File No. 160559 Committee Item No. 1
Board Item No. _____

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Budget & Finance Committee **Date** May 25, 2016

Board of Supervisors Meeting **Date** _____

Cmte Board

Cmte	Board	
☐	☐	Motion
☒	☐	Resolution
☐	☐	Ordinance
☐	☐	Legislative Digest
☐	☐	Budget and Legislative Analyst Report
☐	☐	Youth Commission Report
☒	☐	Introduction Form
☒	☐	Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report
☐	☐	MOU
☐	☐	Grant Information Form
☐	☐	Grant Budget
☐	☐	Subcontract Budget
☒	☐	Contract/Agreement
☐	☐	Form 126 – Ethics Commission
☐	☐	Award Letter
☐	☐	Application
☐	☐	Public Correspondence

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

☒	☐	Planning Commission Motion
☒	☐	MTA Board of Director Resolutions
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	

Completed by: Linda Wong **Date** May 20, 2016
Completed by: Linda Wong **Date** _____

FILE NO. 160559 RESOLUTION NO.

[Cooperative Agreement - Caltrans - 19th Avenue Combined City Project]

Resolution approving a cooperative agreement between the City and County of San Francisco and the State of California Department of Transportation concerning the design and construction of the 19th Avenue combined City project including pedestrian safety, transit improvements, and utility upgrades along 19th Avenue between Junipero Serra Boulevard and Lincoln Way.

WHEREAS, The purpose of the 19th Avenue Combined City project (Project) is to improve safety for pedestrians and transit riders; to improve transit speed and reliability; and to reduce travel time by optimizing transit stop locations along State Route 1; and

WHEREAS, In addition, the Project also would increase the reliability of water transmission services and wastewater services and enhance emergency responses by improving the Auxiliary Water Supply System (AWSS) and constructing four crossings of the Flexible Water Supply System (FWSS); and

WHEREAS, The Project's construction of the utility upgrades in conjunction with the surface improvements would serve to minimize the overall construction disruption to the corridor and its many users; and

WHEREAS, On July 7, 2015, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Board of Directors approved the project elements along the 28 - 19th Avenue Muni transit corridor included in the Muni Forward Service-Related Capital Improvements and Travel Time Reduction Proposals, under Resolution No. 15-107; and

WHEREAS, The Resolution also included findings under the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code, Sections 21000 et seq. (CEQA) and included elements that are part of the Project; and

WHEREAS, A copy of this Resolution is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 160559 and is incorporated herein by reference; and

WHEREAS, The City and State of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) desire to effectuate an agreement that defines the terms and conditions under which the Project is to be constructed, financed, and maintained (the Cooperative Agreement); and

WHEREAS, Said Cooperative Agreement provides that the City will design, construct, and finance the Project; and that Caltrans will provide independent quality assurance for the work within the state highway system right-of-way, provide review and approval of project documents as listed in the Cooperative Agreement, and issue, upon proper application, the encroachment permits required for Project completion; and

WHEREAS, Execution of the Cooperative Agreement is a prerequisite for Caltrans issuing an encroachment permit for the Project; and

WHEREAS, Public Works and Caltrans have reviewed the Cooperative Agreement and recommend its approval; and

WHEREAS, A copy of said Cooperative Agreement is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 160559 and is incorporated herein by reference; and

WHEREAS, In Public Works Order No. 184706, dated March 21, 2016, the Director of Public Works recommends that the Board accept the Cooperative Agreement; and

WHEREAS, A copy of said Order is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 160559 and is incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein; and

WHEREAS, The Project was analyzed in the Transit Effectiveness Project Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) that the San Francisco Planning Commission certified in Motion No. 19105 on March 27, 2014; and

WHEREAS, Said Motion is on file with the Clerk of the Board and is incorporated herein by reference; and

WHEREAS, As part of the Resolution No. 14-041, the SFMTA Board of Directors adopted approval findings under CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31 of the Administrative Code (collectively CEQA Findings) and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the Transit Effectiveness Project; and

WHEREAS, The Resolution, CEQA Findings, and MMRP are on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 160559 and are incorporated herein by reference; and

WHEREAS, The Board adopts these CEQA findings and those included in SFMTA Board of Directors Resolution No. 15-107 as its own; and

WHEREAS, This Board reviewed the FEIR and found that since certification of the FEIR, no changes have occurred in the proposed project or in the circumstances under which the project would be implemented that would cause new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts identified and analyzed in the FEIR, and that no new information of substantial important has emerged that would change the analyses or conclusions set forth in the FEIR; and

WHEREAS, The actions approved herein would not necessitate implementation of additional or considerably different mitigation measures than those identified in the FEIR; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors finds that entering into a Cooperative Agreement with Caltrans for construction of the Project is within the scope of the FEIR and that no additional environmental review is required under Public Resources Code, Section 21166; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors has reviewed the Public Works Order No. 184706 and accepts the Director of Public Works' recommendation to approve the Cooperative Agreement with Caltrans apportioning responsibilities for the Project in substantially the same form as the Agreement on file with the Clerk; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors authorizes and directs the Director of Public Works to approve any additions, amendments or other modifications to the Cooperative Agreement that the Director of Public Works, in consultation with the City Attorney, determines is in the best interest of the City, do not materially increase the obligations or liabilities of the City, or materially decrease the public benefits accruing to the City, and are necessary or advisable to complete the transactions contemplated and effectuate the purpose and intent of this resolution, such determination to be conclusively evidenced by the execution and delivery by the Director of Public Works of any such documents; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That within 30 days of executing the Cooperative Agreement, the Director of Public Works shall forward an executed copy of the Agreement to the Clerk of the Board for its records.

COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT

State Independent Quality Assurance

This AGREEMENT, effective on _____, is between the State of California, acting through its Department of Transportation, referred to as CALTRANS, and:

City and County of San Francisco, a municipal corporation of the State of California, referred to hereinafter as CITY.

RECITALS

1. PARTNERS are authorized to enter into a cooperative agreement for improvements to the state highway system (SHS) per the California Streets and Highways Code sections 114 and 130.

2. For the purpose of this AGREEMENT, *pedestrian and transit bulbouts, utility and signal upgrade on State Route 1 (19th Avenue) from Lincoln Avenue to Holloway Avenue* will be referred to hereinafter as PROJECT. The project scope of work is defined in the PROJECT initiation and approval documents (e.g., Project Study Report, Permit Engineering Evaluation Report, or Project Report).

3. All responsibilities assigned in this AGREEMENT to complete the following PROJECT COMPONENTS will be referred to hereinafter as OBLIGATIONS:

   - Plans, Specifications, and Estimate (PS&E)
   - Right of Way Support (R/W SUPPORT)
   - Right of Way Capital (R/W CAPITAL)
   - CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT
   - CONSTRUCTION CAPITAL

4. This AGREEMENT is separate from and does not modify or replace any other cooperative agreement or memorandum of understanding between PARTNERS regarding the PROJECT.

5. The following work associated with this PROJECT has been completed or is in progress:

   - The San Francisco Planning Commission certified the TEP EIR in March, 2014. The project's proposed bus stop consolidations and relocations, and the transit and pedestrian bulb-outs along SR 1 are included in the TEP EIR as item TTRP.28.

- The San Francisco Planning Department (SF Planning) issued an Abbreviated CEQA Checklist for TEP Improvements subsequent to Certification of the TEP EIR for the additional pedestrian bulb-outs, removal of channelizing islands, and other surface improvements on May 29, 2015.

- SF Planning issued a Categorical Exemption (Cat Ex) for the water distribution system replacement, new installation, and upgrades on August 24, 2015.

- SF Planning concurred with a Statutory Exemption (Stat Ex) prepared by the SFPUC for the replacement of existing AWSS pipeline on April 17, 2015.

- SF Planning concurred with a Stat Ex prepared by the SFPUC for the Flexible Water Supply System pipeline connections on April 17, 2015.

- SF Planning issued a Cat Ex for the wastewater system repair and replacement on January 19, 2016.

- Caltrans issued a Cat Ex for the SF-1 Phase III Signal Upgrade and Interconnect Signals Project (EA 0J700) on April 21, 2015.

6. In this AGREEMENT capitalized words represent defined terms, initialisms, or acronyms.

7. PARTNERS hereby set forth the terms, covenants, and conditions of this AGREEMENT, under which they will accomplish OBLIGATIONS.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Sponsorship

8. CITY is the SPONSOR for the PROJECT COMPONENTS in this AGREEMENT.

Funding

9. The OBLIGATIONS do not use funds administered by CALTRANS. PARTNERS will amend this AGREEMENT should this condition change.

10. Each PARTNER is responsible for the costs they incur in performing the OBLIGATIONS of this AGREEMENT unless otherwise stated in this AGREEMENT.

Implementing Agency

11. CITY is the IMPLEMENTING AGENCY for PS&E.

12. CITY is the IMPLEMENTING AGENCY for RIGHT OF WAY.

13. CITY is the IMPLEMENTING AGENCY for CONSTRUCTION.

14. The IMPLEMENTING AGENCY for a PROJECT COMPONENT will provide a Quality Management Plan (QMP) for that component as part of the PROJECT MANAGEMENT PLAN. The Quality Management Plan describes the IMPLEMENTING AGENCY's quality policy and how it will be used. The Quality Management Plan is subject to CALTRANS review and approval.

The CITY will provide, or cause to provide, source inspection services for PROJECT.

The CITY will prepare a Quality Management Plan (QMP) which will include a description of how source inspection will be performed and will submit the QMP to the DEPARTMENT for review and approval by the State Materials Engineer.

15. Any PARTNER responsible for completing WORK shall make its personnel and consultants that prepare WORK available to help resolve WORK-related problems and changes for the entire duration of the PROJECT including PROJECT COMPONENT work that may occur under separate agreements.

Independent Quality Assurance

16. CALTRANS will provide Independent Quality Assurance for the portions of WORK within the existing and proposed SHS right-of-way.

