment. However, success in identifying funding sources would result in implementation of projects to support the Bicycle Plan goals and objectives. This action would, therefore, support the construction of improvements or implementation of other changes presented as part of the Bicycle Plan and analyzed in Subsections V.A.3, V.A.4, and V.A.5 of the Draft EIR; some of these improvements would have a significant impact on the physical environment as identified in the analysis, including potential worsening of traffic levels-of-service, potential slowing of transit movement in the City, and potential reduction of truck loading spaces.

b) Mitigation Measures that would be implemented in association with the near-term and long-term improvements of the San Francisco Bicycle Plan (M-TR-A8.1) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced but would remain at a significant and unavoidable level even with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-A8.1. As with M-TR-A1.1 and M-TR-A1.2 discussed above, Mitigation Measure M-TR-A8.1 includes all the near-term and long-term mitigation measures that would be implemented in association with the Bicycle Plan. These mitigation measures will address the potential indirect impacts resulting from Action 8.1.

Project Level

24. Transportation Impact to loading along North Point Street east of Columbus Avenue from Project 1-3 under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P1-3b).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Due to double-parked vehicles and the removal of general travel lanes, a significant loading impact may occur along North Point Street east of Columbus Avenue as a result of Project 1-3 under Existing plus Project conditions, .

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to loading along North Point Street east of Columbus Avenue from Project 1-3 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P1-3b) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified to mitigate this loading impact. Therefore, a significant and unavoidable loading impact may occur along North Point Street east of Columbus Avenue with implementation of Project 1-3 under Existing plus Project conditions.

- 25. Transportation Impact to loading along North Point Street east of Columbus Avenue from Project 1-3 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P1-3c).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Due to double-parked vehicles and the removal of general travel lanes, a significant loading impact may occur along North Point Street east of Columbus Avenue as a result of Project 1-3 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to loading along North Point Street east of Columbus Avenue from Project 1-3 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P1-3c) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified to mitigate this loading impact. Therefore, a significant and unavoidable loading impact may occur along North Point Street east of Columbus Avenue with implementation of Project 1-3 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions.

- 26. Transportation Impact to the intersection of 2nd Street and Bryant Street from Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-1a).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

The intersection of 2nd Street/Bryant Street would operate at LOS E under Existing plus Project conditions for Project 2-1 Modified Option 1.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of 2nd Street and Bryant Street from Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-1a) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for the 2nd Street/Bryant Street intersection under Existing plus Project conditions for Option 1. Hence, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur at this intersection with the implementation of Project 2-1 Modified Option 1.

27. Transportation Impact to the intersection of 2nd Street and Bryant Street from Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-1b).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

The intersection of 2nd Street/Bryant Street would operate at LOS F under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Project 2-1 Modified Option 1.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of 2nd Street and Bryant Street from Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-1b) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for the 2nd Street/Bryant Street intersection under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Option 1. Hence, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur.

28. Transportation Impact to the intersection of 2nd Street and Harrison Street from Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-1c).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

The intersection of 2nd Street/Harrison Street would operate at LOS E under Existing plus Project conditions for Project 2-1 Modified Option 1.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of 2nd Street and Harrison Street from Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-1c) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced but would remain at a significant and unavoidable level even with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P2-1c. It is proposed that five seconds of green time be added to the northbound 2nd Street approach and five seconds of green time be reduced from the eastbound Harrison Street approach. This would improve the intersection operations from LOS F to LOS E. It has been ensured that the minimum green times required for pedestrians to cross the 2nd Street/Harrison Street intersection have been maintained even after the green time adjustments to the signal. Nevertheless, this mitigation measure would not reduce the project impacts to a less-than-significant level for Project 2-1 Modified Option 1.

29. Transportation Impact to the intersection of 2nd Street and Harrison Street from Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-1e).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

The intersection of 2nd Street/Harrison Street would operate at LOS F under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Project 2-1 Modified Option 1.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of 2nd Street and Harrison Street from Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-1e) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced but would remain at a significant and unavoidable level even with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P2-1e. It is proposed that five seconds of green time be added to the northbound 2nd Street approach and five seconds of green time be reduced from the eastbound Harrison Street approach, thus improving the 2nd Street/Harrison Street intersection operations and reducing average delay by 50.2 seconds. Nevertheless, this mitigation measure would not reduce the project impacts to a less-than-significant level for Project 2-1 Modified Option 1.

30. Transportation Impact to the intersection of 2nd Street and Folsom Street from Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-1i).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

The intersection of 2nd Street/Folsom Street would operate at LOS F under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Project 2-1 Modified Option 1.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of 2nd Street and Folsom Street from Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-1i) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced but would remain at a significant and unavoidable level even with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P2-1i. It is proposed that the southbound 2nd Street approach be modified from a protected phase to a permitted phase with no changes to green time allocation. This would improve the 2nd Street/Folsom Street intersection operations and reduce the average delay. Nevertheless, this mitigation measure would not reduce the project impacts to a less-than-significant level for Project 2-1 Modified Option 1.

31. Transportation Impact to the intersection of 2nd Street and Howard Street from Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-1k).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

The intersection of 2nd Street/Howard Street would operate at LOS F under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Project 2-1 Modified Option 1.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of 2nd Street and Howard Street from Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-1k) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for the 2nd Street/Howard Street intersection under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions. Hence, a significant and unavoidable traffic impact would occur at the 2nd Street/Howard Street intersection with the implementation of Project 2-1 Modified Option 1.

32. Transportation Impact to Muni bus line 10 from combined Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 and Project 2-16 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-1q).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Muni bus line 10 would experience significant delays as a result of combined Projects 2-1 and 2-16 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to Muni bus line 10 from Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 and Project 2-16 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-1q) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced but would remain at a significant and unavoidable level even with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P2-1q. The implementation of combined Projects 2-1 and 2-16 Modified Option 1, under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions, would add approximately 672 seconds (11.2 minutes) of delay for Muni bus line 10. With mitigation as described for the 2nd Street/Harrison Street, and 2nd Street/Folsom Street intersections, (M-TR-P2-1c, M-TR-P2-1e, M-TR-P2-1f, M-TR-P2-1g, M-TR-P2-1h, M-TR-P2-1i; and M-TR-P2-1j) delay would be reduced by approximately 169 seconds (2.8 minutes) southbound with approximately 625 seconds (10.4 minutes) of delay added northbound to Muni bus line 10. The total added delay of 495 seconds (7.6 minutes) would be greater than the transit delay threshold of six minutes. Therefore, a significant

transit impact to Muni bus line 10 would occur resulting from combined Projects 2-1 and 2-16 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions.

33. Transportation Impact to the intersection of 5th Street and Bryant Street from Project 2-2 Modified Option 2 under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-2b).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Project 2-2 would construct bicycle lanes on 5th Street between Market Street and Townsend Street. The intersection of 5th Street/Bryant Street would operate at LOS F under Existing plus Project conditions for Option 2 of Project 2-2.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of 5th Street and Bryant Street from Project 2-2 Modified Option 2 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-2b) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for the 5th Street/Bryant Street intersection under Existing plus Project conditions for Option 2. Hence, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur at the 5th Street/Bryant Street intersection with the implementation of Project 2-2 Modified Option 2.

34. Transportation Impact to the intersection of 5th Street and Bryant Street from Project 2-2 Modified Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-2d).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

The intersection of 5th Street/Bryant Street would operate at LOS F under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Project 2-2 Modified Option 2.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of 5th Street and Bryant Street from Project 2-2 Modified Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-2d) and Conclusion

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for the 5th Street/Bryant Street intersection under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Option 2. Hence, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur at the 5th Street/Bryant Street intersection with the implementation of Project 2-2. Option 2

35. Transportation Impact to the intersection of 5th Street and Howard Street from Project 2-2 Modified Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-2e).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

The intersection of 5th Street/Howard Street would operate at LOS F under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Project 2-2 Modified Option 2.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of 5th Street and Howard Street from Project 2-2 Modified Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-2e) and Conclusion

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for the 5th Street/Howard Street intersection under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Option 2. Hence, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur at the 5th Street/Howard Street intersection with the implementation of Project 2-2.

36. Transportation Impact to the intersection of 5th Street and Brannan Street for Project 2-2 Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-2f).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

The intersection of 5th Street and Brannan Street would operate at LOS F under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Project 2-2 Modified Option 2.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of 5th Street and Brannan Street from Project 2-2 Modified Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-2f) and Conclusion

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for the 5th Street and Brannan Street intersection from Project 2-2 Modified Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions. Hence, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur at this intersection with the implementation of Modified Project 2-2 Option 2..

37. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Church Street, Market Street and 14th Street from combined Project 2-3 Option 1 and Project 2-11 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-3b).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Project 2-3 would construct bicycle lanes on 14th Street between Dolores Street and Market Street. Project 2-11 would construct bicycle lanes on Market Street between 17th Street and Octavia Boulevard. Implementation of Projects 2-3 and 2-11 combined under

2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions would result in the intersection of Church Street/Market Street/14th Street operating at LOS F.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Church Street, Market Street and 14th Street from combined Project 2-3 Option 1 and Project 2-11 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-3b) and Conclusion

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for the Church Street/Market Street/14th Street intersection under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Option 1. Hence, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur at this intersection with the implementation of Option 1 of combined Project 2-3 and 2-11.

- 38. Transportation Impact to the intersection of 10th Street, Brannan Street, Potrero Avenue, and Division Street from combined Project 2-4 and Project 2-6 Modified Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-4a).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Combined Project 2-4 Modified Option 1 and Project 2-6 Modified Option 2 would construct bicycle lanes on Sanchez Street from 17th Street to 16th Street, on 17th Street between Church Street and Potrero Avenue, on Potrero Avenue between 17th Street and Division Street, on Kansas Street between 16th Street and 17th Street, and on Division Street between 9th Street and 11th Street. Implementation of combined Project 2-4 Modified Option 1 and Project 2-6 Modified Option 2 under Existing plus Project conditions would result in the intersection of 10th Street, Brannan Street, Potrero Avenue, and Division Street would operate at LOS E.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of 10th Street, Brannan Street, Potrero Avenue, and Division Street from combined Project 2-4 Modified Option 1 and Project 2-6 Modified Option 2 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-4a) and Conclusion

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for the 10th Street/ Brannan Street/Potrero Avenue/Division Street intersection under Existing plus Project conditions. Hence, a significant impact would occur at the 10th Street/ Brannan Street/Potrero Avenue/ Division Street intersection with the implementation of combined Project 2-4 Modified Option 1 and Project 2-6 Modified Option 2.

39. Transportation Impact to the intersection of 10th Street, Brannan Street, Potrero Avenue, and Division Street from combined Project 2-4 and Project 2-6 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-4b).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Combined Project 2-4 Modified Option 1 and Project 2-6 Modified Option 2 would construct bicycle lanes on Sanchez Street from 17th Street to 16th Street, on 17th Street between Church Street and Potrero Avenue, on Potrero Avenue between 17th Street and Division Street, on Kansas Street between 16th Street and 17th Street, and on Division Street between 9th Street and 11th Street. Implementation of combined Project 2-4 Modified Option 1 and Project 2-6 Modified Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions would result in the intersection of 10th Street, Brannan Street, Potrero Avenue, and Division Street would operate at LOS F.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of 10th Street, Brannan Street, Potrero Avenue, and Division Street from combined Project 2-4 Modified Option 1 and Project 2-6 Modified Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-4b) and Conclusion

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for the 10th Street/ Brannan Street/Potrero Avenue/Division Street intersection under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions. Hence, a significant impact would occur at the 10th Street/ Brannan Street/Potrero Avenue/ Division Street intersection with the implementation of combined Project 2-4 Modified Option 1 and Project 2-6 Modified Option 2.

40. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Potrero Avenue and 16th Street from Project 2-4 Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-4d).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Project 2-4 would construct bicycle lanes on 17th Street between Corbett Avenue and Kansas Street, including connections to the 16th Street BART Station via Hoff Street or Valencia Street and 17th Street to Division Street via Potrero Avenue. Under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Project 2-4 Option 2, the Potrero Avenue/16th Street intersection would operate at LOS F, and a significant impact would occur at this intersection with the implementation of Project 2-4 Option 2.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Potrero Avenue and 16th Street from Project 2-4 Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-4d) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for the Potrero Avenue/16th Street intersection under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Option 2. Hence, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur at the Potrero Avenue/16th Street intersection with the implementation of Project 2-4 Option 2.

41. Transportation Impact to Muni bus line 9 from Project 2-4 Option 2 and Project 2-6 Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-4e).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Project 2-4 would construct bicycle lanes on 17th Street between Corbett Avenue and Kansas Street, including connections to the 16th Street BART Station via Hoff Street or Valencia Street and 17th Street to Division Street via Potrero Avenue. Project 2-6 would construct bicycles lanes on Division Street between 9th Street to 11th Street. Muni bus line 9 would experience significant delays under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for combined Projects 2-4 and 2-6 Option 2.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to Muni bus line 9 from Project 2-4 Option 2 and Project 2-6 Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-3e) and Conclusion

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for delay on Muni bus line 9 for combined Projects 2-4 and 2-6 Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions. Hence, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur for Muni bus line 9 with implementation of combined Projects 2-4 and 2-6 Option 2.

42. Transportation Impact to SamTrans bus line 292 from Project 2-4 Option 2 and Project 2-6 Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-4f).-Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to SamTrans bus line 292 from Project 2-4 Option 2 and Project 2-6 Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-3d) and Conclusion

SamTrans bus line 292 would experience significant delays under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for combined Projects 2-4 and 2-6 Option 2.

- a) Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-4f and Conclusion

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for delay on SamTrans bus line 292 for combined Projects 2-4 and 2-6 Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project

conditions. Hence, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur for SamTrans bus line 292 with implementation of Projects 2-4 and 2-6 combined with Option 2.

43. Transportation Impact to Muni bus line 9 from Project 2-4 Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-4g).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Muni bus line 9 would experience significant delays under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for individual Project 2-4 Option 2.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to Muni bus line 9 from Project 2-4 Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-4g) and Conclusion

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for delay on Muni bus line 9 for individual Project 2-4 Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions. Hence, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur for Muni bus line 9 with implementation of Project 2-4 Option 2.

44. Transportation Impact to SamTrans bus line 292 from Project 2-4 Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-4h).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

SamTrans bus line 292 would experience significant delays under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for individual Project 2-4 Option 2.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to SamTrans bus line 292 from Project 2-4 Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-4h) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for delay on SamTrans bus line 292 for Project 2-4 Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions. Hence, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur for SamTrans bus line 292 with implementation of individual Project 2-4 Option 2.

45. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Fremont Street and Howard Street from combined Project 2-7 and Project 2-9 under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-7a).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Project 2-7 would construct bicycle lanes on Fremont Street between Harrison Street and Howard Street. Project 2-9 would construct bicycles lanes on Howard Street between The Embarcadero and Fremont Street. The intersection of Fremont Street/Howard Street would operate at LOS E under Existing plus Project conditions for combined Projects 2-7 and 2-9.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Fremont Street and Howard Street from combined Project 2-7 and Project 2-9 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-7a) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced but would remain at a significant and unavoidable level even with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P2-7a. The cycle length at the Fremont Street/Howard Street intersection shall be increased by 35 seconds, so that the intersection will operate at LOS D with 54.9 seconds of delay. However, 54.9 seconds of delay is close to the threshold of 55 seconds of delay which is deemed unsatisfactory operation. Therefore, this mitigation measure would not reduce the project impacts of combined Projects 2-7 and 2-9 to a less-than-significant level for Existing plus Project conditions.

46. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Fremont Street and Howard Street from combined Project 2-7 and Project 2-9 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-7b).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

The intersection of Fremont Street/Howard Street would operate at LOS F under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for combined Projects 2-7 and 2-9.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Fremont Street and Howard Street from combined Project 2-7 and Project 2-9 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-7b) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced but would remain at a significant level even with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P2-7b. The Fremont Street/Howard Street intersection operates at LOS D with 54.9 seconds of delay under Existing plus Project conditions relative to Existing conditions,

with mitigation shown in Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-7a. This is determined to be a significant impact since it is close to the threshold of 55 seconds of delay which is deemed unsatisfactory operation. As a consequence, a corresponding LOS deterioration is expected at this intersection for 2025 Cumulative plus Project compared to 2025 Cumulative conditions. Therefore, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur at the Fremont Street/Howard Street intersection.

47. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Fremont Street and Howard Street from Project 2-9 under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-9a).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Project 2-9 would construct bicycles lanes on Howard Street between The Embarcadero and Fremont Street. The Fremont Street/Howard Street intersection would operate unsatisfactorily at LOS E under Existing plus Project conditions for Project 2-9.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Fremont Street and Howard Street from Project 2-9 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-9a) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced but would remain at a significant level even with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P2-9a. It is proposed that the cycle length at the Fremont Street/Howard Street intersection be increased by 35 seconds. With this improvement, the intersection will operate at LOS D with 54.9 seconds of delay. However, 54.9 seconds of delay is close to the threshold of 55 seconds of delay which is deemed unsatisfactory operation. Therefore, this mitigation measure would not reduce the project impacts of Project 2-9 to a less-than-significant level for Existing plus Project conditions and the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

48. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Fremont Street and Howard Street from Project 2-9 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-9b).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

The intersection of Fremont Street/Howard Street would operate at LOS F under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Project 2-9.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Fremont Street and Howard Street from Project 2-9 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-9b) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced but would remain at a significant level with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P2-9b. It is proposed that lane configuration adjustments be made to the westbound Howard Street direction to improve LOS and reduce the delay at the Fremont Street/Howard Street intersection. The westbound Howard Street approach shall be modified from one through lane and one shared through-right turn lane, into two through lanes and one exclusive right-turn lane. The LOS will remain at level F. Therefore, this mitigation measure would not reduce the project impacts of Project 2-9 to a less-than-significant level for 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions and the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

49. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Church Street, Market Street, and 14th Street from Project 2-11 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-11b).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Project 2-11 would construct bicycle lanes on Market Street between 17th Street and Octavia Boulevard. The intersection of Church Street/Market Street/14th Street would operate at LOS F under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Project 2-11 Option 1 for the PM peak hour.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Church Street, Market Street, and 14th Street from Project 2-11 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-11b) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for the Church Street/Market Street/14th Street intersection under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Option 1. Hence, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur at the Church Street/Market Street/14th Street intersection with the implementation of Project 2-11 Option 1.

50. Transportation Impact to loading on the north side of Market Street near Noe Street from Project 2-11 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-11c).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

A significant impact to loading would result on the north side of Market Street near Noe Street from implementation of Project 2-11 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to loading on the north side of Market Street near Noe Street under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-11c) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified. Therefore, a significant and unavoidable loading impact would occur on Market Street near Noe Street with implementation of Project 2-11 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions.

- 51. Transportation Impact to loading on the north side of Market Street near Noe Street from Project 2-11 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-11d).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

A significant impact to loading would result on the north side of Market Street near Noe Street from implementation of Project 2-11 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to loading on the north side of Market Street near Noe Street from Project 2-11 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-11d) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified. Therefore, a significant and unavoidable loading impact would occur on Market Street near Noe Street with implementation of Project 2-11 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions.

- 52. Transportation Impact to the intersection of 2nd Street and Townsend from Project 2-16 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-16a).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Project 2-16 would construct bicycle lanes on Townsend Street between 8th Street and The Embarcadero. The 2nd Street/Townsend Street intersection would operate unsatisfactorily at LOS E under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions and a significant impact would occur at this intersection with the implementation of Project 2-16 Modified Option 1.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of 2nd Street and Townsend from Project 2-16 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-16a) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for the 2nd Street/Townsend Street intersection under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Option 1. Hence, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur at the 2nd Street/Townsend Street intersection with the implementation of Project 2-16 Modified Option 1.

53. Transportation Impact to the intersection of 7th Street and Townsend from Project 2-16 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-16e)

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions the 7th Street/Townsend Street intersection would operate at LOS F and, a significant impact would occur at this intersection with the implementation of Project 2-16 Modified Option 1.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of 7th Street and Townsend from Project 2-16 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-16e) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced but would remain at a significant and unavoidable level even with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P2-16e. It is proposed that lane configuration adjustments be made to the eastbound Townsend Street direction to improve LOS and decrease the amount of average delay. However, the LOS would remain at LOS F. Therefore, a significant impact would occur at the 7th Street/Townsend Street intersection with the implementation of Project 2-16 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions.

54. Transportation Impact to Muni bus line 30 from Project 2-16 Modified Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-16h).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

A significant transit impact would occur to Muni bus line 30 under Existing plus Project conditions for Project 2-16 Modified Option 1.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to Muni bus line 30 from Project 2-16 Modified Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-16h) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced but would remain at a significant and unavoidable level even with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P2-16h. Feasibility of the following mitigation measures has not yet been determined. There is a range of potential treatments to address the issue at this intersection. One would be repositioning of the bus zone along the south side of Townsend Street. Another treatment would be reconfiguring the approach lanes to the intersection of 4th and Townsend Streets. Finally, installation of discontinuous bicycle lanes at the approach of the 4th Street/Townsend Street intersection could also be

considered. Therefore, a significant transit impact would occur with implementation of Project 2-16 Modified Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions.

55. Transportation Impact to Muni bus line 45 from Project 2-16 Modified Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-16i).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

A significant transit impact would occur to Muni bus line 45 under Existing plus Project conditions for Project 2-16 Modified Option 1.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to Muni bus line 45 from Project 2-16 Modified Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-16i) and Conclusion.

Refer to Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-16h above for mitigation of this transit impact. However, without determination of the feasibility of these measures, a significant and unavoidable transit impact would occur to Muni bus line 45 under Existing plus Project conditions for Project 2-16 Modified Option 1.

56. Transportation Impact to Muni bus line 30 from Project 2-16 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-16l).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

A significant transit impact would occur to Muni bus line 30 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Project 2-16 Modified Option 1.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to Muni bus line 30 from Project 2-16 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-16l) and Conclusion.

Refer to Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-16h above for mitigation of this transit impact. However, without determination of the feasibility of these measures, a significant and unavoidable transit impact would occur to Muni bus line 30 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Project 2-16 Modified Option 1.

57. Transportation Impact to Muni bus line 45 from Project 2-16 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P2-16m).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

A significant transit impact would occur to Muni bus line 45 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Project 2-16 Modified Option 1.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to Muni bus line 45 from Project 2-16 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-16m) and Conclusion.

Refer to Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-16h above for mitigation of this transit impact. However, without determination of the feasibility of these measures, a significant and unavoidable transit impact would occur to Muni bus line 45 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Project 2-16 Modified Option 1.

- 58. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Masonic Avenue and Fell Street from combined Project 3-1 and Project 3-2 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P3-1b).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

The intersection of Masonic Avenue/Fell Street would operate at LOS E under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for combined Projects 3-1 and 3-2 Option 1.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Masonic Avenue and Fell Street from combined Project 3-1 and Project 3-2 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P3-1b) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for the Masonic Avenue/Fell Street intersection under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Option 1. Hence, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur at the Masonic Avenue/Fell Street intersection with the implementation of combined Projects 3-1 and 3-2 Option 1.

- 59. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Masonic Avenue and Turk Street from Project 3-2 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P3-2a).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions the Masonic Avenue/Turk Street intersection would operate at LOS F in the AM Peak hour and a significant impact would occur at the Masonic Avenue/Turk Street intersection with the implementation of Project 3-2 Option 1.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Masonic Avenue and Turk Street from Project 3-2 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P3-2a) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for the Masonic Avenue/Turk Street intersection under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Project 3-2

Option 1. Hence, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur at the Masonic Avenue/Turk Street intersection in the AM Peak hour with the implementation of Project 3-2 Option 1.

60. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Masonic Avenue and Turk Street from Project 3-2 Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P3-2b).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions the Masonic Avenue/Turk Street intersection would operate at LOS F in the AM Peak hour and a significant impact would occur at this intersection with the implementation of Project 3-2 Option 2.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Masonic Avenue and Turk Street from Project 3-2 Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P3-2b) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for the Masonic Avenue/Turk Street intersection under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions in the AM peak hour for Project 3-2 Option 2. Hence, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur at the Masonic Avenue/Turk Street intersection with the implementation of Project 3-2 Option 2.

61. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Masonic Avenue and Fulton Street from Project 3-2 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P3-2c).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for the AM peak hour the Masonic Avenue/Fulton Street intersection would operate at LOS F and a significant impact would occur at the Masonic Avenue/Fulton Street intersection with the implementation of Project 3-2 Option 1.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Masonic Avenue and Fulton Street from Project 3-2 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P3-2c) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for the Masonic Avenue/Fulton Street intersection under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for the AM Peak hour. Hence, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur at the Masonic Avenue/Fulton Street intersection with the implementation of Project 3-2 Option 1.

62. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Masonic Avenue and Fulton Street from Project 3-2 Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P3-2d).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Option 2, the Masonic Avenue/Fulton Street intersection would operate at LOS F in the AM Peak hour and a significant impact would occur at the Masonic Avenue/Fulton Street intersection with the implementation of Project 3-2 Option 2.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Masonic Avenue and Fulton Street from Project 3-2 Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P3-2d) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for the Masonic Avenue/Fulton Street intersection under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions the AM Peak hour. Hence, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur at the Masonic Avenue/Fulton Street intersection with the implementation of Project 3-2 Option 2.

63. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Masonic Avenue and Fell Street from Project 3-2 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P3-2e).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Under Existing plus Project conditions the Masonic Avenue/Fell Street intersection would operate at LOS E and a significant impact would occur at the Masonic Avenue/Fell Street intersection with the implementation of Project 3-2 Option 1.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Masonic Avenue and Fell Street from Project 3-2 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P3-2e) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for the Masonic Avenue/Fell Street intersection under Existing plus Project conditions for Option 1. Hence, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur at the Masonic Avenue/Fell Street intersection with the implementation of Project 3-2 Option 1.

64. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Masonic Avenue and Fell Street from Project 3-2 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P3-2g).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions the Masonic Avenue/Fell Street intersection would operate at LOS F and a significant impact would occur at the Masonic Avenue/Fell Street intersection with the implementation of Project 3-2 Option 1.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Masonic Avenue and Fell Street from Project 3-2 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P3-2g) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for the Masonic Avenue/Fell Street intersection under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Option 1. Hence, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur at the Masonic Avenue/Fell Street intersection with the implementation of Project 3-2 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions.

65. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Masonic Avenue and Fell Street from Project 3-2 Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P3-2h).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions the Masonic Avenue/Fell Street intersection would operate at LOS E and a significant impact would occur at the Masonic Avenue/Fell Street intersection with the implementation of Project 3-2 Option 2.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Masonic Avenue and Fell Street from Project 3-2 Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P3-2h) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for the Masonic Avenue/Fell Street intersection under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Option 2. Hence, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur at the Masonic Avenue/Fell Street intersection with the implementation of Project 3-2 Option 2.

66. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Masonic Avenue and Geary Boulevard from Project 3-2 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P3-2i).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions the Masonic Avenue/Geary Boulevard intersection would operate at LOS E and a significant impact would occur at the Masonic Avenue/Geary Boulevard intersection with the implementation of Project 3-2 Option 1.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Masonic Avenue and Geary Boulevard from Project 3-2 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P3-2i) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions. Hence, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur at the Masonic Avenue/Geary Boulevard intersection with the implementation of Project 3-2 Option 1.

67. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Masonic Avenue and Turk Street from Project 3-2 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P3-2j).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions the Masonic Avenue/Turk Street intersection would operate at LOS F and a significant impact would occur at the Masonic Avenue/Turk Street intersection with the implementation of Project 3-2 Option 1.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Masonic Avenue and Turk Street from Project 3-2 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P3-2j) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced but would remain at a significant and unavoidable level even with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P3-2j. It is proposed that ten seconds of green time be added to the northbound Masonic Avenue direction, with a corresponding reduction of green time in the eastbound Turk Street direction of ten seconds, to improve intersection operations to LOS E. However, the Masonic Avenue/Turk Street intersection would continue to operate at an unacceptable LOS; therefore, the traffic impact would remain significant even after this mitigation measure is implemented for Project 3-2 Option 1.

68. Transportation Impact to Muni bus line 43 from combined Project 3-1 and Project 3-2 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P3-2k).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Under Existing plus Project conditions combined Projects 3-1 and 3-2 Option 1 would result in a significant transit impact for Muni bus line 43 in the PM peak hour.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to Muni bus line 43 from combined Project 3-1 and Project 3-2 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P3-2k) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified to reduce the delay on Muni bus line 43 under Existing plus Project conditions for Option 1. Therefore, a significant and unavoidable transit impact would occur to Muni bus line 43 as a result of combined Projects 3-1 and 3-2 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions in the PM peak hour.

69. Transportation Impact to Muni bus line 43 from combined Project 3-1 and Project 3-2 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P3-2l).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions, combined Projects 3-1 and 3-2 Option 1 would result in a significant transit impact for Muni bus line 43 in the PM peak hour.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to Muni bus line 43 from combined Project 3-1 and Project 3-2 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P3-2l) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified and a significant and unavoidable transit impact would occur to Muni bus line 43 as a result of combined Projects 3-1 and 3-2 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions in the PM peak hour.

70. Transportation Impact to the Muni bus line 43 from Project 3-2 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P3-2m).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Under Existing plus Project conditions individual Project 3-2 Option 1 would result in a significant transit impact for Muni bus line 43 in the PM peak hour.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to Muni bus line 43 from Project 3-2 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P3-2m) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions in the PM peak hour. Therefore, a significant and unavoidable transit impact would occur to Muni bus line 43 as a result of individual Project 3-2 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions in the PM peak hour.

- 71. Transportation Impact to the Muni bus line 43 from Project 3-2 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P3-2n).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions, individual Project 3-2 Option 1 would result in a significant impact to transit for Muni bus line 43 in the PM peak hour.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to Muni bus line 43 from Project 3-2 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P3-2n) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified and a significant and unavoidable transit impact would occur to Muni bus line 43 as a result of individual Project 3-2 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions in the PM peak hour.

- 72. Loading impact on Bayshore Boulevard between Cesar Chavez and Industrial Streets as a result of Project 5-4 Modified Option 2 under Existing plus Project conditions. (Impact TR-P5-4h).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Project 5-4 Modified Option 2 would construct bicycle lanes and sharrows on Bayshore Boulevard between Cesar Chavez Street and Silver Avenue except between Oakdale and Jerrold Avenues, where the existing southbound Class III bicycle route would remain on Jerrold Avenue, Barneveld Avenue, and Loomis Street and the existing northbound Class III bicycle route would be relocated from Bayshore Boulevard to Oakdale Avenue, Loomis Street, Barneveld Avenue and Jerrold Avenue.

Under Existing plus Project conditions Bayshore Boulevard would experience a significant loading impact, and therefore, a significant impact would occur at this intersection with the implementation of Project 5-4 Modified Option 2.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the loading impact on Bayshore Boulevard between Cesar Chavez and Industrial Streets as a result of Project 5-4 Modified Option 2 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-4h) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified. Therefore, a significant loading impact would occur on Bayshore Boulevard between Cesar Chavez and Industrial Streets with implementation of Project 5-4 Modified Option 2 under Existing plus Project conditions.

- 73. Loading impact on Bayshore Boulevard between Cesar Chavez and Industrial Streets as a result of Project 5-4 Modified Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions. (Impact TR-P5-4i).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Project 5-4 Modified Option 2 would construct bicycle lanes and sharrows on Bayshore Boulevard between Cesar Chavez Street and Silver Avenue, except between Oakdale and Jerrold Avenues, where the existing southbound Class III bicycle route would remain on Jerrold Avenue, Barneveld Avenue, and Loomis Street and the existing northbound Class III bicycle route would be relocated from Bayshore Boulevard to Oakdale Avenue, Loomis Street, Barneveld Avenue and Jerrold Avenue. Under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions Bayshore Boulevard would experience a significant loading impact, and therefore, a significant impact would occur at this intersection with the implementation of Project 5-4 Modified Option 2.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the loading impact on Bayshore Boulevard between Cesar Chavez and Industrial Streets as a result of Project 5-4 Modified Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-4i) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified. Therefore, a significant loading impact would occur on Bayshore Boulevard between Cesar Chavez and Industrial Streets with implementation of Project 5-4 Modified Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions.

- 74. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Evans Avenue and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-5 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P5-5a).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Project 5-5 would construct bicycle lanes on Cesar Chavez Street between I-280 and US 101 Freeways. Under Existing plus Project conditions the Evans Avenue/Cesar Chavez

Street intersection would operate at LOS F, and therefore, a significant impact would occur at this intersection with the implementation of Project 5-5 Option 1

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Evans Avenue and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-5 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-5a) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for the Evans Avenue/Cesar Chavez Street intersection under Existing plus Project conditions for Option 1. Hence, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur at the Evans Avenue/Cesar Chavez Street intersection with the implementation of Project 5-5 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions.

- 75. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Evans Avenue and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-5 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P5-5b).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions the Evans Avenue/Cesar Chavez Street intersection would operate at LOS F, and therefore, a significant impact would occur at this intersection with the implementation of Project 5-5 Option 1.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Evans Avenue and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-5 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-5b) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for the Evans Avenue/Cesar Chavez Street intersection under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Option 1. Hence, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur at the Evans Avenue/Cesar Chavez Street intersection with the implementation of Project 5-5 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions.

- 76. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Mission Street and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P5-6a).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Project 5-6 would construct bicycle lanes on Cesar Chavez/26th Street between Sanchez Street and US 101. Under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions the Mission Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection would operate at LOS F in the AM Peak hour, and therefore, a significant impact would occur at the Mission Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6 Option 1.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Mission Street and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6a) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced but would remain at a significant and unavoidable level even with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P5-6a. Lane configuration adjustments to the eastbound and westbound directions on Cesar Chavez Street would improve LOS and reduce the delay at the Mission Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection from LOS F to LOS E. The removal of on-street parking along Cesar Chavez Street (applying either Option 1 or 2 of proposed possible Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6w in conjunction with proposed possible Mitigation Measures M-TR-P5-6e, M-TR-P5-6h, M-TR-P 5-6j, M-TR-P 5-6k, M-TR-P 5-6l, M-TR-P 5-6m, M-TR-P 5-6o, and M-TR-P 5-6q for which feasibility has not yet been determined) is proposed which would provide an additional through lane along the eastbound and westbound Cesar Chavez Street approaches. However, because of the uncertainty regarding the feasibility of this mitigation measure, a significant impact may occur at the Mission Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection in the AM Peak hour with the implementation of Project 5-6 Option 1.

77. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Mission Street and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P5-6b).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

The Mission Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection would operate unsatisfactorily at LOS E in the AM Peak hour under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Project 5-6 Option 2. Therefore, a significant impact would occur at the Mission Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection with implementation of Project 5-6 Option 2.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Mission Street and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6b) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced but would remain at a significant and unavoidable level even with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P5-6b. Lane configuration adjustments to the eastbound and westbound directions on Cesar Chavez Street would improve LOS and reduce the delay at this intersection. The removal of on-street parking along Cesar Chavez Street (applying either Option 1 or 2 of proposed possible Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6w in conjunction with proposed possible Mitigation Measures M-TR-P5-6e, M-TR-P5-6h, M-TR-P 5-6j, M-TR-P 5-6k, M-TR-P 5-6l, M-TR-P 5-6m, M-TR-P 5-6o, and M-TR-P 5-6q for which

feasibility has not yet been determined) is proposed which would provide an additional through lane along the eastbound and westbound Cesar Chavez Street approaches. However, because of the uncertainty regarding the feasibility of this mitigation measure, a significant impact would occur at this intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6 Option 2.

78. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Guerrero Street and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P5-6c).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Under Existing plus Project conditions the Guerrero Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection would operate at LOS F in the AM Peak hour, and therefore, a significant impact may occur at the Guerrero Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6 Option 1.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Guerrero Street and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6c) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced but would remain at a significant and unavoidable level even with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P5-6c Lane configuration adjustments to the westbound direction on Cesar Chavez Street would improve LOS and reduce the delay for this intersection. The removal of on-street parking along Cesar Chavez Street (applying either Option 1 or 2 of proposed possible Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6w in conjunction with proposed possible Mitigation Measures M-TR-P5-6e, M-TR-P5-6h, M-TR-P 5-6j, M-TR-P 5-6k, M-TR-P 5-6l, M-TR-P 5-6m, M-TR-P 5-6o, and M-TR-P 5-6q for which feasibility has not yet been determined) is proposed which would provide an additional through lane along the westbound Cesar Chavez Street approach. However, because of the uncertainty regarding the feasibility of this mitigation measure, a significant impact may occur at the Guerrero Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6 Option 1.

79. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Guerrero Street and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 2 under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P5-6d).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Under Existing plus Project conditions the Guerrero Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection would operate at LOS F, and therefore, a significant impact would occur at

the Guerrero Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6 Option 2.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Guerrero Street and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 2 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6d) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for the Guerrero Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection under Existing plus Project conditions for Option 2. Hence, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur at the Guerrero Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6 Option 2.

- 80. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Guerrero Street and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P5-6e).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions the Guerrero Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection would operate at LOS F, and therefore, a significant impact would occur at the Guerrero Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6 Option 1.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Guerrero Street and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6e) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced but would remain at a significant and unavoidable level even with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P5-6e. Lane configuration adjustments to the westbound direction of Cesar Chavez Street would improve LOS and reduce the delay at the Guerrero Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection. The removal of on-street parking along Cesar Chavez Street (applying either Option 1 or 2 of proposed possible Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6w in conjunction with proposed possible Mitigation Measures M-TR-P5-6e, M-TR-P5-6h, M-TR-P 5-6j, M-TR-P 5-6k, M-TR-P 5-6l, M-TR-P 5-6m, M-TR-P 5-6o, and M-TR-P 5-6q for which feasibility has not yet been determined) is proposed which would provide an additional through lane along the westbound Cesar Chavez Street approach. Nevertheless, this mitigation measure would not reduce the project impacts to a less-than-significant level for Project 5-6 Option 1.

81. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Guerrero Street and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P5-6f).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions the Guerrero Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection would operate at LOS F, and therefore, a significant impact would occur at this intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6 Option 2.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Guerrero Street and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6f) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for the Guerrero Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Option 2. Hence, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur at the Guerrero Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6 Option 2.

82. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Mission Street and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P5-6g).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Under Existing plus Project conditions the Mission Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection would operate unsatisfactorily at LOS F, and therefore, a significant impact would occur at this intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6 Option 1.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Mission Street and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6g) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for the Mission Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection under Existing plus Project conditions for Option 1. Hence, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur at the Mission Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6 Option 1.

83. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Mission Street and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 2 under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P5-6h).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Under Existing plus Project conditions for Option 2 the Mission Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection would operate unsatisfactorily at LOS E, and therefore, a significant impact may occur at this intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6 Option 2.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Mission Street and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 2 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6h) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced but would remain at a significant and unavoidable level even with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P5-6h. It is proposed that lane configuration adjustments be made to the eastbound and westbound directions on Cesar Chavez Street, to improve LOS and reduce the delay at the Mission Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection. It is further proposed that on-street parking be removed (applying either Option 1 or 2 of proposed possible Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6w in conjunction with proposed possible Mitigation Measures M-TR-P5-6e, M-TR-P5-6h, M-TR-P 5-6j, M-TR-P 5-6k, M-TR-P 5-6l, M-TR-P 5-6m, M-TR-P 5-6o, and M-TR-P 5-6q for which feasibility has not yet been determined) along Cesar Chavez Street in the eastbound and westbound directions which would provide an additional through lane in both directions. These lane adjustments would decrease the delay and improve LOS from E to D. However, because of the uncertainty of the feasibility of this mitigation measure, a significant impact may occur at the Mission Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6 Option 2. In addition, bicycle lane discontinuity could occur at this location.

84. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Mission Street and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P5-6i).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Option 1, the Mission Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection would operate at LOS F, and therefore, a significant impact would occur at this intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6 Option 1.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Mission Street and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6i) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for the Mission Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Option 1. Hence, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur at the Mission Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6 Option 1.

85. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Mission Street and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P5-6j).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Option 2, the Mission Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection would operate at LOS F, and therefore, a significant impact would occur at this intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6 Option 2.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Mission Street and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6j) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced but would remain at a significant and unavoidable level even with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P5-6j. Lane configuration adjustments to the eastbound and westbound directions on Cesar Chavez Street would improve LOS and reduce the delay at the Mission Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection. It is proposed that on-street parking be removed (applying either Option 1 or 2 of proposed possible Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6w in conjunction with proposed possible Mitigation Measures M-TR-P5-6e, M-TR-P5-6h, M-TR-P 5-6j, M-TR-P 5-6k, M-TR-P 5-6l, M-TR-P 5-6m, M-TR-P 5-6o, and M-TR-P 5-6q for which feasibility has not yet been determined) along Cesar Chavez Street in the eastbound and westbound directions which would provide an additional through lane in both directions. These lane adjustments would decrease the delay and improve LOS from F to E. However, because of the uncertainty of the feasibility of this mitigation measure, a significant impact would occur at the Mission Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6 Option 2.

86. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Van Ness Avenue and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P5-6k).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Under Existing plus Project conditions for Option 1, the South Van Ness Avenue/Cesar Chavez Street intersection would operate at LOS F, and therefore, a significant impact may occur at this intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6 Option 1.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of South Van Ness Avenue and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6k) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced but would remain at a significant and unavoidable level even with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P5-6k. Lane configuration adjustments to the eastbound and westbound directions on Cesar Chavez Street would improve LOS and reduce the delay at this intersection. It is proposed that on-street parking along Cesar Chavez Street be removed (applying either Option 1 or 2 of proposed possible Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6w in conjunction with proposed possible Mitigation Measures M-TR-P5-6e, M-TR-P5-6h, M-TR-P 5-6j, M-TR-P 5-6k, M-TR-P 5-6l, M-TR-P 5-6m, M-TR-P 5-6o, and M-TR-P 5-6q for which feasibility has not yet been determined) in both the eastbound and westbound directions on Cesar Chavez Street which would provide an additional through lane along both approaches. These lane adjustments would decrease the delay and improve LOS from F to D. However, because of the uncertainty regarding the feasibility of this mitigation measure, a significant impact may occur at South Van Ness Avenue/Cesar Chavez Street intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6 Option 1.

87. Transportation Impact to the intersection of South Van Ness Avenue and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 2 under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P5-6l).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Under Existing plus Project conditions for Option 2, the South Van Ness Avenue/Cesar Chavez Street intersection would operate at LOS E, and therefore, a significant impact may occur at the South Van Ness Avenue/Cesar Chavez Street intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6 Option 2.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of South Van Ness Avenue and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 2 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6l) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced but would remain at a significant and unavoidable level even with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P5-6l. Lane configuration adjustments to the westbound direction on Cesar Chavez Street would improve LOS and reduce the delay at this intersection. It is proposed that on-street parking along Cesar Chavez Street be removed (applying either Option 1 or 2 of proposed possible Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6w in conjunction with proposed possible Mitigation Measures M-TR-P5-6e, M-TR-P 5-6h, M-TR-P 5-6j, M-TR-P 5-6k, M-TR-P 5-6l, M-TR-P 5-6m, M-TR-P 5-6o, and M-TR-P 5-6q for which feasibility has not yet been determined) in the westbound direction on Cesar Chavez Street which would provide an additional through lane along this approach. This lane adjustment would decrease the delay and improve LOS from E to D. However, because of the uncertainty regarding the feasibility of this mitigation measure, a significant impact may occur at this intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6 Option 2.

88. Transportation Impact to the intersection of South Van Ness Avenue and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P5-6m).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Option 1, the Cesar Chavez Street/South Van Ness Avenue intersection would operate at LOS F, and therefore, a significant impact would occur at the South Van Ness Avenue/Cesar Chavez Street intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6 Option 1.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of South Van Ness Avenue and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6m) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced but would remain at a significant and unavoidable level even with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P5-6m. Lane configuration adjustments to the eastbound and westbound directions on Cesar Chavez Street would improve LOS and reduce the delay at the Cesar Chavez Street/South Van Ness Avenue intersection. It is proposed that on-street parking along Cesar Chavez Street be removed (applying either Option 1 or 2 of proposed possible Mitigation Measures M-TR-P5-6w in conjunction with proposed

possible Mitigation Measures M-TR-P5-6e, M-TR-P5-6h, M-TR-P 5-6j, M-TR-P 5-6k, M-TR-P 5-6l, M-TR-P 5-6m, M-TR-P 5-6o, and M-TR-P 5-6q for which feasibility has not yet been determined) in both the eastbound and westbound directions on Cesar Chavez Street which would provide an additional through lane along both approaches. Nevertheless, this mitigation measure would not reduce Project 5-6 Option 1 impacts to a less-than-significant level.

89. Transportation Impact to the intersection of South Van Ness Avenue and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P5-6n).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Option 2, the South Van Ness Avenue/Cesar Chavez Street intersection would operate at LOS F, and therefore, a significant impact would occur at the South Van Ness Avenue/Cesar Chavez Street intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6 Option 2.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of South Van Ness Avenue and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6n) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for the South Van Ness Avenue/Cesar Chavez Street intersection under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Option 2. Hence, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur at the South Van Ness Avenue/Cesar Chavez Street intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6 Option 2.

90. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Bryant Street and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P5-6o).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Under Existing plus Project conditions for Option 1, the Bryant Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection would operate at LOS F, and therefore, a significant impact may occur at this intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6 Option 1.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Bryant Street and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6o) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced but would remain at a significant and unavoidable level even with implementation of

mitigation measure M-TR-P5-6o. Lane configuration adjustments to the eastbound direction and westbound directions on Cesar Chavez Street would improve LOS and reduce the delay at the Bryant Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection. It is proposed that on-street parking be removed (applying either Option 1 or 2 of proposed possible Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6w in conjunction with proposed possible Mitigation Measures M-TR-P5-6e, M-TR-P5-6h, M-TR-P 5-6j, M-TR-P 5-6k, M-TR-P 5-6l, M-TR-P 5-6m, M-TR-P 5-6o, and M-TR-P 5-6q for which feasibility has not yet been determined) along Cesar Chavez Street along the eastbound and westbound directions which would provide an additional through lane in both directions. However, because of the uncertainty regarding the feasibility of this mitigation measure, a significant impact may occur at the Bryant Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6 Option 1.

91. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Bryant Street and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 2 under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P5-6p).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Under Existing plus Project conditions for Option 2, the Bryant Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection would operate at LOS E, and therefore, a significant impact would occur at the Bryant Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6 Option 2.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Bryant Street and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 2 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6p) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for the Bryant Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection under Existing plus Project conditions for Option 2. Hence, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur at the Bryant Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6 Option 2.

92. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Bryant Street and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P5-6q).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Option 1, the Bryant Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection would operate at LOS F, and therefore, a significant impact would occur at this intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6 Option 1.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Bryant Street and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6q) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced but would remain at a significant and unavoidable level even with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P5-6q. Lane configuration adjustments to the eastbound and westbound directions on Cesar Chavez Street would improve LOS and reduce the delay at this intersection. It is proposed that on-street parking be removed (applying either Option 1 or 2 of proposed possible Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6w in conjunction with proposed possible Mitigation Measures M-TR-P5-6e, M-TR-P5-6h, M-TR-P 5-6j, M-TR-P 5-6k, M-TR-P 5-6l, M-TR-P 5-6m, M-TR-P 5-6o, and M-TR-P 5-6q for which feasibility has not yet been determined) along Cesar Chavez Street in the eastbound and westbound directions which would provide an additional through lane along both approaches. Nevertheless, this mitigation measure would not reduce the impacts of Project 5-6 Option 1 to a less-than-significant level.

93. Transportation Impact to the intersection of Bryant Street and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P5-6r).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Option 2, the Bryant Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection would operate at LOS F, and therefore, a significant impact would occur at this intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6 Option 2.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the intersection of Bryant Street and Cesar Chavez Street from Project 5-6 Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6r) and Conclusion.

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for the Bryant Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Option 2. Hence, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur at the Bryant Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6 Option 2.

94. Transportation Impact to Muni bus line 12 from Project 5-6 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P5-6s).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Muni bus line 12 would experience significant delays under Existing plus Project conditions for Project 5-6 Option 1.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to Muni bus line 12 from Project 5-6 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6s) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced but would remain at a significant and unavoidable level even with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P5-6r. The implementation of Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions would add 474 seconds (7.9 minutes) of total delay for Muni bus line 12 westbound. With mitigation as described in proposed possible Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6w in conjunction with proposed possible Mitigation Measures M-TR-P5-6e, M-TR-P5-6h, M-TR-P 5-6j, M-TR-P 5-6k, M-TR-P 5-6l, M-TR-P 5-6m, M-TR-P 5-6o, and M-TR-P 5-6q above, this delay would be reduced. This would reduce total delay below the transit delay threshold of six minutes. However, because of the uncertainty regarding the feasibility of this mitigation measure, a significant transit impact would occur for Muni bus line 12 for Project 5-6 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions.

95. Transportation Impact to Muni bus line 27 from Project 5-6 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P5-6t).

- a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Muni bus line 27 would experience significant delays under Existing plus Project conditions for Project 5-6 Option 1.

- b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to Muni bus line 27 from Project 5-6 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6t) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced but would remain at a significant and unavoidable level even with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P5-6t. The implementation of Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions would add 867 seconds (14.5 minutes) of total delay for Muni bus line 27. With mitigation as described in proposed possible Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6w in conjunction with proposed possible Mitigation Measures M-TR-P5-6e, M-TR-P5-6h, M-TR-P 5-6j, M-TR-P 5-6k, M-TR-P 5-6l, M-TR-P 5-6m, M-TR-P 5-6o, and M-TR-P 5-6q above, delay in the westbound direction would be reduced. Total transit delay would be below the transit delay threshold of six minutes. However, because of the uncertainty of the feasibility of this mitigation measure, a significant impact would occur to Muni bus line 27 for Project 5-6 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions.

96. Transportation Impact to Muni bus line 12 from Project 5-6 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P5-6u).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Muni bus line 12 would experience significant delays under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Project 5-6 Option 1.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to Muni bus line 12 from Project 5-6 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6u) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced but would remain at a significant and unavoidable level even with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P5-6u. The implementation of Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions would add approximately 1,487 seconds (24.7 minutes) of total delay for Muni bus line 12 westbound. With mitigation as described in proposed possible Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6w in conjunction with proposed possible Mitigation Measures M-TR-P5-6e, M-TR-P5-6h, M-TR-P 5-6j, M-TR-P 5-6k, M-TR-P 5-6l, M-TR-P 5-6m, M-TR-P 5-6o, and M-TR-P 5-6q above, this delay would not change. Therefore, a significant transit impact to Muni bus line 12 would occur with implementation of Project 5-6 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions.

97. Transportation Impact to Muni bus line 27 from Project 5-6 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P5-6v).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Muni bus line 27 would experience significant delays under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Project 5-6 Option 1.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to Muni bus line 27 from Project 5-6 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6v) and Conclusion.

The City finds the potentially-significant impacts listed above would be reduced but would remain at a significant and unavoidable level even with implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P5-6v. The implementation of Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions would add approximately 1,487 seconds (24.7 minutes) of total delay for Muni bus line 12 westbound. With mitigation as described in proposed possible Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6w in conjunction with proposed possible Mitigation Measures M-TR-P5-6e, M-TR-P5-6h, M-TR-P 5-6j, M-TR-P 5-6k,

M-TR-P 5-6l, M-TR-P 5-6m, M-TR-P 5-6o, and M-TR-P 5-6q above, this delay would not change. Therefore, a significant transit impact to Muni bus line 12 would occur with implementation of Project 5-6 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions.

98. Transportation Impact to the four intersections along Cesar Chavez for the segment between Bryant and Guerrero Streets analyzed under Project 5-6 Option 1 or Option 2 (Impact TR-P5-6w).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Intersections along Cesar Chavez for the segment between Hampshire and Guerrero Streets analyzed under Project 5-6 Option 1 or Option 2 would operate at unsatisfactory level of service, therefore, a significant impact would occur at these intersections with the implementation of Project 5-6 Option 1 or Option 2.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to the four intersections along Cesar Chavez for the segment between Bryant and Guerrero Streets analyzed under Project 5-6 Option 1 or Option 2 (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6w) and Conclusion.

As referenced in the above Mitigation Measures M-TR-P5-6e, M-TR-P5-6h, M-TR-P 5-6j, M-TR-P 5-6k, M-TR-P 5-6l, M-TR-P 5-6m, M-TR-P 5-6o, and M-TR-P 5-6q, the traffic analysis conducted for Project 5-6 included four study intersections along Cesar Chavez for the segment between Bryant and Guerrero Streets. Analysis indicates that if the lane configurations corresponding to the No Project conditions can be provided, some impacts will be mitigated at these intersections. The following two options are part of proposed possible mitigation measures, for which feasibility has not yet been determined, to reinstate the lane configuration under No Project conditions.

- Option 1

Removal of parking – For the four study intersections analyzed, approximately 100 spaces would need to be removed on Cesar Chavez Street to mitigate the impacts at these locations. However, additional parking spaces may need to be removed to reduce impacts along the entire corridor.

- Option 2

Implementing a discontinuous bicycle lane –The consultant recommends the bicycle lane be discontinued at selected intersection approaches along Cesar Chavez Street. This option may reduce the number of parking spaces that need to be removed on Cesar Chavez Street compared to Option 1.

99. Transportation Impact to loading on the west side of San Bruno Avenue between Paul Avenue and Silver Avenue from Project 5-13 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P5-13a).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Project 5-13 would construct bicycle lanes on San Bruno Avenue between Paul Avenue and Silver Avenue. Project 5-13 would result in a significant impact to loading on the west side of San Bruno Avenue between Paul Avenue and Silver Avenue with implementation of Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to loading on the west side of San Bruno Avenue between Paul Avenue and Silver Avenue from Project 5-13 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-13a) and Conclusion

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for Option 1. Hence, a significant and unavoidable loading impact would occur on the west side of San Bruno Avenue between Paul Avenue and Silver Avenue with the implementation of Project 5-13 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions.

100. Transportation Impact to loading on the west side of San Bruno Avenue between Paul Avenue and Silver Avenue from Project 5-13 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P5-13c).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Project 5-13 would result in a significant impact to loading on the west side of San Bruno Avenue between Paul Avenue and Silver Avenue with implementation of Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to loading on the west side of San Bruno Avenue between Paul Avenue and Silver Avenue from Project 5-13 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-13c) and Conclusion

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified for Option 1. Hence, a significant and unavoidable loading impact would occur on the west side of San Bruno Avenue between Paul Avenue and Silver Avenue with the implementation of Project 5-13 with Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions.

101. Transportation Impact to Muni line 48 from Project 6-2 Option 1, Modified Project 6-5, and 6-6 Modified Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P6-5j).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Project 6-2 Option 1, Modified Project 6-5, and 6-6 Modified Option 2 would result in a significant impact to Muni line 48 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to Muni line 48 from Project 6-2 Option 1, Modified Project 6-5, and 6-6 Modified Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P6-5j) and Conclusion

No feasible mitigation measure was identified and therefore the impact on Muni bus line 48 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions would remain significant.

102. Transportation Impact to Muni line 52 from Project 6-2 Option 1, Modified Project 6-5, and 6-6 Modified Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Impact TR-P6-5k).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Project 6-2 Option 1, Modified Project 6-5, and 6-6 Modified Option 2 would result in a significant impact to Muni line 52 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions.

b) Mitigation Measure for the Transportation Impact to Muni line 52 from Project 6-2 Option 1, Modified Project 6-5, and 6-6 Modified Option 2 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions (Mitigation Measure M-TR-P6-5k) and Conclusion

No feasible mitigation measure was identified and therefore the impact on Muni bus line 52 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions would remain significant.

Transportation Impacts of Minor Improvements

No significant impacts were identified in relation to Minor Improvements.

Transportation Impacts of Long-Term Improvements

103. Long-term Transportation Impact to roadway capacity and traffic delays from the implementation of long-term improvements (Impact TR-LT1).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Both individually, and in a cumulative scenario, the implementation of long-term improvements could result in a reduction in roadway capacity and increased traffic

delays. Reduction in the number of travel lanes could subject vehicles, including transit using the affected roadways, to increased congestion and delays.

b) Mitigation Measures for the Long-term Transportation Impact to roadway capacity and traffic delays from the implementation of long-term improvements (Mitigation Measures; M-TR-LT1.1, M-TR-LT1.2, M-TR-LT1.3, M-TR-LT1.4, and M-TR-LT1.5) and Conclusion

Measures that could potentially reduce significant traffic impacts to less-than-significant levels include:

- M-TR-LT1.1: Unsignalized intersections may be signalized, as appropriate.
- M-TR-LT1.2: Changes may be made to signal timing (including redistributing green time from one phase to another, lengthening of signal cycle times, changing permitted movements to protected movements, signal coordination/progression), as appropriate.
- M-TR-LT1.3: Changes may be made to roadway geometry (e.g., changing shared lanes to exclusive turn lanes, providing exclusive right-turn or left-turn pockets), as appropriate.
- M-TR-LT1.4: Floating bicycle lanes may be implemented, where on-street parking is restricted during peak periods, to provide for additional vehicular capacity, as appropriate.
- M-TR-LT1.5: Parking may be eliminated to provide for additional vehicular capacity, as appropriate.

In some instances, where either existing or projected cumulative conditions at intersections operate at LOS E or LOS F conditions, mitigation measures would not be available, and in these cases traffic impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

104. Long-term Transportation Impact to transit delays from the implementation of long-term improvements (Impact TR-LT2).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Both individually, and in a cumulative scenario, the implementation of long-term improvements may cause transit to experience increased travel time on streets where these improvements reduce capacity of roadways and result in significant increases in delay. Buses may experience increased difficulty pulling into and out of curb bus stops due to reconfiguration of bus stops to accommodate bicycle lanes.

b) Mitigation Measures for the Long-term Transportation Impact to transit delays from the implementation of long-term improvements (Mitigation Measures; M-TR-LT2.1, M-TR-LT2.2, M-TR-LT2.3, and M-TR-LT2.4) and Conclusion

Potential mitigation measures that could reduce significant transit impacts to less-than-significant levels include:

- M-TR-LT2.1: Signal pre-emption or other transit priority techniques may be applied to reduce overall transit travel times, as appropriate.
- M-TR-LT2.2: Bicycle proposals may be modified to create discontinuities in bicycle treatment to avoid transit delays, as appropriate.
- M-TR-LT2.3: Bus stops may be reconfigured to facilitate bus operations, as appropriate.
- M-TR-LT2.4: Parking may be eliminated to substitute for lane removal and/or increase roadway capacity, as appropriate.

In some instances, where either existing or projected cumulative conditions at intersections operate at LOS E or LOS F conditions, feasible mitigation measures would not be available, and transit impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

105. Long-term Transportation Impact to loading from the implementation of long-term improvements (Impact TR-LT3).

a) Potentially-Significant Impact

Both individually, and in a cumulative scenario, the implementation of long-term improvements may result in elimination of curb space currently dedicated to yellow commercial vehicle freight loading zones, or active passenger loading/unloading zones.

b) Mitigation Measures for the Long-term Transportation Impact to loading from the implementation of long-term improvements (Mitigation Measures; M-TR-LT3.1, and M-TR-LT3.2) and Conclusion

The following mitigation measures could reduce significant loading impacts to less-than-significant levels.

- M-TR-LT3.1: Where feasible and required to respond to loading zone impacts, on-street parking layouts shall be modified to accommodate additional yellow commercial freight loading zones.
- M-TR-LT3.2: Traffic management strategies shall be developed and implemented, where feasible, to accommodate short-term passenger loading/unloading activities.

In some locations, feasible mitigation measures would not be available, and loading impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

V. Why Subsequent Environmental Analysis or Recirculation is not Required

Finding: For the reasons set forth below and elsewhere in the Administrative Record, none of the factors are present which would necessitate recirculation of the Final EIR under CEQA Guideline Section 15088.5 or the preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under CEQA Guideline Section 15162. The Comments and Responses document thoroughly addressed all public comments that the Planning Department received on the Draft EIR. In response to these comments, the Department added new and clarifying text to the EIR and modified some mitigation measures. In addition, since publication of the Draft EIR, the staff, in response to public comments and additional staff evaluation of the San Francisco Bicycle Plan proposal, made modifications to a number of projects covered in the Bicycle Plan in order to avoid or alleviate specific concerns raised by the public and City departments.

The Comments and Responses document, which is incorporated herein by reference, analyzed all of these changes, including the Preferred Project, discussed in greater detail in Section A below, and determined that these changes did not constitute new information of significance that would add new significant environmental effects, or substantially increase the severity of effects identified in the Final EIR. Further, additional changes to the Preferred Project have been incorporated into the project after publication of the Comments and Responses document. These changes have been addressed orally by staff or in staff reports, which statements and reports are incorporated herein by reference and based on this information, the Planning Department has determined that these additional changes do not constitute new information of significance that would alter any of the conclusions of the EIR.

Based on the information set forth above and other substantial evidence in light of the whole record on the Final EIR, the Commission determines that the Preferred Project, is within the scope of project analyzed in the Final EIR; (2) approval of Preferred Project will not require important revisions to the Final EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; (3) taking into account the Preferred Project and other changes analyzed in the Final EIR, no substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the Project are undertaken which would require major revisions to the Final EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects, or a substantial increase in the severity of effects identified in the Final EIR; and (4) no new information of substantial importance to the Project has become available which would indicate (a) the Preferred Project or the approval actions will have significant effects not discussed in the Final EIR; (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 Final EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment. Consequently, there is no need to recirculate the Final EIR under CEQA Guideline 15088.5 or to prepare a subsequent or supplemental EIR under CEQA Guideline Section 15162.

VI. Evaluation of Project Alternatives

This Section describes the EIR alternatives (“EIR Options”) and the reasons for finding the Alternatives infeasible and rejecting them as required by Public Resources Code section 21081(a)(3) and *CEQA Guidelines* section 15091(a)(3). This Section also outlines the Preferred Project’s purposes and provides the rationale for selecting alternatives or rejecting alternatives as infeasible, describes the Preferred Project alternative components analyzed in the EIR, and identifies the environmentally superior alternative, where appropriate for the near-term projects.

CEQA mandates that an EIR evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the project, which would “feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the project.” (*CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15126.6(a)).

CEQA requires that every EIR evaluate a “No Project” alternative as part of the range of alternatives analyzed in the EIR. The San Francisco Bicycle Plan EIR’s No Project analysis was prepared in accordance with *CEQA Guidelines* Sections 15126.6(e)(3)(A) and (C).

Alternatives provide a basis of comparison to the Preferred Project in terms of beneficial, significant, and unavoidable impacts and ability to achieve project objectives. This comparative analysis is used to consider reasonable feasible options for minimizing environmental consequences of the Preferred Project.

The Alternatives listed below and rejected are rejected as infeasible based upon substantial evidence in the record, including evidence of economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations described in this Section, and for the reasons described in Section VII below, which is incorporated herein by reference.

Reasons for Selection of the Preferred Project - Alternatives Rejected as Infeasible and Reasons for Rejection as Infeasible - Environmentally Superior Alternative

As described above and in this section, the Preferred Project constitutes adoption of the 2009 Bicycle Plan, related amendments to the General Plan and Planning Code, approval of 60 near-term projects of which 55 have preferred options, authorization to implement minor improvements on the bicycle network, identification of 24 long-term projects, and related actions. This Preferred Project encompasses Program-level Alternative A, as identified in the

Draft EIR on pages VII – 12-14, which constitutes the minor and long-term improvements as described above.

As stated in Section 15126.6 (a) of the *CEQA Guidelines*, “an EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.” These are presented in Section VII of the DEIR. In regard to alternatives, the Draft EIR states: “[u]nlike most EIRs, this EIR contains no separate chapter analyzing alternatives to the proposed project. This is because this EIR does not analyze a preferred project. Instead, for many of the near-term improvements, this EIR evaluates two options as well as a future No-Project scenario (i.e., year 2025 Cumulative conditions, assuming that none of the bicycle facility options is adopted), at an equal level of detail, as EIR alternatives.” The Draft EIR further states: “Because the Bicycle Plan Project includes both project-level and program-level elements, this discussion of Alternatives focuses on a comparison of two project-level alternatives, as well as a comparison of two program-level alternatives The project-level and program-level alternatives can be paired up with each other in a variety of combinations. In addition, other alternatives would result by combining different near-term improvement options as well as different optional designs within the near-term improvements that offer multiple segment options.”

Rejection as Infeasible of the No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative assumes that no City agency, board, commission, or department would take any action to adopt and/or implement the Preferred Project or any part of the Preferred Project. This No Project Alternative is rejected as infeasible for the reasons set forth in this section. The No Project Alternative would not be desirable nor meet the Preferred Project objectives. The No Project Alternative would not satisfy Bicycle Plan Project’s overall goal to increase safe bicycle use nor would it meet the Bicycle Plan’s specific goals. The No Project Alternative would fail to meet the objectives set forth in San Francisco’s Transit First Policy (San Francisco Charter, Section 8A.115), the Regional Transportation Plan, and the SFMTA Climate Action Plan, among other Plans.

The No Project Alternative would not implement any new bicycle facilities, would not build or maintain bicycle pathways beyond current levels, and would not implement new bicycle safety programs beyond current levels. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would fail to increase bicycle safety and ridership on San Francisco streets because studies have linked bicycle safety to education and to the existence of a defined space on the roadway, either through striped bicycle

lanes or shared lane markings, which make a bicyclist's behavior more predictable to motorists and positions bicyclists outside of the door zone of parked cars.

The No Project Alternative would fail to close gaps in the existing bicycle route network, which surveys have shown is a major impediment to additional increases in bicycle mode share in San Francisco. Studies show a significant increase in the number of people making regular bicycle trips in San Francisco, while recent surveys also reveal that an even greater number would make bicycle trips if there were more bicycle lanes and sharrows on the roadways. Furthermore, the City would not benefit from any potential air quality improvements that could result from an increase in bicycle mode share.

The No Project Alternative would not guarantee the maintenance of roadway capacities and transit service at their current levels. With San Francisco's continued growth as an employment center, and population growth over time, new vehicles would be added to the City's roadways and if alternative commute modes are not enhanced to help serve the City's transportation needs, or a plan for such alternative modes is not undertaken (bicycling, or other new transit service), these future trips would continue to be distributed among personal vehicles, bicycles, pedestrian travel, and transit in much the same proportions as is currently the case. By the year 2025 for the No Project Alternative, city intersection levels-of-service (LOS) would worsen at more than two thirds of the intersections studied for this Bicycle Plan Project analysis, and only a little more than one third of the total intersections studied would remain at LOS D or better.

For the foregoing reasons as well as the other economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations set forth in Section VII (Statement of Overriding Considerations), which are incorporated as though fully set forth herein, the No-Project alternative is hereby rejected and found infeasible.

Rejection of Project-Level Alternatives A and B and Program-Level Alternative B as Infeasible

Project-Level Alternative A would include adoption of the Bicycle Plan along with all near-term improvement projects Option 2 (or Option 1 if there is only one option) as these produce fewer identified significant environmental impacts, and therefore Project-Level Alternative A is the Environmentally Superior Alternative as between Project-Level Alternatives A and B.

Project-Level Alternative A assumes that the Bicycle Plan options would be selected solely on the basis of the number of potential impacts the given option could have on the physical environment in the area of the improvements (identified as "Cluster Areas" in this EIR). However, the number of environmental impacts is not necessarily indicative of the project

alternative's full effect. A project alternative could, potentially, have fewer identified impacts than another alternative, but these impacts could have a greater negative effect on City residents, or could contradict City programs and goals to a greater extent, than a scenario with apparently more impacts. This alternative does not attempt to define the value or importance of each impact, or to rank the impacts in order of absolute importance to local residents or the City of San Francisco.

The comparison of impacts resulting from Project-level Alternative A and Project-level Alternative B counts impacts resulting from Existing plus Project Conditions separately from those resulting from 2025 Cumulative plus Project Conditions.

For Project-Level Alternative A there would be: 17 significant and unavoidable traffic impacts at 10 different intersections in Cluster 2; three significant and unavoidable traffic impacts at as many different intersections in Cluster 3; and 10 significant and unavoidable traffic impacts at four different intersections in Cluster 5. There also would be significant and unavoidable transit impacts to four Muni and one SamTrans bus lines, all in Cluster 2. Furthermore there would be: two significant and unavoidable loading impacts in Cluster 1, four significant and unavoidable loading impacts in Cluster 2, and four significant and unavoidable loading impacts in Cluster 5.

Project-Level Alternatives B would include adoption of the Bicycle Plan along with all near-term improvement projects Option 1 as these may result in more identified significant environmental impacts than Alternative A. However, as noted above, the additional impacts related to a project do not necessarily mean that the impacts would result in a greater magnitude of effect on the quality of life or overall transportation network functioning in the City of San Francisco.

For Project-Level Alternative B there would be: 21 significant and unavoidable traffic impacts at 10 different intersections in Cluster 2; seven significant and unavoidable traffic impacts at four different intersections in Cluster 3; 16 significant and unavoidable traffic impacts at as many different intersections in Cluster 5; and 13 significant and unavoidable traffic impacts at two different intersections in Cluster 6. There also would be significant and unavoidable transit impacts to: three Muni bus lines in Cluster 2; one Muni bus line in Cluster 3; two Muni bus lines in Cluster 5; and two Muni bus lines in Cluster 6. Furthermore, there would be: two significant and unavoidable loading impacts in Cluster 1, six significant and unavoidable loading impacts in Cluster 2, and two significant and unavoidable loading impacts in Cluster 5.

Although Project-Level Alternatives A and B would accomplish the Bicycle Plan Project goals, they would not benefit from the project refinements and modifications made by SFMTA to improve upon the project options that were originally analyzed in the DEIR, since some of the

refinements are based on Option 1, and some are based on Option 2, of the near-term improvement projects. In several instances, these refinements would avoid or substantially lessen some of the significant effects of the project. And by refining many of the near-term projects SFMTA further expanded the range of alternatives to give decision-makers a wider array of alternatives from which to select. The Preferred Project includes a combination of some Option 1 projects, some Modified Option 1 projects, some Option 2 projects, and some Modified Option 2 projects (with different options selected for different clusters). In contrast, as stated above, Project-Level Alternative A only includes Option 2 projects and Project-Level Alternative B only includes Option 1 projects. By limiting the options available in this way, Project-Level Alternatives A and B do not improve bicycle network functioning and safety as would be accomplished by the Preferred Project, and do not allow the decision-makers to have the flexibility to respond to the individual, site specific public, stakeholder and City agency considerations incorporated into the Preferred Project. For these reasons, and for the reasons set forth below rejecting the individual alternative designs not chosen for the Preferred Project, project-Level Alternatives A and B are rejected as infeasible.

Program-Level Alternative B would limit the program-level actions to activities involved in locating, placing, and maintaining sharrows to the streets or areas identified for long-term improvements to complete the bicycle route network. This alternative would have no significant and unavoidable impacts, and therefore it is the Environmentally Superior Alternative as between Program-Level Alternatives A and B. In order to attract the greatest number of riders, a bicycle network must include a combination of bicycle facilities that takes all skill-levels of bicyclists and all potential uses (e.g., commute, recreation, and shopping) into account. Sharrows, in and of themselves, are not as likely to attract novice or even intermediate-level bicyclists, whom surveys have shown prefer the comfort and security of bicycle lanes and paths. This is particularly the case in an urban environment like San Francisco where all available transportation modes occur within a very limited right-of-way. Bicycle lanes and paths provide a greater level of comfort and security for bicyclists, which translates into increased mode share and the aforementioned concomitant benefits thereof. Thus, in contrast to Program-level Alternative B, Program-level Alternative A, which is part of the Preferred Project and includes minor improvements on the Bicycle Network and long-term improvements, would be more successful in promoting this and other goals of the 2009 Bicycle Plan.

For the foregoing reasons as well as other economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations set forth in Section VII (Statement of Overriding Considerations), which is incorporated herein by reference, Project-Level Alternatives A and B and Program-Level

Alternative B are hereby rejected as infeasible. Program-level Alternative A is retained as part of the Preferred Project.

Near-term Improvements – Rejection of Options/Alternatives as Infeasible and Reasons for Selection of the Preferred Alternative Design Option

The near-term improvements are bicycle route network improvement projects that will address gaps and deficiencies within the existing bicycle route network. These near-term improvements include bicycle projects that were originally listed as priority projects in the April 2005 draft Network Improvement Document (NID); projects that were already funded, but not implemented prior to the Superior Court of California ruling that prevented implementation; and projects that have been designed subsequently. There are 60 near-term improvements with complete and specific project designs.

The proposed near-term improvements consist of design elements intended to enhance safety and improve bicycle travel in the City. These elements vary from simple improvements such as pavement markings, including sharrows, to more complex treatments, like the installation of bicycle lanes, pathways or other bicycle facilities. Some of these treatments may be implemented in conjunction with the removal or narrowing of traffic lanes. For most of the specific near-term improvements, more than one design option has been developed for consideration by decision makers. The design options chosen for analysis for each project represent a range in terms of resulting environmental effects. As such, these options now constitute a suite of design elements from which decision-makers may choose in order to address the network deficiencies at a specific location. With certification of the Bicycle Plan Project EIR, no further environmental analysis would be required to implement any such design element that is within the range of design elements studied as part of this environmental review process.

Written project descriptions for each of the 60 near-term improvements are included in the Project Description section of the DEIR and project drawings showing existing and proposed road configurations are provided in Appendix B of the DEIR. The project-level analysis of potential environmental effects is included in Chapter V, Section V.A.3, p. V.A.3-1 of the DEIR. Additional project refinements have been presented and analyzed in the Comments and Response Document (C&R). Please see Section D, staff-initiated changes, as well as Appendix F, for revised project drawings in the C&R document. The implementation of these design-ready projects will close network gaps and improve safety and cyclists' experience, thereby increasing bicycle ridership to meet the overall goal of the Bicycle Plan.

This EIR provides project-level CEQA review for specific near-term bicycle route network improvement projects (“near-term projects”). These near-term projects are evaluated as part of the Preferred Project. The EIR concluded that the Project, and more specifically the near-term projects, will have various significant unmitigated environmental impacts, primarily to traffic and transit. Alternatives are thus presented and discussed below. The Commission certifies that it has independently reviewed and considered the information on the alternatives provided in the EIR and in the record. The EIR reflects the Planning Commission's independent judgment. In approving those components of the Preferred Project within its jurisdiction, the Planning Commission has carefully considered the attributes and the environmental effects of the Preferred Project and the scenarios discussed in the EIR. This consideration, along with reports from City staff, public testimony, and community workshops has resulted in the Preferred Project. The Commission finds that the Preferred Project provides the best balance between satisfaction of the project objectives and mitigation of environmental impacts to the extent feasible, as described and analyzed in the EIR. A statement of overriding considerations is found in Section VII and adopted.

After consultation with the public, City staff, and other stakeholders, the Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) staff selected preferred near-term project alternatives (individually and collectively referred to as "Preferred Alternative") that are identified below as each one promotes the greatest achievement of all of the Bicycle Plan goals and provides other benefits, which would not be attained to the same extent by any of the other EIR alternatives/design options which are thus rejected as infeasible for the reasons stated herein and in Section VII (Statement of Overriding Considerations), which is hereby incorporated by reference. Each Preferred Alternative achieves the Project's goals in the way(s) discussed. In some cases as specified below, the MTA has not identified a Preferred Alternative, but has elected to retain the analyzed options as part of the overall Project for further planning. Further, for the reasons stated above under *“Rejection as Infeasible of the No Project Alternative,”* the No Project Alternative is specifically rejected as infeasible for each of the near-term projects listed below for the legal, social, technological, and other considerations stated above and in Section VII (Statement of Overriding Considerations) which is incorporated by reference.

Project 1-1 Broadway Bicycle Lanes, Polk Street to Webster Street

The DEIR analyzed only a single option for Project 1-1, Option 1. However, SFMTA, while approving Option 1 as part of the Bicycle Plan approval, has elected not to proceed with legislation or implementation of that option at this time. Instead, it will continue to work with

the public, stakeholders, and City agencies on the planning effort for this project. Consequently, there is no preferred project at this location.

Option 1 would promote and encourage safe bicycling by providing on-street bicycle facilities, where none currently exist, along this segment of the Broadway corridor, an existing major east-west bicycle route that provides a connection between the Chinatown and Russian Hill neighborhoods, as well as a connection to existing bicycle facilities on Webster, Polk, and Taylor Streets. Option 1 also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

The No Project Alternative, which is associated with fewer impacts, is the Environmentally Superior Alternative, but as stated above, the No Project alternative is rejected as infeasible for the reasons noted above. However, SFMTA is making no decision to select a preferred project at this location at this time pending further public, stakeholder and City agency input and planning, so it is retaining Option 1 as part of the project approval of the Bicycle Plan.

Project 1-2 Broadway Tunnel Signage Improvements

The DEIR analyzed only a single option for this project, Option 1, and SFMTA has identified this as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative for Project 1-2 would install sharrows in the Broadway tunnel and on Broadway frontage road, and install warning and way-finding signage at the approaches to the tunnel.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 1-2 would promote and encourage safe bicycling in and around the Broadway Tunnel, would fill the gap in the existing bicycle route network on Broadway and would expand the existing bicycle route network by installing sharrows on Broadway and warning and way-finding signage. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

Project 1-2 does not create any significant environmental impacts. The Preferred Alternative would improve the current interactions between buses and bicyclists, and could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. As the only option presented, and given that this project is associated with no significant impacts, it is considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

Project 1-3 North Point Street Bicycle Lanes, The Embarcadero to Van Ness Avenue

Project 1-3 originally involved only a single option as analyzed in the DEIR. Based upon public, stakeholder, and City agency input, SFMTA refined this project and refers to this refinement as Modified Option 1. Modified Option 1 is described and analyzed in more detail in the Comments and Responses document for this EIR. SFMTA has identified Modified Option 1 as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would install bicycle lanes on North Point Street between The Embarcadero and Van Ness Avenue.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 1-3 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this segment of the North Point Street corridor and would fill the gap in the existing bicycle route network along this important east-west route, providing a connection between the North Beach, Russian Hill and Marina neighborhoods, as well as a connection to popular recreational areas like Fisherman's Wharf and Fort Mason. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

The difference between Option 1 and the Preferred Alternative is that Option 1 would eliminate two bus zones on North Point Street which would provide a small increase of eight on-street parking spaces as compared to the Preferred Alternative, but also would increase the distance between transit stops. Other than these differences, Option 1 and the Preferred Alternative have similar impacts with significant and unavoidable impacts to traffic at one intersection and to loading in two locations, as well as transit delays. For both Option 1 and the Preferred Alternative, the implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P1-3a will reduce the impact at the intersection of Van Ness Avenue and North Point Street to a less than significant level. The Preferred Alternative accomplishes the project goals without additional bus zone changes and associated effects to transit stop spacing. Also, the Preferred Alternative could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. For these reasons, the Preferred Alternative also is the Environmentally Superior Alternative, and Option 1 is hereby rejected as infeasible.

Project 2-1 2nd Street Bicycle Lanes, King Street to Market Street

Project 2-1 originally involved two options as analyzed in the DEIR, Option 1 and Option 2. Based upon public, stakeholder, and City agency input, SFMTA refined this project and refers to this refinement as Modified Option 1. Modified Option 1 is described and analyzed in more detail in the Comments and Responses document for this EIR. SFMTA has identified Modified

Option 1 as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would install a combination of bicycle lanes and sharrows on 2nd Street between King Street and Market Street.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 2-1 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this segment of 2nd Street and would fill a gap in the existing bicycle route network along this important north-south route, providing a connection between Market Street, the southern Financial District, and South Beach neighborhoods, as well as a connection to Bay Area Rapid Transit stations on Market Street, which provide connectivity to the greater San Francisco Bay Area and the San Francisco International Airport. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

Although each of the options for this project is associated with numerous impacts, the Preferred Alternative has less severe impacts than Option 1 or Option 2 and it eliminates a number of impacts altogether due to its refined design. The Preferred Alternative would remove substantially fewer parking spaces and freight loading zones than Option 1 or Option 2. Also, the Preferred Alternative includes traffic engineering elements, such as restricting left turns from 2nd Street at several intersections, designed to permit better traffic flow through the single lane of traffic and facilitate better transit service. Additionally, the Preferred Alternative could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. For these reasons, the Preferred Alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative. Also, given the above considerations, both Option 1 and Option 2 are hereby rejected as infeasible.

Project 2-2 5th Street Bicycle Lanes, Market Street to Townsend Street

The DEIR analyzed two options for Project 2-2, Option 1 and Option 2. Based upon public, stakeholder, and City agency input, SFMTA refined this project and refers to this refinement as Modified Option 2. Modified Option 2 is described and analyzed in more detail in the Comments and Responses document for this EIR. SFMTA has identified Modified Option 2 as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would install a combination of bicycle lanes and sharrows on 5th Street between Market Street and Townsend Street.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 2-2 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this segment of 5th Street and would fill a gap in the existing bicycle route network along this important north-south route, providing a connection between Market Street, the southern Financial District, South of Market, and Mission Bay neighborhoods, as well as a connection to Bay Area Rapid Transit stations on Market Street, which provide connectivity to the greater San Francisco Bay Area and the San Francisco International Airport. The Preferred Alternative also

would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

All of the options for this project have similar impacts with significant and unavoidable impacts to traffic at three intersections. The Preferred Alternative eliminates the impacts associated with Option 1 at the 5th and Bryant Streets intersection in both the existing and cumulative scenarios. Yet, it shares the same impacts as Option 2. However, the Preferred Alternative has benefits over Option 1 and Option 2 due to the Preferred Alternatives refined design. The Preferred Alternative includes traffic engineering elements such as lane configuration changes that would maintain sufficient capacity for northbound traffic entering or exiting the freeway on and off-ramps at Bryant Street and Harrison Street, respectively, and for northbound traffic accessing the 5th and Mission Streets public parking garage, which serves the South of Market and Union Square areas. Other traffic engineering elements, such as restricting left turns and installing right-turn lanes at key intersections, would permit better traffic flow through the single lane of traffic in the southbound direction. The Preferred Alternative also would provide enhanced bicycle accommodations such as better aligned continuous bicycle lanes with fewer lateral shifts, as compared to Option 1 or Option 2, and would result in fewer parking spaces removed than Option 1 or Option 2. Additionally, the Preferred Alternative could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. For these reasons, the Preferred Alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative. In addition, for the reasons set forth herein, both Option 1 and Option 2 are hereby rejected as infeasible.

Project 2-3 14th Street Bicycle Lane, Dolores Street to Market Street

The DEIR analyzed two options for this project, Option 1 and Option 2. SFMTA has selected Option 1 as the Preferred Alternative for Project 2-3. The Preferred Alternative would install an eastbound bicycle lane on 14th Street from Market Street to Dolores Street and convert this segment of 14th Street from two-way operation to one-way eastbound operation.

The Preferred Alternative would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this segment of the 14th Street corridor and would fill the gap in the existing bicycle route network along this important east-west route, providing a connection between Market Street and other points west with the Mission and South of Market neighborhoods. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

The Preferred Alternative was implemented on March 27, 2006 prior to the Bicycle Plan Injunction, and certification of the EIR. Therefore, Option 2 would require a change to the

existing traffic operations by converting this segment of 14th Street back to two-way operation from one-way eastbound operation. While this could provide a minor improvement to traffic circulation in the area, it also would require traffic signal modifications and decrease the eastbound traffic capacity of the street, which could result in higher traffic volumes and increased delays on Market Street, a major transit corridor. The Preferred Alternative achieves the project goals without these potentially adverse consequences. The Preferred Alternative, when considered alone, has no significant impacts to traffic, transit, parking, pedestrians, bicycle or loading, but could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. For the foregoing reasons, the Preferred Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, and Option 2 is hereby rejected as infeasible.

Project 2-4 17th Street Bicycle Lanes, Corbett Avenue to Kansas Street, including connections to the 16th Street BART Station via Hoff Street or Valencia Street, and 17th Street to Division Street via Potrero Avenue

Project 2-4 involved two options as analyzed in the DEIR, Option 1 and Option 2. Based upon public, stakeholder, and City agency input, SFMTA refined this project and refers to this refinement as Modified Option 1. Modified Option 1 is described and analyzed in more detail in the Comments and Responses document for this EIR. SFMTA has identified Modified Option 1 as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative is divided into three segments: the west segment, between Corbett Avenue and Church Street; the central segment, between Church Street and Potrero Avenue; and the east segment, between Potrero Avenue and Kansas Street.

In the west segment the Preferred Alternative would install sharrows on eastbound 17th Street between from Castro Street to Hartford Street and install bicycle lanes on eastbound 17th Street from Hartford Street to Church Street. In the westbound direction the Preferred Alternative would move the existing bicycle route on 17th Street between Sanchez Street and Market Street to a new route with sharrows on northbound Sanchez Street from 17th Street to 16th Street, and a left-turn bicycle lane on westbound 16th Street from Sanchez Street to Market Street.

In the center segment the Preferred Alternative would install bicycle lanes in both directions on 17th Street between Church Street and Potrero Avenue.

In the east segment the Preferred Alternative would install bicycle lanes in both directions on 17th Street between Potrero Avenue and Kansas Street, a combination of bicycle lanes and sharrows in both directions on Potrero Avenue between 17th Street and Division Street, and bicycle lanes in both directions on Kansas Street between 16th Street and 17th Street.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 2-4 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this segment of the 17th Street corridor and the other adjacent streets as described. The Preferred Alternative would fill a gap in the existing bicycle route network along this important east-west route, providing a connection between the Mission Bay, Potrero Hill, Mission, and Castro neighborhoods. In addition, it would provide a connection to existing and planned bicycle facilities on 16th Street, Division Street, Harrison Street, Valencia Street, and Market Street, as well as a connection to Bay Area Rapid Transit stations on 16th Street and Market Street, which provide connectivity to the greater San Francisco Bay Area and the San Francisco International Airport. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

Option 2 would result in significant and unavoidable impacts at the 16th Street/Potrero Avenue intersection and to two bus lines. Both Option 1 and the Preferred Alternative have similar impacts with significant and unavoidable impacts at the 10th/Potrero/Brannan/Division Streets intersection. The Preferred Alternative would add sharrows instead of a westbound bicycle lane on 17th Street between Eureka and Douglass Streets, as proposed in Option 1, which results in the removal of fewer parking spaces as compared to Option 1 or Option 2. The Preferred Alternative would provide an enhanced bicycle connection at the west end of Project 2-4 as compared to Option 1, via Sanchez and 16th streets, similar to Option 2, which avoids the light-rail tracks on 17th Street approaching Castro Street. Under the Preferred Alternative, a westbound left-turn bicycle lane would be added for the entire length of 16th Street, from Sanchez Street to Market Street. The Preferred Alternative also would provide an enhanced bicycle facility along the center segment of 17th Street between Church Street and Potrero Avenue by removing parking along one or both sides of 17th Street. This design would improve safety and operating conditions for bicyclists as compared to Option 1. At the east end of Project 2-4, the Preferred Alternative would add a southbound left-turn lane on Potrero Avenue approaching Alameda Street, and sharrows would be added on northbound Potrero Avenue between Alameda and Division streets instead of removing a travel lane and adding a bicycle lane, which eliminates a traffic impact as compared to Option 2 and makes some of the traffic impacts that remain less severe. For these reasons, the Preferred Alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

However, SFMTA, although identifying the Preferred Alternative as described above, has elected not to proceed with legislation or implementation of the central segment portion of Project 2-4. Instead, it will continue to work with the public, stakeholders, and City agencies on the planning effort for this portion of the project. As such, there is no preferred project for the

central segment. Consequently, both Option 1 and Option 2 are hereby rejected as infeasible for the east and west segments only of Project 2-4. For the central segment, SFMTA is making no decision to select an alternative pending further public input and planning.

Project 2-5 Beale Street Bicycle Lane, Bryant Street to Folsom Street

The DEIR analyzed only a single option for this project, Option 1, and SFMTA has identified this as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative for Project 2-5 would add a new route to the City's existing bicycle route network and install a southbound bicycle lane on Beale Street from Folsom Street to Bryant Street.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 2-5 would promote and encourage safe bicycling in the rapidly developing, densely populated area of San Francisco, providing a connection between the South of Market and the South Park neighborhoods, as well as a connection to existing bicycle facilities on Folsom Street. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

There are no significant impacts associated with Project 2-5. The Preferred Alternative could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. As the only option presented, and given that this project is associated with no significant impacts, it is considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

Project 2-6 Division Street Bicycle Lanes, 9th Street to 11th Street

The DEIR analyzed two options for this project, Option 1 and Option 2. SFMTA has selected Option 2 as the Preferred Alternative for this project. The Preferred Alternative for Project 2-6 would install bicycle lanes on Division Street between 9th Street and 11th Street.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 2-6 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this segment of the Division Street corridor and would fill the gap in the existing bicycle route network along this important east-west route, providing a connection between the South of Market area with points to the west and to the north, as well as a connection to existing bicycle facilities on 11th Street. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

Neither Option 1 nor the Preferred Alternative has significant impacts to transit, parking, pedestrians, bicycles or loading. And although the Preferred Alternative removes

approximately 25 more parking spaces than Option 1, it maintains the current number of travel lanes and therefore the Preferred Alternative does not have significant impacts to traffic, which would be associated with Option 1. Also, the Preferred Alternative would have the added benefit of eliminating the hazard for ‘dooring’ by parking vehicles and could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. For these reasons, the Preferred Alternative also is the Environmentally Superior Alternative, and Option 1 is hereby rejected as infeasible.

Project 2-7 Fremont Street southbound Bicycle Lane, Harrison Street to Howard Street

The DEIR analyzed only a single option for this project, Option 1, and SFMTA has identified this as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative for Project 2-7 would add a new route to the City’s existing bicycle route network and install a combination of bicycle lanes and sharrows on Fremont Street between Folsom Street and Harrison Street.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 2-7 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this segment of the Fremont Street corridor and would fill the gap in the existing bicycle route network, providing a connection between the South of Market area with points to the north and to the south, as well as a connection to existing bicycle facilities on Howard Street and Folsom Street. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project’s overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan’s specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 2-7, when considered alone, has no impacts to traffic, transit, parking, pedestrians, bicycle or loading, but the Preferred Alternative would benefit pedestrians by providing more buffer space for increased pedestrian safety and circulation. It also could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. As the only option presented, and given that this project is associated with no significant impacts, it is considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

Project 2-8 Howard Street westbound Bicycle Lane, short extension at 9th Street

The DEIR analyzed only a single option for this project, Option 1, and SFMTA has identified this as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative for Project 2-8 would install a bicycle lane in the westbound direction on Howard Street approaching 9th Street.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 2-8 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this segment of the Howard Street corridor and would fill the gap in the existing bicycle route network along this important east-west route, providing a connection between the Embarcadero

and the South of Market and Mission neighborhoods, as well as a connection to existing bicycle facilities on 11th Street. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

There are no significant impacts associated with Project 2-8. The Preferred Alternative could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. As the only option presented, and given that this project is associated with no significant impacts, it is considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

Project 2-9 Howard Street, westbound Bicycle lane, The Embarcadero to Fremont Street

The DEIR analyzed only a single option for this project, Option 1, and SFMTA has identified this as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative for Project 2-9 would install a bicycle lane in the westbound direction on Howard Street between The Embarcadero and Fremont Street.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 2-9 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this segment of the Howard Street corridor and would fill the gap in the existing bicycle route network along this important east-west route, providing a connection between the Embarcadero and the South of Market neighborhoods, as well as a connection to existing bicycle facilities on The Embarcadero. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 2-9 has no impacts to transit, parking, pedestrians, bicycles or loading, but it has traffic impacts at the intersection of Fremont Street and Howard Street that are significant and unavoidable in both the existing plus project and 2025 cumulative plus project scenarios. Nevertheless, these impacts are isolated to a single intersection and would be outweighed by the added benefit the Preferred Alternative would provide to transit operations at another intersection in the project area as well as the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. Given that the Preferred Alternative is associated with significant and unavoidable impacts, the no project alternative is considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative. Nevertheless, for the same reasons stated above, the no project alternative is rejected as infeasible.

Project 2-10 Market Street and Valencia Street Intersection Improvements

Project 2-10 originally involved only a single option as analyzed in the DEIR. Based upon public, stakeholder, and City agency input, SFMTA refined this project and refers to this refinement as Modified Option 1. Modified Option 1 is described and analyzed in more detail in the Comments and Responses document for this EIR. SFMTA has identified Modified Option 1 as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would install bicycle signal heads at the intersection of Market Street and Valencia Street, and narrow the existing sidewalk, from 15 feet to 10 feet, to provide a queuing area for bicyclists traveling from westbound Market Street to southbound Valencia Street.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 2-10 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this segment of the Market Street corridor, and would provide a critical link at this juncture of two important east-west (Market Street) and north-south (Valencia Street) routes in the existing bicycle route network. The Preferred Alternative also would provide a connection between the Noe Valley and Mission neighborhoods to destinations on Market Street and to points north of Market Street such as the Civic Center and Union Square areas, and the Financial District. Moreover the Preferred Alternative would connect bicyclists with the Bay Area Rapid Transit stations on Market Street, which provide connectivity to the greater San Francisco Bay Area and the San Francisco International Airport. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

The principal difference between design Option 1 and the Preferred Alternative is that Option 1 would install a westbound left-turn bicycle lane from Market Street to Valencia Street in addition to the queuing area for these left turns. The Preferred Alternative accomplishes the project goal of providing designated space on the right side of the road for bicyclists traveling from westbound Market Street to southbound Valencia Street. The addition of a bicycle left-turn lane in Option 1 would simply be redundant and therefore unnecessary. In addition, Option 1 would require bicyclists to merge across lanes of vehicular traffic and light-rail tracks to access the left-turn lane, which introduces conflict points. The Preferred Alternative also could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. For these reasons, the Preferred Alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative. In addition, for the foregoing considerations, Option 1 is hereby rejected as infeasible.

Project 2-11 Market Street Bicycle Lanes, 17th Street to Octavia Boulevard

Project 2-11 originally involved two options as analyzed in the DEIR, Option 1 and Option 2. Based upon public, stakeholder, and City agency input, SFMTA refined this project and refers to this refinement as Modified Option 1. Modified Option 1 is described and analyzed in more detail in the Comments and Responses document for this EIR. SFMTA has identified Modified Option 1 as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would install bicycle lanes on short segments of Market Street between 17th Street and Octavia Boulevard to close gaps in otherwise continuous bicycle lanes.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 2-11 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this important segment of the Market Street corridor, which is part of the City's most heavily used bicycle route. It would provide a connection between the Castro and Civic Center neighborhoods, connections to destinations on Market Street, and to points north and south of Market Street by connecting with existing and planned bicycle facilities on 17th Street, Sanchez Street, 16th Street, 14th Street, Duboce Avenue, and Octavia Boulevard. Moreover the Preferred Alternative would connect bicyclists with the Bay Area Rapid Transit stations on Market Street, which provide connectivity to the greater San Francisco Bay Area and the San Francisco International Airport. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

Both Option 1 and Modified Option 1 have significant and unavoidable impacts to traffic at one intersection and to loading at one location. However, the Preferred Alternative reduces that traffic impact to a less than significant level in the existing plus project scenario. Option 2 would remove fewer parking spaces than Option 1 or the Preferred Alternative, but option 2 would narrow the existing sidewalk at several locations, thereby increasing the pedestrian crossing distances at several intersections. The Preferred Alternative would remove fewer parking spaces than Option 1. For these reasons, the Preferred Alternative is also the Environmentally Superior Alternative, and Option 1 and Option 2 are hereby rejected as infeasible.

Project 2-12 Market Street Bicycle Lanes, Octavia Boulevard to Van Ness Avenue

The DEIR analyzed only a single option for this project, Option 1, and SFMTA has identified this as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative for Project 2-12 would install a combination of bicycle lanes and sharrows in both directions on Market Street between Octavia Boulevard and Van Ness Avenue.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 2-12 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this segment of the Market Street corridor and would fill the gap in the existing bicycle route network along this critical east-west route. Market Street is the main artery in the City's downtown street network, therefore the Preferred Alternative would provide a connection between the Civic Center, Mid-Market, and Union Square areas, and to points in almost every direction by connecting with existing bicycle facilities on Octavia Boulevard, Valencia Street, Page Street and 11th Street. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 2-12 was implemented on May 15, 2006, prior to the Bicycle Plan Injunction and certification of the EIR. The Preferred Alternative results in a net loss of six motorcycle parking spaces. However, the Preferred Alternative has increased motor vehicle driver's awareness that bicyclists may be on the road and has helped bicyclists identify a safe travel pathway outside the 'door zone'. It also has had the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. As the only option presented, and given that this project is associated with no significant impacts, it is considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

Project 2-13 McCoppin Street Bicycle Path, Market Street to Valencia Street

The DEIR analyzed only a single option for this project, Option 1, and SFMTA has identified this as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative for Project 2-13 would install a bi-directional bicycle path connecting the intersection of Market Street and Octavia Boulevard to the intersection of McCoppin Street and Valencia Street.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 2-13 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this critical link in the existing bicycle route network by providing a connection between the most heavily used north-south bicycle route on Valencia Street with the most heavily used east-west bicycle route on Market Street. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

There are no significant impacts associated with Project 2-13. The Preferred Alternative could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. As the only option presented, and given that this project is associated with no significant impacts, it is considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

Project 2-14 McCoppin Street Bicycle Lane, Gough Street to Valencia Street

Project 2-14 originally involved only a single option as analyzed in the DEIR. Based upon public, stakeholder, and City agency input, SFMTA refined this project and refers to this refinement as Modified Option 1. Modified Option 1 is described and analyzed in more detail in the Comments and Responses document for this EIR. SFMTA has identified Modified Option 1 as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would install a bicycle lane on westbound McCoppin Street from Gough Street to Valencia Street.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 2-14 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this segment of the McCoppin Street corridor and would fill the gap in the existing bicycle route network along this east-west route, providing a connection between the Civic Center and Mission neighborhoods, as well as a connection to existing and proposed bicycle facilities on McCoppin Street and Valencia Street. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

There are no significant impacts associated with this project, and while Option 1 would result in a net loss of one parking space, the Preferred Alternative would result in a net gain of four parking spaces. Also, the Preferred Alternative could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. For these reasons, the Preferred Alternative also is the Environmentally Superior Alternative, and Option 1 is hereby rejected as infeasible.

Project 2-15 Otis Street westbound Bicycle Lane, Gough Street to South Van Ness Avenue

The DEIR analyzed only a single option for this project, Option 1, and SFMTA has identified this as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative for Project 2-15 would install a bicycle lane on Otis Street from South Van Ness Avenue to Gough Street.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 2-15 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this segment of the Otis Street corridor and would fill the gap in the existing bicycle route network by providing a connection between the Civic Center area and points to the south, as well as a connection to planned bicycle facilities on McCoppin Street, which connects with the existing north-south bicycle route on Valencia Street. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

There are no significant impacts associated with Project 2-15. The Preferred Alternative could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. As the only option presented, and given that this project is associated with no significant impacts, it is considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

Project 2-16 Townsend Street Bicycle Lanes, 8th Street to The Embarcadero

Project 2-16 originally involved two options as analyzed in the DEIR, Option 1 and Option 2. Based upon public, stakeholder, and City agency input, SFMTA refined this project and refers to this refinement as Modified Option 1. Modified Option 1 is described and analyzed in more detail in the Comments and Responses document for this EIR. SFMTA has identified Modified Option 1 as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would install a combination of bicycle lanes and sharrows on Townsend Street between 8th Street and The Embarcadero.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 2-16 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this segment of Townsend Street and would fill a gap in the existing bicycle route network along this important east-west route, providing a connection between the South of Market and South Beach neighborhoods and the Caltrain Depot at 4th and Townsend streets. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

Although each of the options for this project is associated with numerous significant and unavoidable impacts, the Preferred Alternative is less impactful than Option 1 or Option 2 due to its refined design. The Preferred Alternative has eight fewer significant impacts than Option 2 and it reduces two of the impacts it shares with Option 1 to a less than significant level. The Preferred Alternative would result in more overall parking loss than Option 1 or Option 2 but this is almost entirely because the Preferred Alternative formalizes the existence of a 10-foot wide sidewalk on the north side of Townsend Street in those areas where it has not yet been constructed, and as a result, motorists have adopted the convention of parking perpendicular to the roadway. Although this perpendicular parking is technically illegal given the legislated sidewalk, such parking regulations are typically not enforced until sidewalks are constructed, therefore the parking 'loss' associated with converting this parking from perpendicular to parallel has been included in the EIR analysis for this project.

Option 1 and Option 2 do not fully account for the planned changes to 4th Street that are part of the Central Subway project. The Central Subway project would convert 4th Street into a two-way street north of Townsend Street, add rail tracks down the center of the street, and eliminate two southbound left turn lanes on 4th Street. The proposed configuration on southbound 4th Street

would be one through lane and one shared through-right turn lane. On northbound 4th Street there would be a shared through-right turn lane.

The Preferred Alternative would not add a two-way left-turn lane on Townsend Street between 3rd and 4th streets and would convert the angled parking on the south side of Townsend Street from 150 feet west of 5th Street to 4th Street to parallel parking. These refinements were made to maintain two eastbound lanes between 5th Street and 4th Street to accommodate the anticipated increase in Muni bus traffic due to the above-described changes by the Central Subway.

For these considerations, the Preferred Alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative. Also, based on the reasons cited above and elsewhere in this document and the administrative record, both Option 1 and Option 2 are hereby rejected as infeasible.

Project 3-1 Fell Street and Masonic Avenue Intersection Improvements

In response to the large number of reported collisions and in order to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety at the intersection of Fell Street and Masonic Avenue, the City requested relief from the Bicycle Plan injunction to implement Project 3-1 prior to the completion of the Bicycle Plan EIR. In May 2008, the Superior Court granted the City's motion to modify the injunction so as to allow implementation of the recommended safety improvements at the intersection of Fell Street and Masonic Avenue. Modifications to the existing traffic signal and lane configuration of the intersection were made, and as of September 16, 2008, SFMTA has implemented Project 3-1. Therefore, the environmental analysis of Project 3-1 is being presented as part of the Bicycle Plan EIR for informational purposes.

The DEIR analyzed only a single option for this project, Option 1, and SFMTA identified this as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative for Project 3-1 involved signal phasing and timing changes that would eliminate the conflict between Fell Street westbound left-turn vehicles and pedestrians and bicycles crossing Masonic Avenue on the south side of Fell Street. The traffic signal phasing was changed to provide exclusive phases for westbound Fell Street left turns and for Panhandle Pathway traffic.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 3-1 would promote and encourage safe bicycling at this critical point along the heavily used east-west multi-use pedestrian/bicycle pathway in the Panhandle, providing a connection to existing and planned bicycle facilities on Fell Street and access to and from Golden Gate Park. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

The Preferred Alternative has significant and unavoidable impacts to traffic in both the existing and cumulative scenarios in combination with Project 3-2, however, with the implementation of mitigation measure M-TR-P3-1a impacts in the existing scenario would be reduced to a less than significant level. The Preferred Alternative also eliminates the conflict between westbound left-turning vehicles on Fell Street and bicyclists and pedestrians on the Panhandle Pathway, which provides a significant increase in safety. Even though this project is associated with significant and unavoidable impacts, it already has been implemented. Technically, the no project alternative would have been the Environmentally Superior Alternative in comparative terms, but the no project alternative is rejected as infeasible for the reasons stated above.

Project 3-2 Masonic Avenue Bicycle Lanes, Fell Street to Geary Boulevard

The DEIR analyzed two options for Project 3-2, Option 1 and Option 2. However, SFMTA, while approving both options as part of the Bicycle Plan approval, has elected not to proceed with legislation or implementation of either option at this time. Instead, it will continue to work with the public and other stakeholders on the planning effort for this project. Consequently, there is no preferred project at this location.

Both Option 1 and Option 2 would promote and encourage safe bicycling by providing on-street bicycle facilities, where none currently exist, along this segment of the Masonic Avenue corridor, an existing major north-south bicycle route that provides a connection to existing and planned bicycle facilities on Post Street, Geary Boulevard, Turk Street, Golden Gate Avenue, Fell Street and the Pan Handle multi-use path that lead to and from Golden Gate Park. Both options also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

Option 2, which is associated with fewer impacts, is the Environmentally Superior Alternative. However, as stated above, SFMTA is making no decision to select an alternative pending further public input and planning.

Project 3-3 McAllister Street Bicycle Lane, Market Street to Masonic Avenue

The DEIR analyzed only a single option for Project 3-3, Option 1. However, SFMTA, while approving Option 1 as part of the Bicycle Plan approval, has elected not to proceed with legislation or implementation of that option at this time. Instead, it will continue to work with the public and other stakeholders on the planning effort for this project. Consequently, there is no preferred project at this location.

Option 1 would promote and encourage safe bicycling by providing on-street bicycle facilities along this segment of the McAllister Street corridor, an existing major east-west bicycle route that provides a connection between the Central Market Street, Civic Center, Tenderloin, and Western Addition neighborhoods, as well as a connection to existing and planned bicycle facilities on Market, Polk, Webster, Steiner, Scott, and Baker Streets, and Masonic Avenue. Option 1 also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

Option 1 for Project 3-12 has no impacts to traffic, transit, parking, pedestrians, bicycles or loading; but Option 1 has the potential to increase the motor vehicle drivers' awareness that bicyclists may be on the road as well as identify for bicyclists the pathway outside the 'door zone', could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. As the only option presented, and given that this project is associated with no significant impacts, it is considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

Project 3-4 Polk Street Bicycle Lane, Market Street to McAllister Street

The DEIR analyzed two options for this project, Option 1 and Option 2. SFMTA has selected Option 1 as the Preferred Alternative for this project. The Preferred Alternative for Project 3-4 would install a bicycle lane in the northbound direction on Polk Street between Market Street and McAllister Street.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 3-4 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this segment of the Polk Street corridor and would fill the gap in the existing bicycle route network along this important north-south route, providing a connection between Market Street and areas to the south with the Civic Center area, as well as a connection to existing and planned bicycle facilities on Market, Grove, and McAllister Streets. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

Neither the Preferred Alternative nor Option 2 has significant impacts to transit, parking, pedestrians, bicycles or loading. Option 2 would require a change to the existing traffic operations by converting Polk Street between Market Street and Hayes Street to two-way operation from one-way southbound operation. Although this could provide a minor improvement to traffic circulation in the immediate area, it also would require major traffic signal modifications and decrease the southbound traffic capacity of the street, which could result in higher traffic volumes and increased delays on Polk Street, a major transit corridor. Option 2 would also force northbound traffic to make a left turn at Hayes Street, which could

offset any traffic circulation improvement, and it removes more parking than Option 1. The Preferred Alternative achieves the project goals without these potentially adverse consequences and public inconveniences. The Preferred Alternative also could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. For these reasons, the Preferred Alternative is also the Environmentally Superior Alternative and Option 2 is hereby rejected as infeasible.

Project 3-5 Scott Street Bicycle Lane, Fell Street to Oak Street

The DEIR analyzed two options for this project, Option 1 and Option 2. SFMTA has selected Option 1 as the Preferred Alternative for this project. The Preferred Alternative for Project 3-5 would install a northbound left-turn bicycle lane on Scott Street between Oak Street and Fell Street.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 3-5 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this segment of Scott Street and would provide an enhanced bicycle facility at this important north-south connection point between the 'Wiggle' and the major east-west bicycle route on Fell Street. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

Neither Option 1 nor the Preferred Alternative has significant impacts to transit, parking, pedestrians, bicycles or loading. Option 2 would remove three on-street parking spaces. The Preferred Alternative would increase the on-street parking supply, improve the ability of bicyclists to access the bicycle lanes on Fell Street, and could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. Based on these considerations, the Preferred Alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative. In addition, Option 2 is hereby rejected as infeasible for the reasons set forth above.

Project 3-6 The "Wiggle" Improvements

The DEIR analyzed only a single option for this project, Option 1, and SFMTA has identified this as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative for Project 3-6 would install sharrows on Duboce Avenue, Steiner Street, Waller Street, Pierce Street, Haight Street, and Scott Street. It would install a northbound bicycle lane on Scott Street between Haight and Oak Streets, and a bicycle box and right turn restriction on northbound Scott Street at Oak Street

The Preferred Alternative for Project 3-6 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this important segmented, multi-street that provides the primary for bicyclists traveling between the

north and northwest parts of the City, and the east and southeast parts of the City. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 3-6 was implemented on May 13, 2006 prior to the Bicycle Plan Injunction and certification of the EIR. The Preferred Alternative has no impacts and has increased the motor vehicle drivers' awareness that bicyclists may be on the road as well as identified for bicyclists the pathway outside the 'door zone'. It also has had the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. As the only option presented, and given that this project is associated with no significant impacts, it is considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

Project 4-1 16th Street Bicycle Lanes, 3rd Street to Terry Francois Boulevard

The DEIR analyzed only a single option for this project, Option 1, and SFMTA has identified this as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative for Project 4-1 would install bicycle lanes in both directions on 16th Street between 3rd Street and Terry A. Francois Boulevard.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 4-1 would promote and encourage safe bicycling in the Mission Bay, a rapidly developing area of the City, and would fill the gap in the existing bicycle route network. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

There are no significant impacts associated with Project 4-1. As the only option presented, and given that this project is associated with no significant impacts, it is considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

Project 4-2 Cargo Way Bicycle Lanes, 3rd Street to Jennings Street

The DEIR analyzed two options for this project, Option 1 and Option 2. SFMTA has selected Option 1 as the Preferred Alternative for this project. The Preferred Alternative for Project 4-2 would install bicycle lanes in both directions on Cargo Way between 3rd Street and Jennings Street.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 4-2 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this segment of Cargo Way and would fill the gap in the existing bicycle route network along this important east-west route, providing bicycle facilities where none currently exist and providing

a connection between the San Francisco Bay Trail and existing or planned bicycle facilities on Illinois Street, which links to bicycle facilities providing access to all areas of the City, including Mission Bay and China Basin. The Preferred Alternative would provide access to the 3rd Street light rail corridor and its multi-modal connections, and would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

Neither Option 2 nor the Preferred Alternative has significant impacts. And although the Preferred Alternative removes approximately 160 on-street parking spaces, the demand for these spaces is very low due to the fact that the adjacent land is either undeveloped or not fronting Cargo Way, and those buildings which do front Cargo Way have off-street parking lots to accommodate their demand. Option 2 would involve substantial capital expenses to construct the off-street bicycle path and to modify and upgrade the intersections at cross streets to the path to regulate right-of-way, and to connect the path, which would be on the south side of roadway, with the new bicycle facility on the Illinois Street bridge. For these reasons an on-street bicycle facility is preferable from both an operational and economic viewpoint. Also, the Preferred Alternative would have the added benefit of eliminating the hazard for 'dooring' by parking vehicles and could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. For these reasons, the Preferred Alternative is also the Environmentally Superior Alternative, and Option 2 is hereby rejected as infeasible.

Project 4-3 Illinois Street Bicycle Lanes, 16th Street to Cargo Way

The DEIR analyzed only a single option for this project, Option 1, and SFMTA has identified this as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative for Project 4-3 would install bicycle lanes in both directions on Illinois Street between 16th Street and Cargo Way.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 4-3 would promote and encourage safe bicycling on the Illinois Street corridor and would fill the gap in the existing bicycle route network along this important north-south route, providing a connection between the Mission Bay and India Basin areas, and connections to existing or planned bicycle facilities on 16th Street, Mariposa Street, Cesar Chavez Street, and Cargo Way. The Preferred Alternative would provide access to the 3rd Street light rail corridor and its multi-modal connections, and would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

There are no significant impacts associated with Project 4-3. However, the Preferred Alternative would substantially increase the on-street parking supply by converting the pull-in angled

on-street parking on Illinois Street into back-in angled parking, which would potentially benefit bicyclists by increasing the drivers' visibility of oncoming bicyclists and other vehicles both when entering and exiting a parking stall. The Preferred Alternative also could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. As the only option presented, and given that this project is associated with no significant impacts, it is considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

Project 4-4 Innes Avenue Bicycle Lanes, Donahue Street to Hunters Point Boulevard

The DEIR analyzed two options for Project 4-4, Option 1 and Option 2. However, SFMTA, while approving both options as part of the Bicycle Plan approval, has elected not to proceed with legislation or implementation of either option at this time. Instead, it will continue to work with the public and other stakeholders on the planning effort for this project. Consequently, there is no preferred project at this location.

Both Option 1 and Option 2 would promote and encourage safe bicycling by providing on-street bicycle facilities, where none currently exist, along this segment of the Innes Avenue corridor, an existing east-west bicycle route that provides a connection between the 3rd Street Corridor and the Hunter's Point Shipyard area. Both options also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

Option 2, which is associated with fewer impacts, is the Environmentally Superior Alternative. However, as stated above, SFMTA is making no decision to select an alternative pending further public input and planning.

Project 4-5 Mississippi Street Bicycle Lanes, 16th Street to Mariposa Street

The DEIR analyzed only a single option for this project, Option 1, and SFMTA has identified this as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative for Project 4-5 would install bicycle lanes in both directions on Mississippi Street between 16th Street and Mariposa Street.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 4-5 would promote and encourage safe bicycling in the Mission Bay area, a rapidly developing area of the City, and would fill the gap in the existing bicycle route network, providing a connection between Mission Bay and Potrero Hill. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

There are no significant impacts associated with Project 4-5. As the only option presented, and given that this project is associated with no significant impacts, it is considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

Project 5-1 23rd Street Bicycle Lanes, Kansas Street to Potrero Avenue

Project 5-1 originally involved only a single option as analyzed in the DEIR. Based upon public, stakeholder, and City agency input, SFMTA refined this project and refers to this refinement as Modified Option 1. Modified Option 1 is described and analyzed in more detail in the Comments and Responses document for this EIR. SFMTA has identified Modified Option 1 as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would install a combination of bicycle lanes and sharrows in both directions on 23rd Street between Kansas Street and Potrero Avenue.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 5-1 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this segment of 23rd Street and would fill a gap in the existing bicycle route network along this important east-west route, providing a connection between the Mission and Potrero Hill neighborhoods and San Francisco General Hospital. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

Neither Option 1 nor the Preferred Alternative has significant impacts. The Preferred Alternative would remove 36 on-street parking spaces on the north side of 23rd Street between Kansas Street and Potrero Avenue. It also would add sharrows instead of a bicycle lane on eastbound 23rd Street from Potrero Avenue to Utah Street, and on westbound 23rd Street from 50 feet west of Utah Street to Potrero Avenue. The Preferred Alternative would provide an enhanced bicycle facility on 23rd Street as compared to Option 1. The removal of parking along the non-residential side of the street would provide sufficient street space for bicycle lanes in both directions on 23rd Street between Utah and Kansas Streets and wider traffic lanes, which could reduce potential conflicts between bicycles and parked cars and between bicycles and motor vehicles in the adjacent lane. In addition, installing sharrows instead of bicycle lanes in the block generally between Potrero Avenue and Utah Street, maintains the existing lane configuration and therefore would not affect traffic operations at the 23rd Street and Potrero Avenue intersection. In contrast, Option 1 proposed a bicycle lane in the eastbound direction only, with sharrows in the westbound direction, and narrowing of the traffic lanes from 12 feet to 10 feet, and narrowing of the south side parking strip from 8 feet to 7 feet. The Preferred Alternative achieves the project goals without these potential adverse consequences. For these reasons, the

Preferred Alternative also is the Environmentally Superior Alternative, and Option 1 is hereby rejected as infeasible.

Project 5-2 Alemany Boulevard Bicycle Lanes, Bayshore Boulevard to Rousseau Street

Project 5-2 originally involved only a single option as analyzed in the DEIR. Based upon public, stakeholder, and City agency input, SFMTA refined this project and refers to this refinement as Modified Option 1. Modified Option 1 is described and analyzed in more detail in the Comments and Responses document for this EIR. SFMTA has identified Modified Option 1 as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would install a combination of bicycle lanes and sharrows in both directions on Alemany Boulevard between Bayshore Boulevard and Rousseau Street.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 5-2 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this segment of Alemany Boulevard and would fill a gap in the existing bicycle route network by providing a new route connecting the Bayview, Bernal Heights, Excelsior and Portola neighborhoods. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

Neither Option 1 nor the Preferred Alternative has significant impacts. Option 1, which is associated with fewer overall impacts, is the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would remove approximately 375 on-street parking spaces, but the demand for many of these spaces is very low due to the fact that the adjacent land is either undeveloped or where developed off-street parking is available. The Preferred Alternative require bicyclists to ride adjacent to fast-moving traffic on portions of Alemany Boulevard near the I-280 on and off ramps. The Preferred Alternative would remove a travel lane in these areas in order to provide a buffer lane between fast moving traffic and the proposed bicycle lane. This lane removal would not impact intersection operating conditions or cause delay, but it would provide an enhanced level of comfort and safety for bicyclists. Additionally, the Preferred Alternative could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. For the foregoing reasons, Option 1 is hereby rejected as infeasible.

Project 5-3 Alemany Boulevard Bicycle Lanes, Rousseau Street to San Jose Avenue

The DEIR analyzed only a single option for this project, Option 1, and SFMTA has identified this as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative for Project 5-3 would install a

combination of bicycle lanes and sharrows in both directions on Alemany Boulevard between Rousseau Street and San Jose Avenue.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 5-3 would promote and encourage safe bicycling on this portion of the Alemany Boulevard corridor and would fill the gap in the existing bicycle route network along this very important north-south route, providing a connection between the outer Mission, Excelsior and Mission neighborhoods. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 5-3 was implemented on April 28, 2006 prior to the Bicycle Plan Injunction and certification of the EIR. The Preferred Alternative has no significant impacts and has increased the motor vehicle drivers' awareness that bicyclists may be on the road as well as identified for bicyclists the pathway outside the 'door zone'. As the only option presented, and given that this project is associated with no significant impacts, it is considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

Project 5-4 Bayshore Boulevard Bicycle Lanes, Cesar Chavez Street to Silver Avenue

Project 5-4 originally involved two options as analyzed in the DEIR, Option 1 and Option 2. Based upon public, stakeholder, and City agency input, SFMTA refined this project and refers to this refinement as Modified Option 2. Modified Option 2 is described and analyzed in more detail in the Comments and Responses document for this EIR. SFMTA has identified Modified Option 2 as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would install a combination of bicycle lanes and sharrows on Bayshore Boulevard between Cesar Chavez Street and Silver Avenue, except between Oakdale and Jerrold Avenues, where the existing southbound Class III bicycle route would remain on Jerrold Avenue, Barneveld Avenue, and Loomis Street and the existing northbound Class III bicycle route would be relocated from Bayshore Boulevard to Oakdale Avenue, Loomis Street, Barneveld Avenue and Jerrold Avenue. The Preferred Alternative also would add a shared transit and bicycle lane on northbound Bayshore Boulevard between Helena Street and Marengo Street.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 5-4 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this segment of the Bayshore Boulevard corridor and would fill a gap in the existing bicycle route network along this important north-south route, providing a connection between the Bayview, Mission, Potrero Hill and Portola neighborhoods. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

All of the options for this project have similar impacts with significant and unavoidable impacts to traffic (at two intersections), to transit, and to loading. The Preferred Alternative eliminates the impacts associated with Option 1, and shares the same impacts as Option 2. However, the Preferred Alternative has benefits over Option 1 and Option 2 due to the Preferred Alternative's refined design. The Preferred Alternative includes design modifications at the intersection of Bayshore Boulevard and Oakdale Avenue that would improve intersection operating conditions slightly compared to Option 2. In addition, the Preferred Alternative would add a shared transit and bicycle lane on northbound Bayshore Boulevard between Helena Street and Marengo Street. Currently the right-side travel lane on northbound Bayshore Boulevard is used by buses, regular traffic, and bicycles. A shared bus and transit lane would carry less traffic than a general traffic lane, and therefore, it would be an improvement over the existing condition for transit vehicles. Furthermore, with the implementation of mitigation measures M-TR-P5-4f and M-TR-P5-4g, the Preferred Alternative would reduce the aforementioned loading impacts to less than significant levels. Additionally, the Preferred Alternative could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists and is considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative. For the foregoing reasons, Option 1 and Option 2 are hereby rejected as infeasible.

Project 5-5 Cesar Chavez Street Bicycle Lanes, I-280 to US 101 Freeways

The DEIR analyzed two options for this project, Option 1 and Option 2. SFMTA has selected Option 1 as the Preferred Alternative for this project. The Preferred Alternative for Project 5-5 would install bicycle lanes in both directions on Cesar Chavez Street between the I-280 and US-101 freeways, or generally between Pennsylvania Avenue and Kansas Street.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 5-5 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this segment of the Cesar Chavez Street corridor and would fill the gap in the existing bicycle route network along this important east-west route. The Preferred Alternative would also be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

The Preferred Alternative is associated with significant and unavoidable impacts to one intersection in both the existing and cumulative scenarios. However, the Preferred Alternative achieves the project goals, and provides an enhanced bicycle facility because where a traffic lane would be removed, bicyclists generally would be operating next to a single lane of traffic instead of two lanes. The resultant decrease in vehicle speeds from this design feature would provide an enhanced level of comfort and safety for bicyclists. Additionally, the Preferred Alternative could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. Option 2 is

associated with the fewest overall impacts, and consequently, is considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative. Nevertheless, for the reasons specified above, Option 2 is hereby rejected as infeasible.

Project 5-6 Cesar Chavez Street/26th Street Bicycle Lanes, Sanchez Street to US-101

The DEIR analyzed two options for Project 5-6, Option 1 and Option 2. However, SFMTA, while approving both options as part of the Bicycle Plan approval, has elected not to proceed with legislation or implementation of either option at this time. Instead, it will continue to work with the public and other stakeholders on the planning effort for this project. Consequently, there is no preferred project at this location.

Both Option 1 and Option 2 would promote and encourage safe bicycling by providing on-street bicycle facilities, where none currently exist, along this segment of the Cesar Chavez/26th Streets corridor, an existing major east-west bicycle route that provides a connection between the Mission Bay, Bayview, Mission, and Noe Valley neighborhoods, as well as a connection to existing bicycle facilities on Sanchez, Harrison, and Cesar Chavez Streets, and Potrero Avenue. Both options also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

Option 2, which is associated with fewer impacts, is the Environmentally Superior Alternative. However, as stated above, SFMTA is making no decision to select an alternative pending further public input and planning.

Project 5-7 Glen Park Area Bicycle Lanes, (A) Connection between Alemany Boulevard and San Jose Avenue and (B) Connection between Monterey Boulevard and San Jose Avenue

Project 5-7 originally involved two options as analyzed in the DEIR, Option 1 and Option 2. Based upon public, stakeholder, and City agency input, SFMTA refined this project and refers to this refinement as Modified Option 2. Modified Option 2 is described and analyzed in more detail in the Comments and Responses document for this EIR. The project is divided into two segments: A and B. Segment A is the connection between Alemany Boulevard and San Jose Avenue via Arlington Street, Bosworth Street, Lyell Street, Milton Street, Rousseau Street, and Still Street, and it originally had two options. Segment B is the connection between Monterey Boulevard and San Jose Avenue via Monterey Boulevard and San Jose Avenue ramps, and it originally had only one option. For both segments, the Preferred Alternative would install a

combination of bicycle lanes and sharrows on portions of the streets listed. SFMTA has identified Modified Option 2 as the Preferred Alternative for this project, in its entirety.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 5-7 would promote and encourage safe bicycling in and around the Glen Park BART station and would fill several gaps in the existing bicycle route network in the Glen Park area, providing connections to the multi-modal BART station from all directions via streets with existing or planned bicycle facilities such as Alemany Boulevard, San Jose Avenue, Diamond Street, Circular Avenue, Arlington Street, and Bosworth Street. The preferred alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

None of the options analyzed for Project 5-7 would create a significant environmental impact. The Preferred Alternative would provide an enhanced bicycle facility such as a bicycle left-turn lane from Alemany Boulevard to Lyell Street providing a shorter, flatter, more direct bicycle route. Also, the Preferred Alternative could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. For these reasons, the Preferred Alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

However, SFMTA, although identifying the Preferred Alternative as described above, has elected not to proceed with legislation or implementation of the following parts of Segment A: Arlington Street between Wilder and Bosworth Streets, and Bosworth Street between Arlington and Diamond Streets. Instead, SFMTA will continue to work with the public, stakeholders, and City agencies on the planning effort for this part of the project. As such, there is no preferred project for this part. Consequently, Option 1 and Option 2 are hereby rejected as infeasible for all of Project 5-7 except for the above-listed parts of Arlington and Bosworth Streets. SFMTA is making no decision to select an alternative pending further public input and planning.

Project 5-8 Kansas Street Bicycle Lanes, 23rd Street to 26th Street

Project 5-8 originally involved only a single option as analyzed in the DEIR. Based upon public, stakeholder, and City agency input, SFMTA refined this project and refers to this refinement as Modified Option 1. Modified Option 1 is described and analyzed in more detail in the Comments and Responses document for this EIR. SFMTA has identified Modified Option 1 as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would install bicycle lanes in both directions on Kansas Street between 23rd and 26th Streets.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 5-8 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this segment of Kansas Street and would fill the gap in the existing bicycle route network along this important north-south route, providing a connection between the southeast area of the City and all points to the north and the west. It also would provide a connection to existing and planned bicycle facilities on Cesar Chavez Street and Potrero Avenue, and provide bicycle access to San Francisco General Hospital. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

There are no significant impacts associated with Project 5-8. For these reasons, the Preferred Alternative is also the Environmentally Superior Alternative, and Option 1 is hereby rejected as infeasible.

Project 5-9 Ocean Avenue Bicycle Lanes, Alemany Boulevard to Lee Avenue

Project 5-9 originally involved two options as analyzed in the DEIR, Option 1 and Option 2. Based upon public, stakeholder, and City agency input, SFMTA refined this project and refers to this refinement as Modified Option 2. Modified Option 2 is described and analyzed in more detail in the Comments and Responses document for this EIR. SFMTA has identified Modified Option 2 as the Preferred Alternative for this project in its entirety. The Preferred Alternative would install a combination of bicycle lanes and sharrows on Ocean Avenue between Alemany Boulevard and Lee Avenue.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 5-9 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this segment of Ocean Avenue and would fill a gap in the existing bicycle route network along this important east-west route, providing a connection between the Outer Mission and Ingleside/Sunnyside neighborhoods and between the Balboa Park BART and Muni Metro Station and San Francisco City College. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

None of the options has any significant impacts. Options 1 and 2 would remove travel lanes and parking along portions of Ocean Avenue between Lee Avenue and San Jose Avenue to provide bicycle lanes; the Preferred Alternative includes several design changes to Options 1 and 2, including modified travel lane and parking removals, and modified locations for bicycle lanes and sharrows. These design changes would enhance traffic and transit operations compared to Options 1 and 2. The Preferred Alternative would increase the drivers' awareness that bicyclists may be on the road as well as identify for bicyclists the pathway outside the 'door zone'. Based

on the foregoing, the Preferred Alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative. In addition, the abovementioned considerations are the basis to reject Options 1 and 2 as infeasible.

Project 5-10 Phelan Avenue Bicycle Lanes, Judson Avenue to Ocean Avenue

The DEIR analyzed two options for Project 5-10, Option 1 and Option 2. However, SFMTA, while approving both options as part of the Bicycle Plan approval, has elected not to proceed with legislation or implementation of either option at this time. Instead, it will continue to work with the public and other stakeholders on the planning effort for this project. Consequently, there is no preferred project at this location.

Both Option 1 and Option 2 would promote and encourage safe bicycling by providing on-street bicycle facilities, where none currently exist, along this segment of the Phelan Avenue corridor, an existing major north-south bicycle route that provides a connection between the Ingleside neighborhood and points north, and connections to City College of San Francisco, as well as a connection to planned bicycle facilities on Ocean Avenue. Both options also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

Option 2, which is associated with fewer impacts, is the Environmentally Superior Alternative. However, as stated above, SFMTA is making no decision to select an alternative pending further public input and planning.

Project 5-11 Potrero Avenue and Bayshore Boulevard Bicycle Lanes, 25th Street to Cesar Chavez Street

The DEIR analyzed only a single option for this project, Option 1, and SFMTA has identified this as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative for Project 5-11 would install bicycle lanes in both directions on Potrero Avenue generally between 25th Street and Cesar Chavez Street.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 5-11 would promote and encourage safe bicycling on this portion of the Potrero Avenue corridor, and would fill the gap in the existing bicycle route network along this very important north-south route, providing a connection between the Bernal Heights and Mission neighborhoods, as well as facilitate bicycle access to San Francisco General Hospital and nearby recreational facilities. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

There are no significant impacts associated with Project 5-11. As the only option presented, and given that this project is associated with no significant impacts, it is considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

Project 5-12 Sagamore Street and Sickles Avenue Bicycle Lanes, Alemany Boulevard to Brotherhood Way

Project 5-12 originally involved two options as analyzed in the DEIR, Option 1 and Option 2. Based upon public, stakeholder, and City agency input, SFMTA refined this project and refers to this refinement as Modified Option 1. Modified Option 1 is described and analyzed in more detail in the Comments and Responses document for this EIR. SFMTA has identified Modified Option 1 as the Preferred Alternative for this project. The Preferred Alternative would install bicycle lanes in both directions on Sagamore Street and Sickles Avenue between Alemany Boulevard and Brotherhood Way.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 5-12 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along these segments of Sagamore Street and Sickles Avenue and would fill a gap in the existing bicycle route network along this east-west route, providing an important connection between the eastern and western halves of the City, as well as a connection to existing and planned bicycle facilities on Alemany Boulevard, San Jose Avenue, and Brotherhood Way. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

None of the options analyzed for Project 5-12 would create a significant environmental impact. The Preferred Alternative would convert the pull-in angled on-street parking on Sagamore Street into back-in angled parking, which would benefit bicyclists by increasing the drivers' visibility of oncoming bicyclists and other vehicles both when entering and exiting a parking stall. The Preferred Alternative also could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. Option 2, which is associated with fewer overall impacts, is the Environmentally Superior Alternative. However, for the reasons above Option 1 and Option 2 are hereby rejected as infeasible.

Project 5-13 San Bruno Avenue Bicycle Lanes, Paul to Silver Avenues

The DEIR analyzed two options for Project 5-13, Option 1 and Option 2. However, SFMTA, while approving both options as part of the Bicycle Plan approval, has elected not to proceed with legislation or implementation of either option at this time. Instead, it will continue to work with the public and other stakeholders on the planning effort for this project. Both Options 1

and 2 would install bicycle lanes in both directions on San Bruno Avenue between Paul Avenue and Silver Avenue.

Both options for Project 5-13 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this segment of the San Bruno Avenue corridor and would fill a gap in the existing bicycle route network along this important north-south route, providing a connection between the Bayview, Outer Excelsior, and Portola neighborhoods. In addition, both options would provide a connection to existing and planned bicycle facilities on Bayshore Boulevard, Paul Avenue, and Silver Avenue. Both options also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

Both options for this project have the same significant and unavoidable impacts to loading. Additionally, both Option 1 or Option 2 could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. Notwithstanding the aforementioned loading impacts, Option 2, which is associated with fewer overall impacts, is the Environmentally Superior Alternative. Nevertheless, Option 1 has fewer impacts to bicycles because it would provide a wider parking lane, which would reduce the possibility of bicyclists riding inside the 'door zone'. Option 1 would also provide 10-foot wide traffic lanes, which are common throughout the City and therefore not expected to have any impact on traffic operations. Therefore SFMTA has selected Option 1 as the Preferred Alternative. However, as stated above, SFMTA has elected not to proceed with legislation or implementation of an option at this time and therefore is not rejecting Option 2 pending further public input and planning.

Project 6-1 Claremont Boulevard Bicycle Lanes, Dewey Boulevard to Portola Drive

Project 6-1 originally involved only a single option as analyzed in the DEIR. Based upon public, stakeholder, and City agency input, SFMTA refined this project and refers to this refinement as Modified Option 1. Modified Option 1 is described and analyzed in more detail in the Comments and Responses document for this EIR. SFMTA has identified Modified Option 1 as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would install a combination of bicycle lanes and sharrows on Claremont Boulevard between Dewey Boulevard and Portola Drive.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 6-1 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this segment of Claremont Boulevard and would fill the gap in the existing bicycle route network along this important north-south route, providing a connection between the Forest Hill, West Portal, and St. Francis Wood neighborhoods, as well as a connection to existing and planned bicycle facilities on Dewey Boulevard, Taraval Street, and Portola Drive. The Preferred

Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

None of the options analyzed for Project 6-1 would create a significant environmental impact. Yet, Option 1, which is associated with fewer overall impacts, is the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would remove approximately three parking spaces near Portola Drive in order to maintain a sufficient turning radii for traffic turning from westbound Portola Drive to northbound Claremont Boulevard. The Preferred Alternative also would increase the motor vehicle drivers' awareness that bicyclists may be on the road as well as identify for bicyclists the pathway outside the 'door zone', and it could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. For these reasons, Option 1 is hereby rejected as infeasible in favor of the Preferred Alternative.

Project 6-2 Clipper Street Bicycle Lanes, Douglass Street to Portola Drive

Project 6-2 originally involved two options as analyzed in the DEIR, Option 1 and Option 2. Based upon public, stakeholder, and City agency input, SFMTA clarified the project limits. As a result, the original Option 1 for Segment II on Diamond Heights Boulevard from the intersection of Diamond Heights Boulevard with Clipper Street to the intersection of Diamond Heights Boulevard and Portola Avenue already has been rejected from further consideration in the Comments and Responses document. Therefore there is only one option for each project segment. Option 1 for Segments I and II is described and analyzed in more detail in the Comments and Responses document for this EIR. The SFMTA identified Option 1 as the Preferred Alternative for Project 6-2. The Preferred Alternative would install a combination of bicycle lanes and sharrows on Clipper Street and Diamond Heights boulevard between Douglass Street and Portola Avenue.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 6-2 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along these segments of Clipper Street and Diamond Heights Boulevard and would fill the gap in the existing bicycle route network along this important east-west route, providing a connection between the Noe Valley, Diamond Heights, and Portola neighborhoods, as well as a connection to existing and planned bicycle facilities on Portola Drive. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

None of the options retained in the EIR's analysis for Project 6-2 would create a significant environmental impact except for a cumulative transit impact from combined Projects 6-2, 6-5, and 6-6. The Preferred Alternative would increase the motor vehicle drivers' awareness that

bicyclists may be on the road as well as identify for bicyclists the pathway outside the 'door zone', and it could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. Based on the abovementioned considerations, the Preferred Alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative. Option 1 is hereby rejected as infeasible on the grounds set forth above and elsewhere in this document.

Project 6-3 Laguna Honda Boulevard Bicycle Lanes, Plaza Street to Woodside

Project 6-3 originally involved two options as analyzed in the DEIR, Option 1 and Option 2. Based upon public, stakeholder, and City agency input, SFMTA refined this project and refers to this refinement as Modified Option 2. Modified Option 2 is described and analyzed in more detail in the Comments and Responses document for this EIR. SFMTA has identified Modified Option 2 as the Preferred Alternative for this project in its entirety. The Preferred Alternative would install bicycle lanes in both directions on Laguna Honda Boulevard between Clarendon Avenue and Woodside Avenue.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 6-3 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this segment of Laguna Honda Boulevard and would connect and extend the proposed bicycle route on Laguna Honda Boulevard between Portola Drive and Woodside Avenue which connects to the proposed Portola Drive bicycle route. Project 6-3, Option 2 would provide north-south access to the Portola Drive bicycle route which is an important northwest and southwest link for various neighborhoods in the City and also an important link to the other bicycle routes accessing the Financial District and the neighboring districts. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

None of the options analyzed for Project 6-3 would create a significant environmental impact. Option 2, which is associated with fewer overall impacts, is the Environmentally Superior Alternative. However, the Preferred Alternative would extend the northern project boundary from Plaza Street to Clarendon Avenue, and therefore, would provide an enhanced, longer continuous bicycle facility, as compared to Option 1 or Option 2. The Preferred Alternative also could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. For the reasons contained herein, Option 1 and Option 2 are hereby rejected as infeasible in favor of the Preferred Alternative.

Project 6-4 Laguna Honda Boulevard Bicycle Lanes, Portola Drive to Woodside Avenue

Project 6-4 originally involved only a single option as analyzed in the DEIR. Based upon public, stakeholder, and City agency input, SFMTA refined this project and refers to this refinement as Modified Option 1. Modified Option 1 is described and analyzed in more detail in the Comments and Responses document for this EIR. SFMTA has identified Modified Option 1 as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would install a combination of bicycle lanes and sharrows on Laguna Honda Boulevard between Portola Drive and Woodside Avenue.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 6-4 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this segment of Laguna Honda Boulevard and would fill the gap in the existing bicycle route network along this important north-south route, providing a connection between the Forest Hill, West Portal, and St. Francis Wood neighborhoods, as well as a connection to existing and planned bicycle facilities on Laguna Honda Boulevard and Portola Drive. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

None of the options analyzed for Project 6-4 would create a significant environmental impact. The Preferred Alternative would remove fewer parking spaces than Option 1, it would increase the motor vehicle drivers' awareness that bicyclists may be on the road as well as identify for bicyclists the pathway outside the 'door zone', and it could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. For these reasons, the Preferred Alternative is also the Environmentally Superior Alternative, and Option 1 is hereby rejected as infeasible.

Project 6-5 Portola Drive Bicycle Lanes, Corbett Avenue to O'Shaughnessy Boulevard

Project 6-5 originally involved only a single option as analyzed in the DEIR. Based upon public, stakeholder, and City agency input, SFMTA refined this project and refers to this refinement as Modified Option 1. Modified Option 1 is described and analyzed in more detail in the Comments and Responses document for this EIR. SFMTA has identified Modified Option 1 as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would install a combination of bicycle lanes and sharrows in both directions on Portola Drive between Corbett Avenue and O'Shaughnessy Boulevard.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 6-5 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this segment of Portola Drive and would fill a gap in the existing bicycle route network along this

important route, providing a connection between the Diamond Heights, Noe Valley and Twin Peaks neighborhoods. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

Option 1 for this project has several significant and unavoidable impacts to traffic and to transit. The significant and unavoidable transit impacts in the cumulative scenario would remain with the Preferred Alternative. However, the Preferred Alternative eliminates all of traffic impacts because it retains the existing lane configurations at the intersections of Woodside Avenue/O'Shaughnessy Boulevard/Portola Avenue and Portola Avenue/Burnett Avenue/Diamond Heights Boulevard/Clipper Street. The Preferred Alternative would increase the motor vehicle drivers' awareness that bicyclists may be on the road as well as identify for bicyclists the pathway outside the 'door zone', and it could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. For these reasons, the Preferred Alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative. Also, these abovementioned considerations are the reasons to reject as infeasible Option 1.

Project 6-6: Portola Drive Bicycle Lanes, O'Shaughnessy Boulevard/Woodside Avenue to Sloat Boulevard/St. Francis Boulevard

Project 6-6 originally involved two options as analyzed in the DEIR, Option 1 and Option 2. Based upon public, stakeholder, and City agency input, SFMTA refined this project and refers to this refinement as Modified Option 2. Modified Option 2 is described and analyzed in more detail in the Comments and Responses document for this EIR. SFMTA has identified Modified Option 2 as the Preferred Alternative for this project in its entirety. The Preferred Alternative would install a combination of bicycle lanes and sharrows in both directions on Portola Drive between O'Shaughnessy Boulevard/Woodside Avenue and Sloat Boulevard/St. Francis Boulevard.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 6-6 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this segment of Portola Drive and would fill a gap in the existing bicycle route network along this important route, providing a connection between the Diamond Heights, Saint Francis Wood and West Portal neighborhoods. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

Option 1 for this project has several significant impacts to traffic. However, both Option 2 and the Preferred Alternative eliminate those impacts by retaining the existing lane configurations at

the intersection of Woodside Avenue/O'Shaughnessy Boulevard/Portola Avenue. Option 2, which is associated with fewer overall impacts than the Preferred Alternative, is the Environmentally Superior Alternative. However, the Preferred Alternative would provide a continuous northbound bicycle lane, which is an enhanced bicycle facility as compared to Option 2. Also, the Preferred Alternative would increase the motor vehicle drivers' awareness that bicyclists may be on the road as well as identify for bicyclists the pathway outside the 'door zone', and it could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. For these reasons, Option 1 and Option 2 are hereby rejected as infeasible in favor of the Preferred Alternative.

Project 7-1 Intersection Improvements at 7th Avenue and Lincoln Way

Project 7-1 originally involved only a single option as analyzed in the DEIR. Based upon public, stakeholder, and City agency input, SFMTA refined this project and refers to this refinement as Modified Option 1. Modified Option 1 is described and analyzed in more detail in the Comments and Responses document for this EIR. The Final EIR analyzed two options for this project, Option 1 and Modified Option 1. SFMTA has identified Modified Option 1 as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would involve modifications at the intersection of 7th Avenue the Lincoln Way to allow northbound bicyclists to cross Lincoln Way. These modifications would involve the installation of a cut-through in raised median and installation of a northbound bicycle-only lane on the south leg of the intersection.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 7-1 would promote and encourage safe bicycling and would fill the gap in the existing bicycle route network at this intersection, providing a connection between the Inner Sunset area and Golden Gate Park. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

None of the options analyzed for Project 7-1 would create a significant environmental impact. The Preferred Alternative would provide bicyclists with a designated right-of-way for travel and could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. Based on these considerations, the Preferred Alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative. Option 1 also is hereby rejected as infeasible in reliance on the reasons set forth above and elsewhere in this document and the administrative record.

Project 7-2 7th Avenue Bicycle Lanes, Lawton Street to Lincoln Way

The DEIR analyzed only a single option for this project, Option 1, and SFMTA has identified this as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative for Project 7-2 would add a combination of bicycle lanes and sharrows in both directions on 7th Avenue between Lawton Street and Lincoln Way.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 7-2 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along the 7th Avenue corridor and would fill a gap in the existing bicycle route network along this important north-south route, providing a connection between the West Portal, Laguna Honda, and Forest Hill areas with the Inner Sunset and UC Medical Center, as well as a connection to existing and planned bicycle facilities on Kirkham Street, Parnassus Street, and the intersection of 7th Avenue and Lincoln Way. The preferred alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

None of the options analyzed for Project 7-2 would create a significant environmental impact. As the only option presented, and given that this project is associated with no significant impacts, it is considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

Project 7-3 Great Highway and Point Lobos Avenue Bicycle Lanes, 48th Avenue/El Camino Del Mar to Fulton Street

Project 7-3 originally involved only a single option as analyzed in the DEIR. Based upon public, stakeholder, and City agency input, SFMTA refined this project and refers to this refinement as Modified Option 1. Modified Option 1 is described and analyzed in more detail in the Comments and Responses document for this EIR. SFMTA has identified Modified Option 1 as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would install bicycle lanes in both directions on Great Highway and Point Lobos Avenue between 48th Avenue/El Camino Del Mar and Fulton Street, and would install sharrows to the following street segments, which would be added to the bicycle route network: Balboa Street, between Point Lobos/Great Highway and La Playa Street; and La Playa Street between Balboa and Cabrillo Streets.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 7-3 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along these segments of Great Highway, Point Lobos Avenue, Balboa Street and La Playa Street, and would fill a gap in the existing bicycle route network along this important route, providing a connection between Golden Gate Park, Ocean Beach and Sutro Heights Park. The Preferred

Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

None of the options analyzed for Project 7-3 would create a significant environmental impact. The Preferred Alternative would increase the motor vehicle drivers' awareness that bicyclists may be on the road as well as identify for bicyclists the pathway outside the 'door zone', and it could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. For these reasons, the Preferred Alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative. Also, based on the foregoing considerations, Option 1 is hereby rejected as infeasible.

Project 7-4 John F. Kennedy Drive and Kezar Drive Bicycle Lanes, Stanyan Street to Transverse Drive

Project 7-4 originally involved only a single option as analyzed in the DEIR. Based upon public, stakeholder, and City agency input, SFMTA refined this project and refers to this refinement as Modified Option 1. Modified Option 1 is described and analyzed in more detail in the Comments and Responses document for this EIR. SFMTA has identified Modified Option 1 as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would install bicycle lanes in both directions on John F. Kennedy Drive and Kezar Drive between Stanyan Street and Transverse Drive.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 7-4 would promote and encourage safe bicycling and would fill the gap in the existing bicycle route network along this major east-west route through Golden Gate Park, which serves as a key commuter route between the Richmond and Sunset neighborhoods and downtown business areas, and serves as one of the most popular recreational routes providing access to all of attractions and destinations in Golden Gate Park. In addition the Preferred alternative would connect to the several north-south routes the also pass through Golden Gate Park increasing the overall completeness of the bicycle route network. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

None of the options analyzed for Project 7-4 would create a significant environmental impact. Parking and travel lane changes that are required to create the Preferred Alternative have already been implemented by the Recreation and Park Department and the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority as part of the John F. Kennedy Drive Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements project. These improvements were the subject of a separate EIR on the Music Concourse Underground Garage and Golden Gate Concourse Authority Projects, which the Planning

Commission certified on July 23, 2003. The Preferred Alternative would provide bicyclists with a designated right-of-way for travel and could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. For these reasons, the Preferred Alternative is also the Environmentally Superior Alternative, and Option 1 is hereby rejected as infeasible.

Project 7-5 Kirkham Street Bicycle Lanes, 9th Avenue to Great Highway

The DEIR analyzed two options for this project, Option 1 and Option 2. SFMTA has selected Option 1 as the Preferred Alternative for this project. The Preferred Alternative for Project 7-5 would install bicycle lanes in both directions on Kirkham Street between 9th Avenue and Great Highway. The Preferred Alternative is divided into three segments: the east segment, between 9th and 18th Avenues; the central segment between 18th and 20th Avenues; and the west segment, between 20th Avenue and Great Highway.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 7-5 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along the Kirkham Street corridor and would fill a gap in the existing bicycle route network along this important east-east route in the Sunset District, providing a connection between the Inner Sunset and Outer Sunset neighborhoods, access to the Pacific Ocean, as well as a connection to existing and planned bicycle facilities on 20th and 34th Avenues, and Great Highway. The preferred alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

None of the options analyzed for Project 7-5 would create a significant environmental impact. Option 2, which is associated with fewer overall impacts, is the Environmentally Superior Alternative. Nevertheless, the Preferred Alternative would provide continuous bicycle lanes which would be an enhanced bicycle facility as compared to Option 2. Also, the Preferred Alternative could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. However, SFMTA, although identifying the Preferred Alternative as described above, has elected not to proceed with legislation or implementation of the central segment portion of Project 7-5. Instead, it will continue to work with the public, stakeholders, and City agencies on the planning effort for this portion of the project. As such, there is no preferred project for the central segment. Consequently, Project 7-5 Option 2 is hereby rejected for the east and west segments only. For the central segment, SFMTA is making no decision to select an alternative pending further public input and planning.

Project 7-6 Page and Stanyan Streets Intersection Traffic Signal Improvements

The DEIR analyzed only a single option for this project, Option 1, and SFMTA has identified this as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative for Project 7-6 would signalize the Page and Stanyan Streets intersection and add pedestrian push buttons and bicycle signal heads.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 7-6 would promote and encourage safe bicycling at this intersection which is the connection between the east-west route on page Street and Golden Gate Park. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

Project 7-6 does not create any significant environmental impacts. The Preferred Alternative would improve pedestrian and bicyclist safety by signalizing the intersection and eliminating right-of-way conflicts. As the only option presented, and given that this project is associated with no significant impacts, it is considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

Project 8-1 19th Avenue Mixed-use Path, Buckingham Way to Holloway Avenue

The DEIR analyzed two options for this project, Option 1 and Option 2. SFMTA has selected Option 2 as the Preferred Alternative for this project. The Preferred Alternative for Project 8-1 would construct a new mixed-use pedestrian/bicycle pathway within the San Francisco State University campus between Buckingham Way and Holloway Avenue and a mixed-use pedestrian/bicycle bridge extending between the student housing complex at University Park North and the north side of Thornton Hall.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 8-1 would promote and encourage safe bicycling through the SFSU campus and would provide a connection to existing and planned bicycle facilities on Buckingham Way and Holloway Avenue. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

The Preferred Alternative has no impacts and would be constructed entirely outside of the public right-of-way. Option 1 would remove approximately 45 on-street parking spaces and 35 motorcycle spaces. For these reasons, the Preferred Alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative., Given these considerations and the other benefits of the Preferred Alternative, Option 1 is hereby rejected as infeasible.

Project 8-2 Buckingham Way Bicycle Lanes, 19th Avenue to 20th Avenue

Project 8-2 originally involved only a single option as analyzed in the DEIR. Based upon public, stakeholder, and City agency input, SFMTA refined this project and refers to this refinement as Modified Option 1. Modified Option 1 is described and analyzed in more detail in the Comments and Responses document for this EIR. SFMTA has identified Modified Option 1 as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would install sharrows on westbound Buckingham Way from 19th Avenue to 20th Avenue.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 8-2 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this short segment of Buckingham Way and would fill the gap in the existing bicycle route network by providing a connection between the existing and planned bicycle facilities on 19th Avenue, 20th Avenue, and the multi-use pedestrian/bicycle pathway through the San Francisco State University campus. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

There are no significant impacts associated with Project 8-2. Option 1 would remove approximately 10 on-street parking spaces, but the Preferred Alternative would not change the parking conditions in the project area. Additionally, the Preferred Alternative could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. For these reasons, the Preferred Alternative is also the Environmentally Superior Alternative, and Option 1 is hereby rejected as infeasible.

Project 8-3 Holloway Avenue Bicycle Lanes, Junipero Serra Boulevard to Varela Avenue

The DEIR analyzed two options for this project, Option 1 and Option 2. SFMTA has selected Option 1 as the Preferred Alternative for this project. The Preferred Alternative for Project 8-3 would install bicycle lanes in both directions on Holloway Avenue between Junipero Serra Boulevard and Varela Avenue.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 8-3 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this segment of the Holloway Avenue corridor and would fill the gap in the existing bicycle route network along this important east-west route, providing a connection between the Ingleside and Park Merced neighborhoods, as well as a connection to the San Francisco State University campus and planned bicycle facilities therein. The Preferred Alternative also would be

consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

Neither the Preferred Alternative nor Option 2 has any significant impacts. However, Option 2 would remove approximately 50 parking spaces along Holloway Avenue, which is a residential area. When classes are in session, these parking spaces are used mostly by San Francisco State University students. The Preferred would achieve the project goals without the public inconvenience associated with this parking loss and could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. In light of the reasons described above, the Preferred Alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative. Also, based on the considerations set forth herein and elsewhere in the record, Option 2 is hereby rejected as infeasible.

Project 8-4 John Muir Drive Bicycle Lanes, Lake Merced Blvd to Skyline Boulevard

The DEIR analyzed only a single option for this project, Option 1, and SFMTA has identified this as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative for Project 8-4 would install bicycle lanes in both directions on John Muir Drive between Lake Merced Boulevard and Skyline Boulevard.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 8-4 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this segment of John Muir Drive and provide a connection between existing bicycle facilities on Lake Merced and Skyline Boulevards, as well as improve bicyclists' access to recreational facilities at Lake Merced and Fort Funston. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 8-4 has no significant impacts. The Preferred Alternative would convert the pull-in angled on-street parking on John Muir Drive into back-in angled parking which would potentially benefit bicyclists by increasing the drivers' visibility of oncoming bicyclists and other vehicles both when entering and exiting a parking stall. As the only option presented, and given that this project is associated with no significant impacts, it is considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

Project 8-5 Sloat Boulevard Bicycle Lanes, Great Highway to Skyline Boulevard

The DEIR analyzed only a single option for this project, Option 1, and SFMTA has identified this as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative for Project 8-5 would install bicycle lanes in both directions on Sloat Boulevard between the Great Highway and Skyline Boulevard.

The Preferred Alternative for Project 8-5 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this segment of Sloat Boulevard and provide a connection between existing and planned bicycle facilities on the Great Highway and Lake Merced Boulevard, as well as improve bicyclists' access to recreational facilities at the Pacific Ocean, the San Francisco Zoo, and Lake Merced. The Preferred Alternative also would be consistent with and promote the Bicycle Plan Project's overall goal to increase safe bicycle use, as well as the Bicycle Plan's specific goals 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

There are no significant impacts associated with Project 8-5. The Preferred Alternative would benefit transit operation on Sloat Boulevard between 37th and 39th Avenues, and could have the beneficial effect of improving roadway conditions and safety for bicyclists. As the only option presented, and given that this project is associated with no significant impacts, it is considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

Additional Alternatives Proposed by the Public

During the term of analysis of the 2009 Bicycle Plan and its associated EIR and their related comment period, various property owners, residents, and commentators proposed alternative near-term project design options to the Preferred Project(s). To the extent that these comments addressed the adequacy of the EIR analysis, they were described and analyzed in the Responses to Comments document. As presented in the record, the Final EIR reviewed a reasonable range of alternatives, and CEQA does not require the project sponsor to consider every proposed alternative so long as the CEQA requirements for alternatives analysis have been satisfied. For the foregoing reasons as well as economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations set forth herein and elsewhere in the record and this document, these alternatives are hereby rejected as infeasible in favor of the Preferred Project.

VII. Statement of Overriding Considerations

Notwithstanding the significant and unavoidable impacts for the Preferred Project and related actions, the Commission finds, after considering the Final EIR and based on substantial evidence in the record and as set forth elsewhere in these findings and herein, that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations outweigh the identified significant effects on the environment.

1. Approval of this Project would help fulfill the mandate of San Francisco's Transit First Policy as set forth in the San Francisco Charter, Section 8A.115, to make bicycling an attractive alternative to travel by private automobile, and to promote bicycling by encouraging safe streets for riding, convenient access to transit, bicycle lanes and secure bicycle parking.
2. Approval of the Project is consistent with San Francisco Charter Section 8A.113(a) which requires MTA to facilitate the design and operation of City streets to enhance alternative forms of transit, including bicycling.
3. This Project is also consistent with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Regional Bicycle Plan, updated in 2009 as part of the update to the Regional Transportation Plan, "Transportation 2035." The Regional Bicycle Plan recognizes regionally significant elements of the San Francisco Bicycle Route Network and allows for funding for improvements to the those regionally significant elements from MTC funding sources.
4. The Project is consistent with state, region and Citywide plans and policies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by facilitating the increased use of bicycles in San Francisco, which will help reduce dependence on the private automobile, because private automobiles are a major source of greenhouse gas emissions. These plans and policies include, but are not limited to:
 - a. San Francisco's "Climate Action Plan: Local Actions to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions," adopted in September 2004, which affirms San Francisco's commitment to reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 20% below 1990 levels by 2012. Among other policies, the Climate Action Plan outlines policies to encourage bicycling and discourage trips by private automobile.
 - b. San Francisco Department of the Environment's Strategic Plan 2009-2011, a annually updated mission statement by the Department of the Environment, which among other topics, outlines goals and actions to promote bicycle use in San Francisco in order to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from transportation by 963,000 tons per year by 2012.

- c. the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, otherwise known as AB 32, a California state law that requires the state’s greenhouse gas emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020.
 - d. United Nations Urban Environmental Accords, a series of implementable goals that can be adopted at a city level to achieve urban sustainability, promote healthy economies, advance social equity and protect the world’s ecosystem. Adopted in 2005, and signed by San Francisco, the Accords, among other goals, advocates for policies to reduce the percentage of commute trips by single occupancy vehicles by ten percent in seven years.
5. Approval of the Project, will allow the City to be eligible for substantial amounts of bicycle funding. For example, to be eligible for many sources of funds, California cities and counties must have a Bicycle Transportation Plan (BTP) that discusses items (a) through (k) in Section 891.2 of the California Streets and Highways Code. The city or county must adopt the BTP or certify that it has been updated and complies with Section 891.2 of the California Streets and Highways Code and the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Approval of the Bicycle Plan will enable the City to use money from these sources instead of requiring the use of General Fund or other money.
6. The Project has identified eight specific goals whose achievement would result in substantial and measurable positive benefits to the City. These goals are outlined below and their specific benefits provide further evidence that the implementation of the Project outweighs its unavoidable adverse environmental effects.
- a. Goal 1 – Refine and Expand the Existing Bicycle Route Network: Achievement of this goal would significantly improve the connectivity of the Bicycle Route Network throughout the City. The proposed infrastructure improvements, namely the addition of striped Class II bike lanes and marked shared lane pavement markings, or “sharrows,” would nearly double the number of miles of bike routes. Achievement of this goal and its proposed actions would also result in improved coordination with other City agencies, more robust data systems for monitoring network performance, the integration of best practices for facility design, and a revision of the City’s project evaluation methodologies so that they better respond to the multimodal nature of the City’s transportation system.
 - b. Goal 2 – Ensure Plentiful, High-Quality Bicycle Parking: Achievement of this goal and its proposed actions will result in a significant increase of bicycle parking in key locations throughout the City and improved access to crucial destinations. Achievement of this goal would also modify the Planning Code to better prioritize bicycle parking in new and existing residential and commercial

developments, while ensuring well-defined guidelines for bicycle facility design, parking outreach, and enforcement of bicycle theft.

- c. Goal 3 – Expand Bicycle Access to Transit and Bridges: Achievement of this goal and its proposed actions would result in bicyclists being able to utilize existing transit services much more effectively through expanded installation of bicycle racks and the implementation of policies that permit bicyclists on transit vehicles. Ultimately, the achievement of this goal will result in enhanced connections to regional destinations for bicyclists.
- d. Goal 4 – Educate the Public about Bicycle Safety: In recent years, bicycling in the City has increased by 43 percent, and now bicycle trips make up 6 percent of all daily trips. This goal seeks to ensure that current and future bicyclists are well-trained and knowledgeable about how to ride a bicycle safely. Achievement of this goal and its proposed actions would result in expanded and targeted training and outreach to all bicyclists, but especially for youth and novice bicyclists. Implementation of these actions will ultimately reduce bicycle collisions and the number of traffic conflicts in the City.
- e. Goal 5 – Improve Bicycle Safety through Targeted Enforcement: Achievement of this goal and its proposed actions would result in increased enforcement of both bicyclist and motorist violations that most frequently cause injuries and fatalities, while ensuring that all SFPD police officers are better informed about the rights and responsibilities of bicyclists and techniques required for safe and legal sharing of the roadway. The proposed actions for this goal also call for more standardized reporting procedures for bicycle collisions, thereby facilitating the City's ability to measure the effectiveness of its facilities and programs, as well as respond to locations with a high number of bicycle collisions.
- f. Goal 6 – Promote and Encourage Safe Bicycling: Achievement of this goal and its proposed actions would result in more awareness about the benefits of bicycling to residents, especially among diverse age, income, and ethnic populations. This goal also prioritizes more coordinated outreach efforts, economic development of bicycle-related business, and the development of public bicycle sharing in the City, a program that has been demonstrably successful in cities around the world.
- g. Goal 7 – Adopt Bicycle-Friendly Practices and Policies: Achievement of this goal and its proposed actions would result in modifications to the General Plan's Transportation Element, Downtown Area Plan and to the City's environmental review guidelines. As a result of these changes, bicycling as a safe and sustainable transportation mode would be better integrated and prioritized in the future development and growth of the City. In addition, this goal seeks to provide City

staff with more robust data about the growth, impact, and scope of bicycling in the City.

- h. Goal 8 - Prioritize and Increase Bicycle Funding: Achievement of this goal and its proposed actions would enable the City to fund the proposed improvements to the City's bicycle network. Funds dedicated to bicycling infrastructure are very scarce and competition amongst municipalities is fierce. In order for the City to be able to fund its desired bicycle improvements, it must comprehensively develop a long-range funding plan, as outlined in this goal.
7. With its temperate climate, dense neighborhoods, limited supply of automobile parking and compact geography, the City offers an ideal venue for a diverse group of bicyclists: commuters, shoppers, recreational riders, and tourists. Bicycling in the City has increased dramatically in recent years, and implementation of this Project will ensure a continued increase in the number of people that use bicycles as a safe transportation mode. Such an increase in bicycling is a critical component to improving the future health and prosperity of San Francisco. By investing in and implementing the bicycle facility improvements, educational efforts, and innovative policies and programs recommended in the Project, the City will make bicycling a more viable mobility option. Finally, this Project supports larger City efforts to revitalize and transform its streets into more inviting public spaces that prioritize non-motorized travel.
 8. The benefits of increased bicycle usage are varied and well-documented. Bicycling not only has health benefits for the bicyclist, but also it contributes to an improved quality of life for society as a whole. More specifically, bicycling as a safe and ubiquitous mode of travel can benefit the City in the following ways:
 - a. Transportation: Bicycling can significantly reduce gridlock on, and facilitate more efficient use of, City streets. The vast majority of trips made by automobile are within a few miles of their origins. These short trips could be accomplished by bicycle, provided there is adequate and safe infrastructure. By promoting the policies and implementing the projects in this Project, the City can dramatically shift the number of people driving to more sustainable modes of travel. Augmented bicycle infrastructure and enhanced policies that promote bicycling, as proposed in this Project, can also improve connections to other public transportation modes, further reducing the number of trips made by private automobile.
 - b. Health and safety: Bicycling not only provides an efficient mode of travel, but also a great way for people to exercise. As rates of obesity and physical inactivity continue to rise in America, the importance of bicycling cannot be understated. Even minimal amounts of bicycling have been shown to produce measurable

physical and mental health benefits. Investments in increased physical activity have also been shown to reduce long-term health care costs. Implementation of the near-term projects, enforcement policies, and education efforts in this Project will also result in increased visibility of bicyclists, a reduction in moving violations, and increased awareness of driver and bicyclist responsibilities. The end result will be a reduction in the number of bicycle collisions on City streets.

- c. Environmental: Bicycles are the most environmentally sustainable vehicle available. They produce none of the greenhouse gases associated with global warming, nor any of the pollutants linked to asthma or other chronic health problems. Furthermore, bicycles are quiet and do not contribute to noise pollution. Implementation of this Project will undoubtedly facilitate the City's push to become a more sustainable City that preserves and protects its natural resources for future generations.
- d. Economic: The annual costs of congestion, pollution, traffic accidents, as well as constructing new, and maintaining existing, automobile infrastructure are significant. Augmenting and improving bicycling infrastructure in the City can significantly reduce the economic costs associated with driving by shifting drivers to more cost-effective transportation options. Furthermore, increased bicycling infrastructure can improve access to many of the City's commercial corridors. Studies have shown that in a dense urban environment such as the City many shoppers do not access commercial centers by automobile, but rather through transit or other non-motorized modes. This Project would stimulate significant economic growth by facilitating access to commercial zones and encouraging the development of these zones not just as shopping "centers," but rather as vibrant public spaces.
- e. Equity: The annual costs of driving are in thousands of dollars, leaving many segments of the population unable to afford the luxury of owning an automobile. Conversely, bicycles are one of the cheapest modes of transportation available. For many low-income individuals, bicycles constitute their predominant mode of travel. The implementation of the projects and policies in this Project will significantly expand bicycle infrastructure in the City, thereby providing enhanced transportation access to underserved segments of the population.

Project-level Significant and Unavoidable Impacts and Overriding Considerations

In addition to the reasons set forth above, the following specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations outweigh the identified significant, unavoidable

effects (as referenced by their Impact Numbers noted in Section IV) on the environment due to the implementation of the specific projects contained in the Preferred Project.

Project 1-3: North Point Bicycle Lanes, Embarcadero to Van Ness Avenue, Mod. Option 1

This project is associated with a significant and unavoidable loading impact (North Point east of Columbus) in both the existing and cumulative conditions, as further detailed in the section on significant and unavoidable impacts. (See Impacts #24 and 25). Notwithstanding these impacts, the preferred project is acceptable because the bike lanes on North Point are a critical link between the waterfront, Van Ness Avenue (a major north-south arterial and US Route 101), and Fort Mason, which provides further connections to the Marina District, Chrissy Field and the Golden Gate Bridge. Project 1-3 is already part of the Route 2 of Bicycle Network and would extend existing Class II bike lanes from the Embarcadero to Fort Mason. Furthermore, this route is the flattest east-west bicycle route option in this area. Finally, although on-street loading will be impacted on North Point during peak commute hours, the proposed North Point bicycle lanes will make on-street, double-parked loading activities easier during non-peak hours. Loading is legally allowed from Class II bicycle lanes when curb-side loading is not available. Therefore, between 9:00 a.m. and 3:30 p.m. double parked loading will actually be safer and more convenient for legitimate commercial loading on North Point.

Project 2-1: 2nd Street Bicycle Lanes, King Street to Market Street, Mod. Option 1

This project is associated with a variety of significant and unavoidable intersection impacts, transit delays, and loading impacts in both the existing and cumulative conditions, as further detailed in the section on significant and unavoidable impacts. (See Impact #26 through 32). Notwithstanding these impacts, the preferred project benefits the City because 2nd Street serves as a vital element of the Bicycle Network. As part of Bicycle Route 11, 2nd Street provides a critical link between Market Street (Route 50 – a major bicycle thoroughfare), Bicycle Routes 30/5, the Montgomery Street BART station, and key destinations in SoMa – the 4th and King Caltrain station, AT&T Park, and the waterfront. Bicyclists are currently using 2nd Street as a route through SoMa and to/from downtown, and recent bicycle counts have shown an increase in the number of bicyclists using this corridor (a 39 percent increase at 2nd/Townsend from 2006 to 2008). Unfortunately, the narrow width of the street and high traffic volumes make 2nd Street a particularly challenging bicycling environment. The addition of bicycle lanes on 2nd Street would reduce the likelihood of “dooring” collisions, while improving bicyclist visibility and reducing vehicle speeds.

Project 2-2: 5th Street Bicycle Lanes, Market Street to Townsend Street, Mod. Option 2

This project is associated with numerous significant and unavoidable intersection impacts in both the existing and cumulative conditions, as further detailed in the section on significant and

unavoidable impacts. (See Impacts #33 through 36). Even with these impacts, the preferred project is acceptable because 5th Street serves as a crucial element of the Bicycle Network. As part of Bicycle Route 19, 5th Street provides a critical link between Market Street (Route 50 – a major bicycle thoroughfare), Bicycle Routes 30/36, the Powell Street BART station, and key destinations in SoMa – the 4th and King Caltrain station, AT&T Park, and the waterfront. 5th Street provides the most proximate north-south bicycle route between the 4th and King Caltrain station and downtown, and, therefore, is essential to connecting bicyclists to regional transit services. Bicycle ridership in this corridor has also increased substantially in recent years (a 21 percent increase at 5th/Townsend and a 31 percent increase at 5th/Market since 2006). At the same time, the 5th Street corridor ranked 10th in 2007 in the number of bicycle collisions. By reducing lane width, dedicating more space for bicyclists, slowing vehicle speed, and improving bicyclist visibility, bicycle lanes on 5th Street will ensure that a growing number of bicyclists can travel safely between downtown and important destinations in SoMa.

Project 2-3: 14th Street Bicycle Lanes, Dolores Street to Market Street, Option 1; Project 2-11: Market Street Bicycle Lanes, 17th Street to Octavia Boulevard, Mod. Option 1

Project 2-3 by itself is not associated with any significant and unavoidable impact. However, the combined design modifications of Project 2-3 and Project 2-11 produces a significant and unavoidable intersection impact (Church/Market/14th) in the cumulative condition, as further detailed in the section on significant and unavoidable impacts. (See Impact #37). Notwithstanding these impacts, Project 2-3 provides multiple benefits by filling a gap within the Bicycle Route Network that extends bicycle lanes on Route 30 from Dolores Street to Market Street. The installation of bicycle lanes will have a number of positive results for pedestrians and bicyclists, including reduced crossing distances, improved visibility, slower vehicular speeds, and reduced numbers of bicyclists using the sidewalks. Motorists will also benefit from this project as traffic circulation will improve because the proposed lane design is consistent with the configuration east of Dolores Street. Finally, the widened parking lane will facilitate more convenient and safer parking conditions. See below for more on the statement of overriding consideration for Project 2-11.

Project 2-4: 17th Street Bicycle Lanes, Corbett Avenue to Kansas Street, Mod. Option 1; Project 2-6: Division Street Bicycle Lanes, 9th Street to 11th Street, Option 2

The combined design modifications of Project 2-4 and Project 2-6 result in a number of significant and unavoidable intersection and transit delay impacts, as further detailed in the section on significant and unavoidable impacts. (See Impact #38 through 44.) Project 2-4 outweighs these impacts because 17th Street serves as a vital east-west route in the Bicycle Route Network. 17th Street is Route 40 in the Bicycle Route Network and bicycle lanes on this street would dramatically improve east-west travel for bicyclists, as well as enhance connectivity to transit services at the 16th Street BART Station and the Castro Muni station. Furthermore, Route

40 offers connections to numerous other north-south bicycle routes. The 17th Street corridor also has seen substantial growth in the number of bicyclists (a 57 percent increase at 17th/Valencia since 2006). The benefits of Project 2-6 also outweigh these impacts. Project 2-6 would promote and encourage safe bicycling along the Division Street corridor and would fill the gap in the existing bicycle route network along this important east-west route, providing a connection between the South of Market area with points to the west and to the north, as well as a connection to existing bicycle facilities on 11th Street. Because of its location under the US 101 freeway, and the prevalence of vehicular traffic, this segment of Division Street is especially inhospitable to bicyclists. The addition of Class II bicycle lanes on Division Street would greatly enhance the road environment and bicycling experience in this corridor. By reducing lane width, dedicating more space for bicyclists, slowing vehicle speed, and improving bicyclist visibility, the addition of bicycle lanes on 17th Street and Division Street will ensure that a growing number of bicyclists can travel safely through the these areas.

Project 2-7: Fremont Street Bicycle Lane, Harrison Street to Howard Street, Option 1; Project 2-9: Howard Street Bicycle Lane, Embarcadero to Fremont Street, Option 1

Project 2-7 by itself is not associated with any significant or unavoidable impact. However, the combined design modifications of Project 2-7 and Project 2-9 produces a significant and unavoidable intersection impact (Fremont/Howard) in both the existing and cumulative conditions, as further detailed in the section on significant and unavoidable impacts. (See Impact #45-46.) Notwithstanding this impact, Project 2-7 is acceptable because it would add an important new segment to the City's Bicycle Route Network. The addition of Class II and III bicycle facilities on Fremont Street would facilitate connections to Route 30 on Folsom Street and the larger bicycle route network. Fremont Street also serves as a major off-ramp from I-80 into San Francisco and high vehicle speeds make Fremont Street a particularly challenging bicycling environment. Finally, the nearby construction of the Transbay Terminal and planned residential growth in this area necessitates an improved environment for bicyclists and pedestrians. By reducing lane width, dedicating more space for bicyclists, slowing vehicle speed, and improving bicyclist visibility, bicycle lanes on Fremont Street will ensure that a growing number of bicyclists can travel safely in this area. See below for more on the statement of overriding consideration for Project 2-9.

Project 2-9: Howard Street Bicycle Lane, Embarcadero to Fremont Street, Option 1

In addition to the significant and unavoidable impact generated by the combination of Project 2-7 and Project 2-9 (as discussed above), Project 2-9 by itself results in a significant and unavoidable intersection impact (Howard/Fremont) for both existing and cumulative conditions, as further detailed in the section on significant and unavoidable impacts. (See Impact #47-48.) Even with this impact, the preferred project will benefit the City in that it would extend existing bicycle lanes on Howard Street (Route 30) east to the Embarcadero. These new lanes would

provide a needed connection between the Embarcadero and destinations west into SoMa. Bicycle ridership along the Howard Street corridor is also on the rise (47 percent increase at 11th/Howard since 2006), and this project would ensure additional safe connections for growing numbers of riders. Finally, Route 30 will help to enhance regional transit connections for bicycle riders due to its proximity to the Transbay Transit Terminal.

Project 2-11: Market Street Bicycle Lanes, 17th Street to Octavia Boulevard, Mod. Option 1

This project is associated with a significant and unavoidable intersection impact (Church/Market/14th Streets) in the cumulative condition. This project is also associated with a significant and unavoidable loading impact (north side of Market Street near Noe Street) in both the existing and cumulative conditions, as further detailed in the section on significant and unavoidable impacts. (See Impact #49-51.) Notwithstanding these significant and unavoidable impacts, the benefits of the preferred project outweigh these detriments because the project creates continuous bicycle infrastructure on Market Street, the primary bicyclist connection to/from downtown and a major connector to local and regional transit services. Bicycle ridership on Market Street during the P.M. peak has increased dramatically in recent years a 33 percent increase at 11th/Market and a 31 percent increase at 5th/Market since 2006. At the same time, the Market Street corridor ranked first in the number of bicycle injury collisions from 2003 to 2007 with 179. By reducing lane width, slowing vehicle speed, and improving bicyclist visibility, bicycle lanes on Market Street will ensure that a growing number of bicyclists can travel safely to and from the downtown core.

Project 2-16: Townsend Bicycle Lanes, 8th Street to Embarcadero, Mod. Option 1

Numerous significant and unavoidable intersection and transit delay impacts accompany this project as further detailed in the section on significant and unavoidable impacts. (See Impact #32 and #52-57.) These impacts, however, are balanced against the benefits of the preferred project supporting a crucial element of the Bicycle Network along Townsend Street. As part of Bicycle Route 36, Townsend Street provides a critical link from the Embarcadero west through SoMa, as well as connections to numerous north-south bicycle routes to/from downtown and key destinations in SoMa – the 4th and King Caltrain station, AT&T Park, and the waterfront. Townsend Street provides the most proximate east-west bicycle route to the 4th and King Caltrain station and is essential to connecting bicyclists to regional transit services. Bicycle ridership in this corridor has also increased substantially in recent years (a 39 percent increase at 2nd/Townsend since 2006). By reducing lane width, dedicating more space for bicyclists, slowing vehicle speed, and improving bicyclist visibility, bicycle lanes on Townsend Street will ensure that a growing number of bicyclists can travel safely to destinations in SoMa. The abovementioned benefits outweigh the identified impacts of this project.

Project 3-2: Masonic Avenue Bicycle Lanes, Fell Street to Geary Boulevard, Preferred Option not yet determined; Project 3-1: Fell Street and Masonic Avenue Intersection Improvements

Project 3-2 by itself results in significant and unavoidable intersection and transit delay impacts as further detailed in the section on significant and unavoidable impacts. (See Impact # 58-71.) In addition, the combined design modifications of Project 3-2 and Project 3-1 generates a significant and unavoidable intersection impact (Masonic/Fell) in the cumulative condition. Nevertheless, this Project provides an important north-south connection between the Panhandle/Golden Gate Park vicinity and Geary Boulevard, a primary east-west corridor in the western part of the City. Masonic Avenue (Route 55) is a major north-south route for bicyclists and connects to several east-west bicycle routes, as well as the University of San Francisco, a significant generator of bicycle trips. Bicycle ridership in this corridor is also on the rise, as the 2008 bicycle counts revealed a 39 percent increase in bicyclists at Masonic Avenue and the Panhandle since 2006. The presence and speed of vehicles in this area also presents a particularly challenging environment for bicyclists. From 2003 to 2007, the Masonic Avenue Corridor ranked 10th in the number of bicycle injury collisions, while the intersection of Fell Street and Masonic Avenue ranked 1st. By reducing lane width, dedicating more space for bicyclists, slowing vehicle speed, and improving bicyclist visibility, bicycle lanes on Masonic Avenue will ensure that a growing number of bicyclists can travel safely in this area.

Due to a high number of bicycle injury collisions and escalating safety concerns at the Fell Street and Masonic Avenue intersection, Project 3-1 was granted relief from the Bicycle Plan injunction and was implemented in September of 2008. As a result, Project 3-1 is not included in this statement of overriding considerations.

Project 5-4: Bayshore Boulevard Bicycle Lanes, Cesar Chavez Street to Silver Avenue, Mod. Option 1

This project is associated with a significant and unavoidable loading impact (Bayshore Boulevard between Cesar Chavez and Industrial Streets) for both the existing and cumulative conditions, as further detailed in the section on significant and unavoidable impacts. (See Impact #72-73.) Notwithstanding these significant and unavoidable impacts, the Project 5-4 is acceptable because it promotes and encourages safe bicycling along this segment of the Bayshore Boulevard corridor and would fill a gap in the existing bicycle route network, providing a connection between the Bayview, Mission, Potrero Hill and Portola neighborhoods. The new bicycle lanes and sharrows on Bayshore Boulevard would greatly improve the north-south bicycle network in this vital corridor, as well as enhance bicyclists' links to numerous east-west bicycle routes. The proximity of Route 25 to both the US-101 and I-280 freeways make Project 5-4 essential to improving bicyclist safety. The presence of and speed of vehicles in this corridor make it a challenging environment for bicyclists. The dedication of exclusive street space to bicyclists will

greatly improve bicyclist visibility, limit the number of conflicts with parked vehicles, and reduce vehicle speeds. As a result, Project 5-4 is consistent with the City goal of improving road conditions and safety for bicyclists.

Project 5-5: Cesar Chavez Bicycle Lanes, I-280 to US 101 Freeways, Mod. Option 1

This project is associated a significant and unavoidable intersection impact (Evans/Cesar Chavez) in both the existing and cumulative conditions, as further detailed in the section on significant and unavoidable impacts. (See Impact #74-75.) However, the preferred project provides substantial City-wide benefit as it provides a critical east-west connection between I-280 and US 101. Bicycle lanes on Cesar Chavez Boulevard (Route 60) would enhance connections between Potrero Hill and the Mission neighborhood and help to overcome the significant barrier presented by US 101. Route 60 also links with Route 525 and Route 68, which connect to major destinations like S.F. General Hospital and China Basin. Bicycle lanes on Cesar Chavez also would improve safety for bicyclists by increasing space dedicated to bicycle travel and reducing traffic conflicts in one of the more auto-oriented section of the City.

Project 5-6: Cesar Chavez/26th Street Bicycle Lanes, Sanchez Street to US 101, Preferred Option not yet determined

This project results in numerous significant and unavoidable intersection and transit delay impacts as further detailed in the section on significant and unavoidable impacts. (See Impact #76-98.) Yet, even with such impacts, the Cesar Chavez bicycle segment serves as valuable elements of the Bicycle Network. As part of Bicycle Route 60, Cesar Chavez and 26th Street provide a critical east-west route through the Bernal Heights and Mission neighborhoods. Bicycle ridership in this corridor also has increased substantially in recent years (a 39 percent increase at Cesar Chavez/Harrison since 2006). However, Cesar Chavez is one of the major arteries that serve US 101. The prevalence and speed of vehicular traffic in this area has made this corridor especially inhospitable to bicyclists and pedestrians. By reducing lane width, dedicating more space for bicyclists, slowing vehicle speed, and improving bicyclist visibility, bicycle lanes on Cesar Chavez and 26th Street will ensure that a growing number of bicyclists can travel safely in this area. Finally, this Project supports larger City efforts to revitalize and transform the Cesar Chavez corridor into a more “liveable” neighborhood that prioritizes non-motorized travel and inviting public spaces.

Project 5-13: San Bruno Avenue Bicycle Lanes, Paul Avenue to Silver Avenue, Preferred Option net yet determined

This project has significant and unavoidable loading impacts (west side of San Bruno between Paul and Silver Avenues) for Options 1 & 2 in both the current and cumulative conditions, as further detailed in the section on significant and unavoidable impacts. (See Impact #99-100.)

Even with such impacts, the preferred project would create an important new segment to the City's Bicycle Route Network with multiple benefits. Bicycle lanes on San Bruno Avenue would offer a new north-south connection between Route 70 on Silver Avenue and Route 5 on Paul Avenue, thereby enabling bicyclists to access the nearby Caltrain stations with greater ease. The addition of bicycle lanes also would facilitate more efficient use of roadway capacity and the narrowed lanes in the southbound direction would slow vehicular speeds. By reducing lane width, dedicating more space for bicyclists, slowing vehicle speed, and improving bicyclist visibility, bicycle lanes on San Bruno Avenue will ensure that a growing number of bicyclists can travel safely in this area.

Project 6-5: Portola Drive Bicycle Lanes, Corbett Avenue to O'Shaughnessy Boulevard, Mod. Option 1; Project 6-6: Portola Drive Bicycle Lanes, O'Shaughnessy Boulevard/Woodside Avenue to Sloat Boulevard/St. Francis Boulevard, Modified Option 2; Project 6-2: Clipper Street Bicycle Lanes, Douglass Street to Portola Drive, Option 1

As a result of changes to project designs, Project 6-5 by itself is not associated with any significant or unavoidable impact. However, the combined design modifications of Project 6-5, Project 6-6, and Project 6-2 produces a significant and unavoidable transit delay impact in the cumulative condition, as further detailed in the section on significant and unavoidable impacts. (See Impact #101-102.) Nevertheless, Project 6-5 provides many benefits as Portola Drive is an essential component to the City's Bicycle Route Network. Portola Drive already serves as Bicycle Routes 50, 55, and 60 which connect to Sloat Blvd., Clipper Street, 17th Street, Market Street, and Haight Street. Portola Drive also offers the primary flat route through this topographically challenging area of the City. By creating space specifically for bicyclists this project will greatly enhance the environment for bicyclists, while reducing the conflicts associated with large numbers of bicyclists riding on the sidewalk in this corridor. Motorists will also benefit from 8 additional parking spaces and a wider parking lane. By reducing lane width, dedicating more space for bicyclists, slowing vehicle speed, and improving bicyclist visibility, bicycle lanes on Portola Drive will ensure that a growing number of bicyclists can travel safely in this area. As a result, this project's benefits will outweigh the environmental detriments cited above.

The benefits of Project 6-6 also outweigh the impacts generated by its implementation. Project 6-6 serves as a necessary complement to Project 6-5. This project would promote and encourage safe bicycling along this segment of Portola Drive and complete a gap in the existing bicycle route network along this important route, providing a connection between the Diamond Heights, Saint Francis Wood, and West Portal neighborhoods.

Finally, Project 6-2 it will close a gap on Route 60 of the Bicycle Route Network and offer enhanced connectivity to numerous other routes (749/49/55/50) in the area. Clipper Street offers the only east-west connection between Noe Valley and Portola Drive and is essential component to ensuring that bicyclists can travel through the challenging topography of this neighborhood.

Ridership in this area has also shown an increase in recent years (26 percent increase at Portola and O'Shaughnessy since 2006) and this new infrastructure is essential to safely accommodating new bicyclists. Thus, this project's benefits outweigh the identified environmental impacts.

Bicycle Plan and Long-Term Project Related Significant and Unavoidable Impacts and Overriding Considerations

The following section addresses the Bicycle Plan-related and Long term project-related significant and unavoidable impacts. Below is a list referring to the traffic, transit, and loading impacts related to these approval actions. Such impacts are further detailed in the section on significant and unavoidable impacts.

A. Plan-related Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

1. Bicycle Route Network Goals, Objectives and Action Items
 - a) Impact – TR-A1.1: Traffic, Transit and Loading Impacts (Impact #17)
 - b) Impact – TR-A1.2: Traffic, Transit and Loading Impacts (Impact #18)
 - c) Impact – TR-A1.4: Traffic, Transit and Loading Impacts (Impact #19)
2. General Plan Amendments, Environmental Review, and Citywide Coordination Goals, Objectives and Action Items
 - a) Impact – TR-A7.1: Traffic, Transit and Loading Impacts (Impact #20)
 - b) Impact – TR-A7.3: Traffic, Transit and Loading Impacts (Impact #21)
 - c) Impact – TR-A7.4: Traffic, Transit and Loading Impacts (Impact #22)
3. Bicycle Funding Goals and Objectives
 - a) Impact – TR-A8.1: Traffic, Transit and Loading Impacts (Impact #23)

B. Long-Term Improvements-related Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

1. Impact – TR-LT1: Traffic Impacts (Impact #103)
2. Impact – TR-LT2: Transit Impacts (Impact #104)
3. Impact – TR-LT3: Loading Impacts (Impact #105)

Notwithstanding the significant and unavoidable impacts noted above related to the Plan and Long-Term improvements, the Commission finds, after considering the Final EIR and based on

substantial evidence in the record and as set forth elsewhere in these findings and herein, that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations outweigh the identified significant effects on the environment related to these actions.

1. The 2009 Bicycle Plan and long-term improvements are necessary components to ensuring that San Francisco becomes a world-class bicycling City for residents and visitors alike. As bicycling continues to emerge in San Francisco as a preferred and safe alternative transportation option, it will be essential for the City to continue to expand and modify the Bicycle Route Network and respond to changes in demand for bicycling infrastructure. These approval actions would enable the City to complete the bicycle route network, close network gaps, refine and rationalize the bicycle route network, and continue to improve bicyclist safety and riding experience.
2. Using bicycles instead of automobiles is considerably cheaper and often more effective. Bicycles can be more effective for police enforcement wherever there is considerable traffic congestion and at locations difficult to patrol by motor vehicle. Approval of the Bicycle Plan would allow for better promotion of the use of bicycles by City employees when attending meetings, performing field work, or conducting site inspections, as well as the establishment and expansion of programs designed to prioritize adding bicycles to the City's fleet whenever replacing or upgrading motor vehicles.
3. A large number of the long-term improvements are planned for areas of the City that are underserved by bicycling infrastructure, such as Mission Bay and Hunter's Point. As growth in the areas continues and planned development takes shape it is essential that these long-term improvements be implemented to provide existing and new residents access to a safe transportation option.
4. The long-term improvements at the Transbay Terminal will be essential to ensuring that bicyclists are able to access regional transit services. These long-term improvements will enable commuters, visitors, and residents to reduce their number of automobile trips and access parts of the region via safe, sustainable, and cost-effective transportation options.
5. Many of the long-term improvements have not been finalized and will be undergoing significant levels of additional study. As these projects undergo further design and environmental study it is expected that some of the identified impacts will be addressed through design changes or reduced to a less than significant level via mitigation.

Having considered these specific Project benefits, including the overall benefits of bicycling discussed above, the Commission finds that the Project's benefits outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, and that the adverse environmental effects are therefore acceptable. The Commission further finds that each of the Project benefits discussed above is a

separate and independent basis for these finding, and for rejecting the alternatives as further described in Section VI.

Exhibit 1
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Exhibit 1

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<i>A-1 MITIGATION MEASURES AGREED TO BY THE PROJECT SPONSOR WHICH REDUCE THE IMPACT TO LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT</i>					
MITIGATION MEASURES FROM THE INITIAL STUDY					
CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES					
<i>Mitigation Measure 1: Archaeological Deposits Mitigation Measure (Accidental Discovery)</i>					
The following mitigation measure is required to avoid any potential adverse effect from the proposed project on accidentally discovered buried or submerged historical resources as defined in <i>CEQA Guidelines</i> Section 15064.5(a)(c). 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.	Project sponsor	Prior to any soil disturbing activities	Distribute Planning Department Archeological Resource "ALERT" sheet to Prime Contractor, sub-contractors and utilities firms.	Project sponsor, archaeologist and Environmental Review Officer (ERO)	Prior to any soil disturbing activities.
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) to the ERO confirming that all field personnel have received copies of the Alert Sheet.	Project sponsor			Submit signed affidavit of distribution to ERO.	Following distribution of "ALERT" sheet but prior to any soils disturbing activities.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
Should any indication of an archeological resource be encountered during any soils disturbing activity of the project, the project Head Foreman and/or project sponsor shall immediately notify the ERO and shall immediately suspend any soils disturbing activities in the vicinity of the discovery until the ERO has determined what additional measures should be undertaken.	Head Foreman and/or project sponsor	Accidental discovery	Suspend any soils disturbing activity.	Notify ERO of accidental discovery.	
If the ERO determines that an archeological resource may be present within the project site, the project sponsor shall retain the services of a qualified archeological consultant. The archeological consultant shall advise the ERO as to whether the discovery is an archeological resource, retains sufficient integrity, and is of potential scientific/historical/ cultural significance.	Project sponsor	In case of accidental discovery	If ERO determines an archeological resource may be present, services of a qualified archeological consultant to be retained.		
If an archeological resource is present, the archeological consultant shall identify and evaluate the archeological resource. The archeological consultant shall make a recommendation as to what action, if any, is warranted. Based on this information, the ERO may require, if warranted, specific additional measures to be implemented by the project sponsor.	Archeological consultant	In case of accidental discovery	Identify and evaluate archeological resources.	Make recommendation to the ERO	
Measures might include: preservation in situ of the archeological resource; an archaeological monitoring program; or an archeological testing program. If an archeological monitoring program or archeological testing program is required, it shall be consistent with the Major Environmental Analysis (MEA) division guidelines for such programs. 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.	Project sponsor	After determination by the ERO of appropriate action to be implemented following evaluation of accidental discovery.	Implementation of Archeological measure required by ERO.		

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p>The project archeological consultant shall submit a Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archeological resource and describes the archeological and historical research methods employed in the archeological monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the final report.</p>	<p>Project sponsor</p>	<p>Following completion of any* archeological field program. (* required.)</p>	<p>Submittal of Draft/Final FARR to ERO.</p>		
<p>Copies of the Draft FARR shall be sent to the ERO for review and approval. 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 MEA 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 or interpretive value, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.</p>	<p>Project sponsor</p>		<p>Distribution of Final FARR.</p>		

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES					
<i>Mitigation Measure 3: Protection of Nesting Birds Mitigation Measure</i>					
<p>The project sponsor shall implement the following protective measures to ensure implementation of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and compliance with State regulations during construction. Pre-construction surveys for nesting birds shall be conducted by a qualified ornithologist or wildlife biologist to ensure that no nests would be disturbed during project implementation. A preconstruction survey shall be conducted no more than 14 days prior to the initiation of demolition/construction activities during the early part of the breeding season (January through April) and no more than 30 days prior to the initiation of these activities during the late part of the breeding season (May through August). During this survey, the qualified person shall inspect all trees in and immediately adjacent to the impact areas for nests. If an active nest is found close enough to the construction area to be disturbed by these activities, the ornithologist, in consultation with CDFG, shall determine the extent of a construction-free buffer zone to be established around the nest.</p>	<p>Project sponsor and qualified ornithologist or wildlife biologist.</p>	<p>Prior to any on-site construction activities.</p>	<p>Pre-construction surveys for nesting birds to be conducted by a qualified ornithologist or wildlife biologist. If an active nest is found close to construction area, the ornithologist, in consultation with CDFG, shall determine construction-free buffer zone extent established around the nest.</p>		

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
MITIGATION MEASURES FROM THE DRAFT EIR					
TRANSPORTATION, CIRCULATION, AND PARKING					
NEAR-TERM IMPROVEMENTS					
Cluster 1: Financial District/North Beach Area					
<p><u>M-TR-P1-1a:</u> An alternative school passenger drop-off location would have to be identified to accommodate passenger loading demand, such as expanding the existing passenger drop-off location along the east side of Franklin Street between Pacific Avenue and Broadway on the west side of the school building. Alternatively, the passenger drop off zone on Broadway could be maintained by eliminating the proposed eastbound bicycle lane between Franklin Street and Van Ness Avenue and having bicyclists share the curb lane with motor vehicles, similar to existing conditions. With the implementation of either of these mitigation measures, the significant impact on loading for the students of Saint Brigid School would be reduced to less than significant under Existing plus Project conditions for Project 1-1.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 1-1.	SFMTA to identify and implement an alternative passenger loading zone as described.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO.	Quarterly report to ERO as new improvements are implemented.
<p><u>M-TR-P1-1b:</u> Refer to Mitigation Measure M-TR-P1-1a, above for mitigation of this impact. With the implementation of either of these mitigation measures, the significant impact on loading for the students of Saint Brigid School would be reduced to less than significant under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Project 1-1.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 1-1.	SFMTA to identify and implement an alternative passenger loading zone as described.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO.	Quarterly report to ERO as new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-P1-1c:</u> Extend the existing passenger loading zone on the north side of Broadway near Webster Street towards the east, all the way to Buchanan Street. The passenger zone extension would be located to the right of the proposed bicycle lane and would be operational during school arrival and dismissal periods only (typically from 7:00 to 8:30 a.m. and from 2:00 to 3:30 p.m.). This mitigation would reduce or eliminate incidents of double parking related to passenger loading and alleviate any associated congestion. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, the significant impact regarding loading for the students of Hamlin School would be reduced to less than significant under Existing plus Project conditions for Project 1-1.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 1-1.	SFMTA to implement the changes to passenger loading zone on the north side of Broadway near Webster Street as described.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO.	Quarterly report to ERO as new improvements are implemented.
<p><u>M-TR-P1-1d:</u> Refer to Mitigation Measure M-TR-P1-1c, above, for mitigation of this impact. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, the significant impact on loading for the students of Hamlin School would be reduced to less than significant under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Project 1-1.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 1-1.	SFMTA to implement the changes to passenger loading zone on the north side of Broadway near Webster Street as described.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO.	Quarterly report to ERO as new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-P1-3a:</u> Per the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), a signal warrant analysis was conducted to determine the feasibility of signalization of the Van Ness/North Point Street intersection. The criteria for signal warrants were satisfied. Therefore, signalization of this intersection was proposed as the mitigation measure. The intersection shall be converted from a three-way stop- controlled (FWSC) intersection to a signalized intersection (with the application of 90 seconds of cycle length) to improve intersection operations. With this improvement, the intersection operation would improve to LOS B, with 19 seconds of delay and a V/C ratio of 0.65. The intersection operations would improve from LOS E to LOS B for 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions. Minimum green times required for pedestrians to cross the intersection would be maintained to the signal. Hence, this mitigation measure would reduce impacts of Project 1-3 to a less-than-significant level.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 1-3.	SFMTA to convert the intersection from a three-way stop-controlled intersection into a signalized intersection as described.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO.	Quarterly report to ERO as new improvements are implemented.
Cluster 2: South of Market Area					
<p><u>M-TR-P2-1o (Projects 2-1 and 2-16 combined):</u> The implementation of Option 1 of the combined Projects 2-1 and 2-16 under Existing plus Project conditions would add approximately 863 seconds (14.4 minutes) of delay for Muni bus line 10. With mitigation as described for the 2nd Street/ Harrison Street, and 2nd Street/ Folsom Street intersections, approximately 27 seconds of delay southbound and 266 seconds (4.4 minutes) of delay northbound would be added to Muni bus line 10. The total added delay of 293 seconds (4.8 minutes) would be less than the transit delay threshold of six minutes. Therefore, impacts to Muni bus line 10 from Modified Option 1 of the combined Projects 2-1 and 2-16 under Existing plus Project conditions would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 2-1 and 2-16 combined.	SFMTA to modify the southbound 2 nd Street traffic signal phase as described.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO.	Quarterly report to ERO as new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-P2-1s:</u> The implementation of Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions would add approximately 845 seconds (14.1 minutes) of delay for Muni bus line 10. With mitigation as described for the 2nd Street/ Harrison Street, and 2nd Street/Folsom Street intersections, approximately 27 seconds of delay southbound and 249 seconds (4.2 minutes) of delay northbound would be added to Muni bus line 10. The total added delay of 276 seconds (4.6 minutes) would be less than the transit delay threshold of six minutes. Therefore, impacts to Muni bus line 10 for individual Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 2-1.	SFMTA to modify the southbound 2 nd Street traffic signal phase as described.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO.	Quarterly report to ERO as new improvements are implemented.
<p><u>M-TR-P2-1u:</u> The implementation of individual Project 2-1 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions would add approximately 450 seconds (7.5 minutes) of delay for Muni bus line 10. With mitigation as described for the 2nd Street/ Harrison Street, and 2nd Street/Folsom Street intersections, delay would be reduced by approximately 170 seconds (2.8 minutes) southbound with approximately 403 seconds (6.7 minutes) of delay added northbound to Muni bus line 10. The total added delay of 233 seconds (3.8 minutes) would be less than the transit delay threshold of six minutes. Therefore, impacts to Muni bus line 10 for individual Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 2-1.	SFMTA to modify the southbound 2 nd Street traffic signal phase as described.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO.	Quarterly report to ERO as new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-P2-16c:</u> Six seconds of green time shall be added to the eastbound Townsend Street approach and six seconds of green time shall be reduced from the northbound 7th Street approach, to improve the 7th Street/Townsend Street intersection operations from LOS F to LOS D, with 35.2 seconds of delay. It has been ensured that the minimum green times required for pedestrians to cross the intersection have been maintained even after the green time adjustments to the signal. Hence, this mitigation measure would reduce the project impacts of Project 2-16 Modified Option 1 to a less-than-significant level.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 2-16.	SFMTA to modify the traffic signal timing for the northbound 7 th Street approach as described.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO.	Quarterly report to ERO as new improvements are implemented.
<p><u>M-TR-P2-16g:</u> The westbound Townsend Street approach shall be modified from a permitted phase to a protected signal phase. In addition, five seconds of green time shall be added to the westbound Townsend Street approach and five seconds of green time shall be reduced from the southbound 4th Street approach. This would improve the 4th Street/Townsend Street intersection operations from LOS F to LOS D, with 42.2 seconds of delay. It has been ensured that the minimum green times required for pedestrians to cross the intersection have been maintained even after the green time adjustments to the signal. Hence, this mitigation measure would reduce the project impacts of Project 2-16 Modified Option 1 to a less-than-significant level.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 2-16.	SFMTA to modify the signal phase timing to the westbound Townsend Street direction as described.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO.	Quarterly report to ERO as new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
Cluster 3: Civic Center/Western Addition					
<p><u>M-TR-P3-1a (Projects 3-1 and 3-2 combined):</u> Four seconds of green time shall be added to the northbound and southbound directions of Masonic Avenue and four seconds of green time shall be reduced from the westbound direction of Fell Street. With these adjustments, Masonic Avenue/Fell Street intersection operations will improve to LOS D, with 52.7 seconds of delay. It has been ensured that the minimum green times required for pedestrians to cross the intersection would be maintained even after the green time adjustments to the signal. Hence, this mitigation measure would reduce impacts from combined Projects 3-1 and 3-2 Option 1 to a less-than-significant level under Existing plus Project conditions.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 3-1 and 3-2 combined.	SFMTA to implement the signal phase timing changes as described.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO.	Quarterly report to ERO as new improvements are implemented.
<p><u>M-TR-P3-2f:</u> Four seconds of green time shall be added to the northbound and southbound Masonic Avenue directions, with a corresponding reduction in green time in the westbound Fell Street direction of four seconds. With these adjustments, the Masonic Avenue/Fell Street intersection operations would improve to LOS D, with 45.8 seconds of delay and a V/C ratio of 1.1. It has been ensured that the minimum green times required for pedestrians to cross the intersection have been maintained even after the green time adjustments to the signal. Hence, this mitigation measure would reduce the project impacts at the Masonic Avenue/Fell Street intersection to a less-than-significant level for Project 3-2 Option 2 under Existing plus Project conditions.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 3-2.	SFMTA to implement the signal phase timing change as described.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO.	Quarterly report to ERO as new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
Cluster 5: Mission/Glen Park/Excelsior Area					
<p><u>M-TR-P5-4f (Projects 5-2 and 5-4 combined):</u> The implementation of Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Projects 5-2 and 5-4 combined would add approximately 417 seconds (7.0 minutes) of total delay for Muni bus lines 9, 9X, 9AX and SamTrans 292. With mitigation as described above in Mitigation Measure 5.4e, transit delay would be reduced to approximately 70 seconds (1.2 minutes) of delay northbound and 13 seconds of delay southbound. The total added delay of approximately 83 seconds (1.4 minutes) would be less than the transit delay threshold of six minutes. Therefore, impacts to transit for Muni bus lines 9, 9X, 9AX and SamTrans 292 for Projects 5-2 and 5-4 with Modified Option 1 combined under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Projects 5-2 and 5-4 combined.	SFMTA to implement the signal timing changes as described.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO.	Quarterly report to ERO as new improvements are implemented.
<p><u>M-TR-P5-4g:</u> The implementation of Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Project 5-4 only would add approximately 417 seconds (7.0 minutes) of total delay for Muni bus lines 9, 9X, 9AX and SamTrans 292. With mitigation as described above in Mitigation Measure 5.4e, transit delay would be reduced to approximately 70 seconds (1.2 minutes) of delay northbound and 13 seconds of delay southbound. The total added delay of approximately 83 seconds (1.4 minutes) would be less than the transit delay threshold of six minutes. Therefore, impacts to transit for Muni bus lines 9, 9X, 9AX and SamTrans 292 for Project 5-4 only with Modified Option 1 combined under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 5-4.	SFMTA to implement the signal timing changes as described.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO.	Quarterly report to ERO as new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
A-2 MITIGATION MEASURES AGREED TO BY THE PROJECT SPONSOR FOR WHICH IMPLEMENTATION WOULD IMPROVE CONDITIONS BUT WOULD NOT REDUCE THE EFFECTS TO LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT					
NEAR-TERM IMPROVEMENTS					
Cluster 2: South of Market Area					
<u>M-TR-P2-1c:</u> It is proposed that five seconds of green time be added to the northbound 2 nd Street approach and five seconds of green time be reduced from the eastbound Harrison Street approach. This would improve the intersection operations from LOS F to LOS E. It has been ensured that the minimum green times required for pedestrians to cross the 2 nd Street/Harrison Street intersection have been maintained even after the green time adjustments to the signal. Nevertheless, this mitigation measure would not reduce the project impacts to a less-than-significant level for Project 2-1 Modified Option 1.	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 2-1.	SFMTA to modify the traffic signal timing phase as described.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO.	Quarterly report to ERO as new improvements are implemented.
<u>M-TR-P2-1e:</u> It is proposed that five seconds of green time be added to the northbound 2 nd Street approach and five seconds of green time be reduced from the eastbound Harrison Street approach, thus improving the 2 nd Street/Harrison Street intersection operations and reducing average delay. It has been ensured that the minimum green times required for pedestrians to cross the intersection have been maintained even after the green time adjustments to the signal. Nevertheless, this mitigation measure would not reduce the project impacts to a less-than-significant level for Project 2-1 Modified Option 1.	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 2-1.	SFMTA to modify the traffic signal timing phase as described.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO.	Quarterly report to ERO as new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-P2-1i:</u> It is proposed that the southbound 2nd Street approach be modified from a protected phase to a permitted phase with no changes to green time allocation. This would improve the 2nd Street/Folsom Street intersection operations and reduce the average delay. Nevertheless, this mitigation measure would not reduce the project impacts of Project 2-1 Modified Option 1 to a less-than-significant level.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 2-1.	SFMTA to modify the traffic signal timing phase as described.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO.	Quarterly report to ERO as new improvements are implemented.
<p><u>M-TR-P2-1q (Projects 2-1 and 2-16 combined):</u> The implementation of combined Projects 2-1 and 2-16 Modified Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions would add approximately 672 seconds (11.2 minutes) of delay for Muni bus line 10. With mitigation as described for the 2nd Street/Harrison Street (M-TR-P2-1c through M-TR-P2-1f), and 2nd Street/Folsom Street (M-TR-P2-1g through M-TR-P2-1j) intersections, delay would be reduced by approximately 169 seconds (2.8 minutes) southbound with approximately 625 seconds (10.4 minutes) of delay added northbound to Muni bus line 10. The total added delay of 495 seconds (7.6 minutes) would be greater than the transit delay threshold of six minutes. Therefore, a significant transit impact to Muni bus line 10 would occur resulting from implementation of Modified Option 1 of the combined Projects 2-1 and 2-16 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 2-1 and 2-16.	SFMTA to modify the traffic signal timing phase as described.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO.	Quarterly report to ERO as new improvements are implemented.
<p><u>M-TR-P2-7a (Projects 2-7 and 2-9 combined):</u> The cycle length at the Fremont Street/Howard Street intersection shall be increased by 35 seconds (from 60 seconds to 95 seconds), so that the intersection will operate at LOS D with 54.9 seconds of delay. However, 54.9 seconds of delay is close to the threshold of 55 seconds of delay which is deemed unsatisfactory operation. Therefore, this mitigation measure would not reduce the project impacts of combined Projects 2-7 and 2-9 to a less-than-significant level.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 2-7 and 2-9 combined.	SFMTA to modify the traffic signal timing phase as described.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO.	Quarterly report to ERO as new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-P2-7b (Projects 2-7 and 2-9 combined):</u> The Fremont Street/Howard Street intersection operates at LOS D with 54.9 seconds of delay under Existing plus Project conditions relative to Existing conditions, with mitigation shown in Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-7a. This is determined to be a significant impact since it is close to the threshold of 55 seconds of delay which is deemed unsatisfactory operation. As a consequence, a corresponding LOS deterioration is expected at this intersection for 2025 Cumulative plus Project compared to 2025 Cumulative conditions. Therefore, a significant impact would occur at the Fremont Street/Howard Street intersection.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 2-7 and 2-9 combined.	SFMTA to modify the traffic signal timing phase as described.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO.	Quarterly report to ERO as new improvements are implemented.
<p><u>M-TR-P2-9a:</u> It is proposed that the cycle length at the Fremont Street/Howard Street intersection be increased by 35 seconds (from 60 seconds to 95 seconds). With this improvement, the intersection will operate at LOS D with 54.9 seconds of delay. However, 54.9 seconds of delay is close to the threshold of 55 seconds of delay which is deemed unsatisfactory operation. Therefore, this mitigation measure would not reduce the project impacts of Project 2-9 to a less-than-significant level.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 2-9.	SFMTA to modify the traffic signal timing phase as described.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO.	Quarterly report to ERO as new improvements are implemented.
<p><u>M-TR-P2-9b:</u> It is proposed that lane configuration adjustments be made to the westbound Howard Street direction to improve LOS and reduce the delay at the Fremont Street/Howard Street intersection. The westbound Howard Street approach shall be modified from one through lane and one shared through-right turn lane, into two through lanes and one exclusive right-turn lane. The LOS will remain at level F. Therefore, this mitigation measure would not reduce the project impacts of Project 2-9 to a less-than-significant level for 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 2-9.	SFMTA to modify the traffic signal timing phase as described.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO.	Quarterly report to ERO as new improvements Are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-P2-16e:</u> It is proposed that lane configuration adjustments be made to the eastbound Townsend Street direction to improve LOS and decrease the amount of average delay. Assuming that the existing railroad alignment would be removed, the eastbound Townsend Street approach would be modified from one shared through-left turn lane and one exclusive right-turn lane to one shared through-left turn lane and one shared through-right turn lane. Hence, this lane adjustment decreases the amount of average delay and reduces the V/C ratio by 78 percent (from 5.52 to 1.24). This would improve intersection operations. Nevertheless, a significant impact would occur at the 7th Street/Townsend Street intersection with the implementation of Project 2-16 Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative conditions.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 2-16.	SFMTA to make lane configuration adjustments to the eastbound Townsend Street direction as described.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO.	Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.
Cluster 3: Civic Center/Western Addition					
<p><u>M-TR-P3-2j:</u> It is proposed that ten seconds of green time be added to the northbound Masonic Avenue direction, with a corresponding reduction of green time in the eastbound Turk Street direction of ten seconds, to improve intersection operations at the Masonic Avenue/Turk Street intersection to LOS E, with 72.5 seconds of delay and a V/C ratio of 1.29. It has been ensured that the minimum green times required for pedestrians to cross the intersection have been maintained even after the green time adjustments to the signal. However, the Masonic Avenue/Turk Street intersection would continue to operate at an unacceptable LOS, therefore the traffic impact would be significant even after this improvement measure is implemented.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 3-2.	SFMTA to implement signal phase timing change as described.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO.	Quarterly report to ERO as new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
A-3 MITIGATION MEASURES FOR WHICH THE FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION IS UNCERTAIN					
SAN FRANCISCO BICYCLE PLAN GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND ACTION ITEMS					
<p><u>M-TR-A1.1:</u> Mitigation Measures defined in Subsection V.A.3 [of the Draft EIR] shall be implemented in association with the 60 near-term improvements proposed and implemented under the Bicycle Plan. For those identified significant impacts with respect to traffic, transit, and loading in Subsection V.A.3 for which no feasible mitigation measures have been identified, the impacts remain significant and unavoidable.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of near-term improvements.	SFMTA to implement the feasible mitigation measures described below for the near-term improvements. Please see also mitigation measures for which feasibility has not been determined in the next section.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO.	Quarterly report to ERO as new improvements are implemented.
<p><u>M-TR-A1.2:</u> Mitigation Measures discussed and defined in Subsection V.A.5 shall be implemented in association with long-term improvements proposed and implemented under the Bicycle Plan. Specific designs for the long-term improvements are unknown at this time. Once specific project designs for the long-term improvements are developed and analyzed for potential environmental impacts with respect to traffic, transit, parking, pedestrian, bicycles and loading, mitigation measures may be identified and implemented.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of long-term improvements.	SFMTA to identify and continue to investigate the effectiveness of potential feasible mitigation measures, whenever possible, for the long-term improvements.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.	Quarterly report to ERO as new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-A1.4:</u> The indirect impacts of Action 1.4 could result in the implementation of improvements to support the City's Transit First Policy. Therefore, it would include potential impacts identified under all sections of this environmental review for the Bicycle Plan such as those discussed in the transportation impact analysis of the potential impacts of the near-term improvements, long-term improvements, and minor improvements as well as impacts that may result from future projects which would be similar to those discussed in this analysis. Physical improvements known at this time are analyzed in Subsections V.A.3, V.A.4, and V.A.5 of this EIR. As discussed in Subsection V.A.4, no significant impacts would result from implementation of the minor improvements. Mitigation measures have been identified in Subsections V.A.3 and V.A.5 that would address some of the significant impacts for near-term and long-term improvements. However, there are some impacts that would remain significant and unavoidable and those are also discussed in the above referenced sections.</p>	<p>SFMTA</p>	<p>Prior to implementation of long-term improvements.</p>	<p>SFMTA to identify and continue to investigate the effectiveness of potential feasible mitigation measures, whenever possible, for the long-term improvements. Feasible mitigation measures for the near-term improvements are as described in the previous section.</p>	<p>SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.</p>	<p>Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.</p>

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-A7.1:</u> As described under the mitigation measures M-TR-A1.1 and M-TR-A1.2 above for potential significant impacts TR-A1.2 and TR-A 1.2 resulting from Actions A1.1 and A1.2, Mitigation Measures defined in Subsections V.A.3 and V.A.5 shall be implemented in association with improvements proposed and implemented under the Bicycle Plan for potential indirect impacts resulting from Action 7.1.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of long-term improvements.	<p>SFMTA to identify and continue to investigate the effectiveness of potential feasible mitigation measures, whenever possible, for the long-term improvements.</p> <p>Feasible mitigation measures for the near-term improvements are as described in the previous section.</p>	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.	Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-A7.3:</u> As described under the mitigation measure M-TR-A1.4 above for potential significant impact TR-A1.4 resulting from Action A1.4, Mitigation Measures defined in Subsections V.A.3 and V.A.5 shall be implemented in association with improvements proposed and implemented under the Bicycle Plan for potential indirect impacts resulting from Action 7.3.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of long-term improvements.	<p>SFMTA to identify and continue to investigate the effectiveness of potential feasible mitigation measures, whenever possible, for the long-term improvements.</p> <p>Feasible mitigation measures for near-term improvements are as described in previous section.</p>	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.	Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-A7.4:</u> As described under the mitigation measure M-TR-A1.4 for potential indirect impact TR-A1.4 resulting from Action A1.4, Mitigation Measures defined in Subsections V.A.3 and V.A.5 shall be implemented in association with improvements proposed and implemented under the Bicycle Plan to address potential indirect impacts resulting from Action 7.4.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of long-term improvements.	<p>SFMTA to identify and continue to investigate the effectiveness of potential feasible mitigation measures, whenever possible, for the long-term improvements.</p> <p>Feasible mitigation measures for the near-term improvements are as described in the previous section.</p>	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.	Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-A8.1:</u> As described under the mitigation measures M-TR-A1.1 and M-TR-A1.2 above for potential significant impacts TR-A1.2 and TR-A 1.2 resulting from Actions A1.1 and A1.2, Mitigation Measures defined in Subsections V.A.3 and V.A.5 shall be implemented in association with improvements proposed and implemented under the Bicycle Plan to address potential indirect impacts resulting from Action 8.1.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of long-term improvements.	<p>SFMTA to identify and continue to investigate the effectiveness of potential feasible mitigation measures, whenever possible, for the long-term improvements.</p> <p>Feasible mitigation measures for the near-term improvements are described above.</p>	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.	Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.
LONG-TERM IMPROVEMENTS					
<p><u>M-TR-LT1.1:</u> Unsignalized intersections may be signalized, as appropriate.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Long-term improvement.	SFMTA to implement intersection signalization, where appropriate, as described and to investigate the effectiveness of any potential mitigation measure.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.	Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-LT1.2:</u> Changes may be made to signal timing (including redistributing green time from one phase to another, lengthening of signal cycle times, changing permitted movements to protected movements, signal coordination/ progression), as appropriate.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Long-term Improvements.	SFMTA to implement changes to signal timing, where appropriate, as described, and to continue to investigate the effectiveness of any potential mitigation measures.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.	Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.
<p><u>M-TR-LT1.3:</u> Changes may be made to roadway geometry (e.g., changing shared lanes to exclusive turn lanes, providing exclusive right-turn or left-turn pockets), as appropriate.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Long-term improvements.	SFMTA to implement roadway geometry changes, where appropriate, as described, and to continue to investigate the effectiveness of any potential mitigation measures.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.	Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-LT1.4:</u> Floating bicycle lanes may be implemented, where on-street parking is restricted during peak periods, to provide for additional vehicular capacity, as appropriate.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Long-term improvements.	SFMTA to implement floating bicycle lanes appropriate, as described, and to continue to investigate the effectiveness of any potential mitigation measures.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.	Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.
<p><u>M-TR-LT1.5:</u> Parking may be eliminated to provide for additional vehicular capacity, as appropriate.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Long-term improvements.	SFMTA to implement parking space removal as described, and to continue to investigate the effectiveness of any potential mitigation measures.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.	Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-LT2.1:</u> Signal pre-emption or other transit priority techniques may be applied to reduce overall transit travel times, as appropriate.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Long-term improvements.	SFMTA to implement signal pre-emption or other transit priority techniques as described, and to continue to investigate the effectiveness of any potential mitigation measures.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.	Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.
<p><u>M-TR-LT2.2:</u> Bicycle proposals may be modified to create discontinuities in bicycle treatment to avoid transit delays, as appropriate.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Long-term improvements.	SFMTA to create discontinuity in bicycle treatments as described, where appropriate, to facilitate transit operations, and to continue to investigate the effectiveness of any potential mitigation measures.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.	Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-LT2.3:</u> Bus stops may be reconfigured to facilitate bus operations, as appropriate.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Long-term improvements.	SFMTA to implement bus stops reconfiguration, where appropriate to facilitate bus operations, as described, and to continue to investigate the effectiveness of any potential mitigation measures.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.	Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.
<p><u>M-TR-LT2.4:</u> Parking may be eliminated to substitute for lane removal and/or increase roadway capacity, as appropriate. In some instances, where either existing or projected cumulative conditions at intersections operate at LOS E or LOS F conditions, feasible mitigation measures would not be available, and transit impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Long-term improvements.	SFMTA to determine whether or not parking may be eliminated to substitute for lane removal and/or increase roadway capacity, as described, and to continue to investigate the effectiveness of any potential mitigation measures.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.	Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-LT3.1:</u> Where feasible and required to respond to loading zone impacts, on-street parking layouts shall be modified to accommodate additional yellow commercial freight loading zones.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Long-term improvements.	SFMTA to determine where on-street parking layouts shall be modified to accommodate additional yellow commercial freight loading zones, where feasible and required, in order to respond to loading zone impacts, as described, and to continue to investigate the effectiveness of any potential mitigation measures.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.	Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-LT3.2:</u> Traffic management strategies shall be developed and implemented, where feasible, to accommodate short-term passenger loading/unloading activities.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Long-term improvements.	SFMTA to implement traffic management strategies to accommodate short-term passenger loading/unloading activities, where appropriate, as described, and to continue to investigate the effectiveness of any potential mitigation measures.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.	Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.
NEAR-TERM IMPROVEMENTS					
Cluster 2: South of Market Area					
<p><u>M-TR-P2-16h:</u> Feasibility of the following mitigation measures has not yet been determined. There is a range of potential treatments to address the issue at this intersection. One would be repositioning of the bus zone along the south side of Townsend Street. Another treatment would be reconfiguring the approach lanes to the intersection of 4th and Townsend Streets. Finally, installation of discontinuous bicycle lanes at the approach of the intersection could also be considered. Therefore, a significant transit impact would occur with implementation of Project 2-16 Modified Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 2-16.	SFMTA to implement one of the identified potential treatments as described and to continue to investigate the effectiveness of the potential mitigation measures.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.	Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-P2-16i:</u> Refer to Mitigation Measure 2-16h above for mitigation of this transit impact. However, without determination of the feasibility of these measures, a significant transit impact would occur to Muni bus line 45 under Existing plus Project conditions for Project 2-16 Modified Option 1.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 2-16.	SFMTA to implement one of the identified potential treatments as described and to continue to investigate the effectiveness of the potential mitigation measures.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.	Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.
<p><u>M-TR-P2-16l:</u> Refer to Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-16h above for mitigation of this transit impact. However, without determination of the feasibility of these measures, a significant transit impact would occur to Muni bus line 30 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Project 2-16 Modified Option 1.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 2-16.	SFMTA to implement one of the identified potential treatments as described and to continue to investigate the effectiveness of the potential mitigation measures.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts	Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-P2-16m:</u> Refer to Mitigation Measure M-TR-P2-16h above for mitigation of this transit impact. However, without determination of the feasibility of these measures, a significant transit impact would occur to Muni bus line 45 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions for Project 2-16 Modified Option 1.</p>	<p>SFMTA</p>	<p>Prior to implementation of Project 2-16.</p>	<p>SFMTA to implement one of the identified potential treatments as described and to continue to investigate the effectiveness of the potential mitigation measures.</p>	<p>SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.</p>	<p>Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.</p>

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
Cluster 5: Mission/Glen Park/Excelsior Area					
<p><u>M-TR-P5-6a:</u> Lane configuration adjustments to the eastbound and westbound direction on Cesar Chavez Street would improve LOS and reduce the delay at the Mission Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection from LOS F to LOS E. The removal of on-street parking along Cesar Chavez Street (applying either Option 1 or 2 per proposed possible Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6w in conjunction with proposed possible Mitigation Measures M-TR-P5-6e, M-TR-P5-6h, and M-TR-P5-6j, M-TR-P5-6k, M-TR-P5-6l, M-TR-P5-6m, M-TR-P5-6o, M-TR-P5-6q, for which feasibility has not yet been determined) is proposed which would provide an additional through lane along the eastbound and westbound Cesar Chavez Street approaches. This additional capacity will help reduce the delay and improve the V/C ratio by 9 percent (from 1.31 to 1.18). However, because of the uncertainty of the feasibility of this mitigation measure, a significant impact may occur at the Mission Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 5-6.	SFMTA to provide lane configuration adjustments corresponding to the No Project conditions with the implementation of one of the two options described in M-TR-P5-6w, and to continue to investigate the effectiveness of the potential mitigation measures as described in the referenced mitigation measures.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.	Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-P5-6b:</u> Lane configuration adjustments to the eastbound and westbound directions on Cesar Chavez Street would improve LOS and reduce the delay at the Mission Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection. The removal of on-street parking along Cesar Chavez Street (applying either Option 1 or 2 per proposed possible Mitigation Measure M- TR-P6-5w in conjunction with proposed possible Mitigation Measures, M-TR-P5-6e, M-TR-P5-6h, and M-TR-P5-6j, M-TR-P5-6k, M-TR-P5-6l, M-TR-P5-6m, M-TR-P5-6o, M-TR-P5-6q, for which feasibility has not yet been determined) is proposed which would provide an additional through lane along the eastbound and westbound Cesar Chavez Street approaches. This additional capacity will help reduce the delay and improve the V/C ratio by 23 percent (from 1.17 to 0.90). However, because of the uncertainty of the feasibility of this mitigation measure, a significant impact would occur at the Mission Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 5-6.	SFMTA to provide lane configuration adjustments corresponding to the No Project conditions with the implementation of one of the two options described in M-TR-P5-6w, and to continue to investigate the effectiveness of the potential mitigation measures as described in the referenced mitigation measures.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.	Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-P5-6c:</u> Lane configuration adjustments to the westbound direction of Cesar Chavez Street would improve LOS and reduce the delay for the Guerrero Street/Cesar Chavez Street. The removal of on-street parking along Cesar Chavez Street (applying either Option 1 or 2 per proposed possible Mitigation M-TR-P5-6w in conjunction with proposed possible Mitigation Measures, M-TR-P5-6e, M-TR-P5-6h, and M-TR-P5-6j, M-TR-P5-6k, M-TR-P5-6l, M-TR-P5-6m, M-TR-P5-6o, M-TR-P5-6q, for which feasibility has not yet been determined) is proposed which would provide an additional through lane along the westbound Cesar Chavez Street approach. This lane adjustment would decrease the delay and improve the V/C ratio by 28 percent (from 1.23 to 0.88) and improve LOS from F to D. However, because of the uncertainty of the feasibility of this mitigation measure, a significant impact may occur at the Guerrero Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 5-6.	SFMTA to provide lane configuration adjustments corresponding to the No Project conditions with the implementation of one of the two options described in M-TR-P5-6w, and to continue to investigate the effectiveness of the potential mitigation measures as described in the referenced mitigation measures.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.	Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-P5-6e</u> Lane configuration adjustments to the westbound direction along Cesar Chavez Street would improve LOS and reduce the delay at the Guerrero Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection. The removal of on-street parking along Cesar Chavez Street (applying either Option 1 or 2 per proposed possible Mitigation Measure M-TR-5-6w in conjunction with proposed possible Mitigation Measures, M-TR-P5-6e, M-TR-P5-6h, and M-TR-P5-6j, M-TR-P5-6k, M-TR-P5-6l, M-TR-P5-6m, M-TR-P5-6o, M-TR-P5-6q, for which feasibility has not yet been determined) is proposed which would provide an additional through lane along the westbound approach of Cesar Chavez Street. This lane adjustment would decrease the delay and improve the V/C ratio by 26 percent (from 1.76 to 1.30). Nevertheless, this mitigation measure would not reduce the project impacts at Guerrero Street/Cesar Chavez Street to a less-than-significant level.</p>	<p>SFMTA</p>	<p>Prior to implementation of Project 5-6.</p>	<p>SFMTA to provide lane configuration adjustments corresponding to the No Project conditions with the implementation of one of the two options described in M-TR-P5-6w, and to continue to investigate the effectiveness of the potential mitigation measures as described in the referenced mitigation measures.</p>	<p>SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.</p>	<p>Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.</p>

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-P5-6h:</u> Lane configuration adjustments to the eastbound and westbound directions along Cesar Chavez Street would improve LOS and reduce the delay at the Mission Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection. It is proposed that on-street parking be removed from Cesar Chavez Street (applying either Option 1 or 2 per proposed possible Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6w in conjunction with proposed possible Mitigation Measures, M-TR-P5-6e, M-TR-P5-6h, and M-TR-P5-6j, M-TR-P5-6k, M-TR-P5-6l, M-TR-P5-6m, M-TR-P5-6o, M-TR-P5-6q, for which feasibility has not yet been determined, along Cesar Chavez Street in eastbound and westbound directions which would provide an additional through lane in both directions. These lane adjustments would decrease the delay and improve LOS from E to D. However, because of the uncertainty of the feasibility of this mitigation measure, a significant impact would occur at the Mission Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6. In addition, bicycle lane discontinuity could occur at this location.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 5-6.	SFMTA to provide lane configuration adjustments corresponding to the No Project conditions with the implementation of one of the two options described in M-TR-P5-6w, and to continue to investigate the effectiveness of the potential mitigation measures as described in the referenced mitigation measures.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.	Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-P5-6j:</u> Lane configuration adjustments to the eastbound and westbound directions along Cesar Chavez Street would improve LOS and reduce the delay at the Mission Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection. It is proposed that on-street parking be removed from Cesar Chavez Street (applying either Option 1 or 2 per proposed possible Mitigation Measure M-TR-5-6w in conjunction with proposed possible Mitigation Measures, M-TR-P5-6e, M-TR-P5-6h, and M-TR-P5-6j, M-TR-P5-6k, M-TR-P5-6l, M-TR-P5-6m, M-TR-P5-6o, M-TR-P5-6q, for which feasibility has not yet been determined) along Cesar Chavez Street in the eastbound and westbound directions which would provide an additional through lane in both directions. These lane adjustments would decrease the delay and improve LOS from F to E. However, because of the uncertainty of the feasibility of this mitigation measure, a significant impact would occur at the Mission Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 5-6.	SFMTA to provide lane configuration adjustments corresponding to the No Project conditions with the implementation of one of the two options described in M-TR-P5-6w, and to continue to investigate the effectiveness of the potential mitigation measures as described in the referenced mitigation measures.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.	Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-P5-6k:</u> Lane configuration adjustments to the eastbound and westbound directions along Cesar Chavez Street would improve LOS and reduce the delay at the Cesar Chavez Street/South Van Ness Avenue intersection. It is proposed that on-street parking along Cesar Chavez Street be removed (applying either Option 1 or 2 per proposed possible Mitigation Measure M-TR-5-6w in conjunction with proposed possible Mitigation Measures, M-TR-P5-6e, M-TR-P5-6h, and M-TR-P5-6j, M-TR-P5-6k, M-TR-P5-6l, M-TR-P5-6m, M-TR-P5-6o, M-TR-P5-6q, for which feasibility has not yet been determined) in both the eastbound and westbound directions on Cesar Chavez Street, which would provide an additional through lane along both approaches. These lane adjustments would decrease the delay and improve LOS from F to D. However, because of the uncertainty of the feasibility of this mitigation measure, a significant impact would occur at the Cesar Chavez Street/South Van Ness Avenue intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 5-6.	SFMTA to provide lane configuration adjustments corresponding to the No Project conditions with the implementation of one of the two options described in M-TR-P5-6w, and to continue to investigate the effectiveness of the potential mitigation measures as described in the referenced mitigation measures.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.	Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-P5-6l</u> Lane configuration adjustments to the westbound direction along Cesar Chavez Street would improve LOS and reduce the delay at the Cesar Chavez Street/South Van Ness Avenue intersection. It is proposed that on-street parking along Cesar Chavez Street be removed (applying either Option 1 or 2 per proposed possible Mitigation Measure M-TR-5-6w in conjunction with proposed possible Mitigation Measures, M-TR-P5-6e, M-TR-P5-6h, and M-TR-P5-6j, M-TR-P5-6k, M-TR-P5-6l, M-TR-P5-6m, M-TR-P5-6o, M-TR-P5-6q, for which feasibility has not yet been determined) in the westbound direction which would provide an additional through lane along this approach. This lane adjustment would decrease the delay and improve LOS from E to D. However, because of the uncertainty of the feasibility of this mitigation measure, a significant impact would occur at the Cesar Chavez Street/South Van Ness Avenue intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6.</p>	<p>SFMTA</p>	<p>Prior to implementation of Project 5-6.</p>	<p>SFMTA to provide lane configuration adjustments corresponding to the No Project conditions with the implementation of one of the two options described in M-TR-P5-6w, and to continue to investigate the effectiveness of the potential mitigation measures as described in the referenced mitigation measures.</p>	<p>SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.</p>	<p>Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.</p>

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-P5-6m:</u> Lane configuration adjustments to the eastbound direction and westbound direction on Cesar Chavez Street would improve LOS and reduce the delay at the Cesar Chavez Street/South Van Ness intersection. It is proposed that on- street parking along Cesar Chavez Street be removed (applying either Option 1 or 2 per proposed possible Mitigation Measure M-TR-5-6w conjunction with proposed possible Mitigation Measures, M-TR-P5-6e, M-TR-P5-6h, and M-TR-P5-6j, M-TR-P5-6k, M-TR-P5-6l, M-TR-P5-6m, M-TR-P5-6o, M-TR-P5-6q, for which feasibility has not yet been determined) in both the eastbound and westbound directions on Cesar Chavez Street, which would provide an additional through lane along both approaches. These lane adjustments decrease the amount of average delay and reduce the V/C ratio by 22 percent (from 1.91 to 1.49). Nevertheless, this mitigation measure would not reduce the project impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p>	<p>SFMTA</p>	<p>Prior to implementation of Project 5-6.</p>	<p>SFMTA to provide lane configuration adjustments corresponding to the No Project conditions with the implementation of one of the two options described in M-TR-P5-6w, and to continue to investigate the effectiveness of the potential mitigation measures as described in the referenced mitigation measures.</p>	<p>SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.</p>	<p>Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.</p>

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-P5-6o:</u> Lane configuration adjustments to the eastbound direction and westbound direction along Cesar Chavez Street would improve LOS and reduce the delay at the Bryant Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection. It is proposed that on-street parking be removed along the eastbound and westbound directions on Cesar Chavez Street (applying either Option 1 or 2 per proposed possible Mitigation Measure M-TR-5-6w in conjunction with proposed possible Mitigation Measures, M-TR-P5-6e, M-TR-P5-6h, and M-TR-P5-6j, M-TR-P5-6k, M-TR-P5-6l, M-TR-P5-6m, M-TR-P5-6o, M-TR-P5-6q, for which feasibility has not yet been determined), which would provide an additional through lane in both directions. These lane adjustments would decrease the delay and improve the V/C ratio by 29 percent (from 1.34 to 0.95) and improve LOS from F to D. However, because of the uncertainty of the feasibility of this mitigation measure, a significant impact would occur at the Bryant Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 5-6.	SFMTA to provide lane configuration adjustments corresponding to the No Project conditions with the implementation of one of the two options described in M-TR-P5-6w, and to continue to investigate the effectiveness of the potential mitigation measures as described in the referenced mitigation measures.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.	Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-P5-6g:</u> Lane configuration adjustments to the eastbound and westbound directions along Cesar Chavez Street would improve LOS and reduce the delay at the Bryant Street/Cesar Chavez Street intersection. It is proposed that on-street parking be removed in the eastbound and westbound directions along Cesar Chavez Street (applying either Option 1 or 2 per proposed possible Mitigation Measure M-TR-5-6w in conjunction with proposed possible Mitigation Measures, M-TR-P5-6e, M-TR-P5-6h, and M-TR-P5-6j, M-TR-P5-6k, M-TR-P5-6l, M-TR-P5-6m, M-TR-P5-6o, M-TR-P5-6q, for which feasibility has not yet been determined), which would provide an additional through lane along both approaches. These lane adjustments would decrease the delay and improve the V/C ratio by 28 percent (from 2.04 to 1.47). Nevertheless, this mitigation measure Chavez Street intersection with the implementation of Project 5-6. would not reduce the project impacts to a less-than-significant level. Hence a significant impact would occur at the Bryant Street/Cesar Chavez Streets.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 5-6.	SFMTA to provide lane configuration adjustments corresponding to the No Project conditions with the implementation of one of the two options described in M-TR-P5-6w, and to continue to investigate the effectiveness of the potential mitigation measures as described in the referenced mitigation measures.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.	Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-P5-6s:</u> The implementation of Modified Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions would add 474 seconds (7.9 minutes) of total delay for Muni bus line 12 westbound. With mitigation as described in Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6w in conjunction with proposed possible Mitigation Measures, M-TR-P5-6e, M-TR-P5-6h, and M-TR-P5-6j, M-TR-P5-6k, M-TR-P5-6l, M-TR-P5-6m, M-TR-P5-6o, M-TR-P5-6q, for which feasibility has not yet been determined, this delay would be reduced to 262 seconds (4.4 minutes) of delay westbound for Muni bus line 12. This would reduce total delay below the transit delay threshold of six minutes. However, because of the uncertainty of the feasibility of this mitigation measure, a significant impact would occur to Muni bus line 12 for Project 5-6 Modified Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions.</p>	<p>SFMTA</p>	<p>Prior to implementation of Project 5-6 Option 1.</p>	<p>SFMTA to provide lane configuration adjustments corresponding to the No Project conditions with the implementation of one of the two options described in M-TR-P5-6w, and to continue to investigate the effectiveness of the potential mitigation measures as described in the referenced mitigation measures.</p>	<p>SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.</p>	<p>Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.</p>

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-P5-6t:</u> The implementation of Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions would add 867 seconds (14.5 minutes) of total delay for Muni bus line 27. With mitigation as described in Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6w in conjunction with proposed possible Mitigation Measures, M-TR-P5-6e, M-TR-P5-6h, and M-TR-P5-6j, M-TR-P5-6k, M-TR-P5-6l, M-TR-P5-6m, M-TR-P5-6o, M-TR-P5-6q, for which feasibility has not yet been determined, delay in the westbound direction would be reduced to 324 seconds (5.4 minutes) of delay westbound and 29 seconds eastbound for a total added delay of 353 seconds (5.8 minutes). This would reduce total delay below the transit delay threshold of six minutes. However, because of the uncertainty of the feasibility of this mitigation measure, a significant impact would occur to Muni bus line 27 for Project 5-6 Option 1 under Existing plus Project conditions.</p>	<p>SFMTA</p>	<p>Prior to implementation of Project 5-6 Option 1.</p>	<p>SFMTA to provide lane configuration adjustments corresponding to the No Project conditions with the implementation of one of the two options described in M-TR-P5-6w, and to continue to investigate the effectiveness of the potential mitigation measures as described in the referenced mitigation measures.</p>	<p>SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.</p>	<p>Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.</p>

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-P5-6u:</u> The implementation of Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions would add approximately 1,487 seconds (24.7 minutes) of total delay for Muni bus line 12 westbound with mitigation as described in Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6w in conjunction with proposed possible Mitigation Measures, M-TR-P5-6e, M-TR-P5-6h, and M-TR-P5-6j, M-TR-P5-6k, M-TR-P5-6l, M-TR-P5-6m, M-TR-P5-6o, M-TR- P5-6q, for which feasibility has not yet been determined. Therefore, a significant transit impact to Muni bus line 12 would occur with implementation of Project 5-6 with Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 5-6 Option 1.	SFMTA to provide lane configuration adjustments corresponding to the No Project conditions with the implementation of one of the two options described in M-TR-P5-6w, and to continue to investigate the effectiveness of the potential mitigation measures as described in the referenced mitigation measures.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.	Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-P5-6v:</u> The implementation of Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions would add approximately 2,429 seconds (40.5 minutes) of total delay for Muni bus line 27. With mitigation as described in Mitigation Measure M-TR-P5-6w in conjunction with proposed possible Mitigation Measures, M-TR-P5-6e, M-TR-P5-6h, and M-TR-P5-6j, M-TR-P5-6k, M-TR-P5-6l, M-TR-P5-6m, M-TR-P5-6o, M-TR-P5-6q, for which feasibility has not yet been determined, this delay would not be reduced westbound but would be reduced to 99 seconds (1.6 minutes) of delay eastbound. The total added delay of 1,897 seconds (31.6 minutes) would be greater than the transit delay threshold of six minutes. Therefore, a significant transit impact to Muni bus line 27 would occur with implementation of Project 5-6 with Option 1 under 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions.</p>	<p>SFMTA</p>	<p>Prior to implementation of Project 5-6 Option 1.</p>	<p>SFMTA to provide lane configuration adjustments corresponding to the No Project conditions with the implementation of one of the two options described in M-TR-P5-6w, and to continue to investigate the effectiveness of the potential mitigation measures as described in the referenced mitigation measures.</p>	<p>SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.</p>	<p>Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.</p>

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>M-TR-P5-6w.</u> As referenced in the above Mitigation Measures M-TR-P5-6e, M-TR-P5-6h, M-TR-P 5-6j, M-TR-P 5-6k, M-TR-P 5-6l, M-TR-P 5-6m, M-TR-P 5-6o, and M-TR-P 5-6q, the traffic analysis conducted for Project 5-6 included four study intersections along Cesar Chavez for the segment between Hampshire and Guerrero Streets. Analysis indicates that if the lane configurations corresponding to the No Project conditions can be provided, some impacts will be mitigated at these intersections. The following two options are part of proposed possible mitigation measures, for which feasibility has not yet been determined, to reinstate the lane configuration under No Project conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1 Removal of parking – For the four study intersections analyzed, approximately 100 spaces would need to be removed on Cesar Chavez Street to mitigate the impacts at these locations. However, additional parking spaces may need to be removed to reduce impacts along the entire corridor. • Option 2 Implementing a discontinuous bicycle lane – The consultant recommends the bicycle lane be discontinued at selected intersection approaches along Cesar Chavez Street. This option may reduce the number of parking spaces that need to be removed on Cesar Chavez Street compared to Option 1. 	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 5-6.	SFMTA to provide lane configuration adjustments corresponding to the No Project conditions with the implementation of one of the two options described in M-TR-P5-6w, and to continue to investigate the effectiveness of the potential mitigation measures as described in the referenced mitigation measures.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing feasible mitigation measures and the extent to which they reduce the identified impacts.	Quarterly report to ERO if new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Improvement Measures	Implementation Responsibility	Schedule	Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
B-1 IMPROVEMENT MEASURES AGREED TO BY PROJECT SPONSOR RELATED TO THE NEAR-TERM IMPROVEMENTS:					
<p><u>I-P2-1a:</u> To improve freight loading conditions in the 2nd Street corridor, metered parking spaces on Mission Street east of 2nd Street would be converted to yellow commercial freight loading zones.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Modified Project 2-1.	SFMTA to convert metered parking spaces immediately adjacent to the two commercial freight loading zones on the west side of Hawthorne Street north of Folsom Street on 2 nd Street would be converted to yellow commercial freight loading zones.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing the implementation of improvement measures.	Quarterly report to ERO as new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Improvement Measures	Implementation Responsibility	Schedule	Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>I-P2-1b:</u> To improve freight loading conditions in the 2nd Street corridor, two metered parking spaces immediately adjacent to the aforementioned commercial freight loading spaces on Hawthorne Street would be converted to yellow commercial freight loading spaces.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Modified Project 2-1.	SFMTA to convert two metered parking spaces immediately adjacent to the aforementioned commercial freight loading spaces on Hawthorne Street to yellow commercial freight loading spaces.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing the implementation of improvement measures.	Quarterly report to ERO as new improvements are implemented.
<p><u>I-P2-4a:</u> In order to address improvements for the non-significant parking impacts resulting from the loss of on-street parking spaces under Existing plus Project and 2025 Cumulative plus Project Conditions, it is recommended that the existing parallel parking on some cross streets along 17th Street is converted to perpendicular parking. This improvement measure would reduce the net parking loss from 212 to 166 parking spaces.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Modified Project 2-4	SFMTA to investigate conversion of existing parallel parking on some cross streets along 17 th Street along the project alignment to perpendicular parking.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing the implementation of improvement measures.	Quarterly report to ERO as new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Improvement Measures	Implementation Responsibility	Schedule	Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p><u>I-P2-11a:</u></p> <p>In order to address improvements for the non-significant loading impacts resulting from the loss of on-street loading spaces under Existing plus Project and 2025 Cumulative plus Project conditions, it is recommended that the City conduct a loading needs analysis to determine how many and where additional on-street yellow commercial freight loading spaces are required on or near Market Street between Laguna and Noe Streets.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Modified Project 2-11	SFMTA to conduct a loading needs analysis to determine how many and where additional on-street yellow commercial freight loading spaces are required on or near Market Street between Laguna and Noe Streets.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing the implementation of improvement measures.	Quarterly report to ERO as new improvements are implemented.
<p><u>I-P5-7a:</u></p> <p>This improvement measure is recommended to improve parking conditions with implementation of Project 5-7. The second phase design study for the Glen Park Station area conducted by the SFMTA could further investigate parking management strategies in this area, such as parking pricing, better striping and potential expansion of the existing parking lot on the north side of Bosworth Street. The Glen Park neighborhood has been working closely with the City on the development of a transportation concept plan for this area. It should consider potential loss of an additional 56 to 59 parking spaces due to the proposed bicycle improvements and identify acceptable strategies with the neighborhood organizations to address the issue of parking loss.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of Project 5-7a	SFMTA could further investigate parking management strategies in this area, such as parking pricing, better striping and potential expansion of the existing parking lot on the north side of Bosworth Street.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing the implementation of improvement measures.	Quarterly report to ERO as new improvements are implemented.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Improvement Measures	Implementation Responsibility	Schedule	Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
B-2 IMPROVEMENT MEASURES RELATED TO THE LONG-TERM IMPROVEMENTS FOR WHICH FEASIBILITY HAS YET TO BE DETERMINED					
<p><u>I-TR-LT3.1:</u> Converting metered parking to yellow commercial freight loading zones, where feasible.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of a long-term improvement	SFMTA to determine locations to convert metered parking to yellow commercial freight loading zones, where appropriate. and feasible.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing the implementation of improvement measures.	Quarterly report to ERO as new improvements are implemented.
<p><u>I-TR-LT3.2:</u> Developing and implementing traffic management strategies to accommodate short-term passenger loading/unloading activities, where feasible.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to implementation of a long-term improvement	SFMTA to develop and implement traffic management strategies to accommodate short-term passenger loading/unloading activities, where appropriate and feasible.	SFMTA to provide a report to ERO detailing the implementation of improvement measures.	Quarterly report to ERO as new improvements are implemented.