CALTRANS' Independent Quality Assurance efforts are to ensure that CITY's quality assurance activities result in WORK being developed in accordance with the applicable standards and within an established Quality Management Plan. Independent Quality Assurance does not include any efforts necessary to develop or deliver WORK or any validation by verifying or rechecking work performed by another party.

When CALTRANS performs Independent Quality Assurance it does so for its own benefit. No one can assign liability to CALTRANS due to its Independent Quality Assurance.

CEQA Lead Agency

17. CITY is the CEQA Lead Agency for the PROJECT.

18. CALTRANS is a CEQA Responsible Agency for the PROJECT.

Environmental Permits, Approvals and Agreements

19. PARTNERS will comply with the commitments and conditions set forth in the environmental documentation, environmental permits, approvals, and applicable agreements as those commitments and conditions apply to each PARTNER's responsibilities in this AGREEMENT.

20. Unless otherwise assigned in this AGREEMENT, the IMPLEMENTING AGENCY for a PROJECT COMPONENT is responsible for all PROJECT COMPONENT WORK associated with coordinating, obtaining, implementing, renewing, and amending the PROJECT permits, agreements, and approvals whether they are identified in the planned project scope of work or become necessary in the course of completing the PROJECT.

21. The PROJECT requires the following environmental requirements/approvals:

ENVIRONMENTAL PERMITS/REQUIREMENTS
401, Regional Water Quality Control Board
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), State Water Resources Control Board
State Waste Discharge Requirements (Porter Cologne), Regional Water Quality Control Board

Plans, Specifications, and Estimate (PS&E)

22. As IMPLEMENTING AGENCY for PS&E, CITY is responsible for all PS&E WORK except those PS&E activities and responsibilities that are assigned to another PARTNER in this AGREEMENT and those activities that may be specifically excluded.

23. CITY will prepare Utility Conflict Maps identifying the accommodation, protection, relocation, or removal of any existing utility facilities that conflict with construction of the PROJECT or that violate CALTRANS' encroachment policy.

CITY will provide CALTRANS a copy of Utility Conflict Maps for CALTRANS' concurrence prior to issuing the Notices to Owner and executing the Utility Agreement. All utility conflicts will be addressed in the PROJECT plans, specifications, and estimate.

Right of Way (R/W)

24. As IMPLEMENTING AGENCY for R/W, CITY is responsible for all R/W SUPPORT WORK except those R/W SUPPORT activities and responsibilities that are assigned to another PARTNER in this AGREEMENT and those activities that may be specifically excluded.

25. Right of Way acquisition will not occur prior to the approval of the environmental document. If environmental permits, licenses, agreements, or certifications are needed for the right of way acquisition than those must be obtained prior to the acquisition.

26. The selection of R/W personnel and WORK within the completed PROJECT's SHS right-of-way will be performed in accordance with federal and California laws and regulations, and CALTRANS' policies, procedures, standards, practices, and applicable agreements.

27. CITY will make all necessary arrangements with utility owners for the timely accommodation, protection, relocation, or removal of any existing utility facilities that conflict with construction of the PROJECT or that violate CALTRANS' encroachment policy.

28. CITY will provide CALTRANS a copy of conflict maps, Relocation Plans, proposed Notices to Owner, Reports of Investigation, and Utility Agreements (if applicable) for CALTRANS' concurrence prior to issuing the Notices to Owner and executing the Utility Agreement. All utility conflicts will be fully addressed prior to Right of Way Certification and all arrangements for the protection, relocation, or removal of all conflicting facilities will be completed prior to construction contract award and included in the PROJECT plans, specifications, and estimate.

29. CITY will determine the cost to positively identify and locate, protect, relocate, or remove any utility facilities whether inside or outside SHS right-of-way in accordance with federal and California laws and regulations, and CALTRANS' policies, procedures, standards, practices, and applicable agreements including but not limited to Freeway Master Contracts.

30. CITY will provide a land surveyor licensed in the State of California to be responsible for surveying and right-of-way engineering. All survey and right-of-way engineering documents will bear the professional seal, certificate number, registration classification, expiration date of certificate, and signature of the responsible surveyor.

31. CITY will utilize a public agency currently qualified by CALTRANS or a properly licensed consultant for all right-of-way activities. A qualified right-of-way agent will administer all right-of-way consultant contracts.

CITY will submit a draft Right of Way Certification document to CALTRANS six (6) weeks prior to the scheduled Right of Way Certification milestone date for review.

CITY will submit a final Right of Way certification document to CALTRANS for approval prior to the PROJECT advertisement.

32. Physical and legal possession of right-of-way must be completed prior to construction advertisement, unless PARTNERS mutually agree to other arrangements in writing. Right of way conveyances must be completed prior to OBLIGATION COMPLETION, unless PARTNERS mutually agree to other arrangements in writing.

33. CALTRANS' acceptance of right-of-way title is subject to review of an Updated Preliminary Title Report provided by CITY verifying that the title is free of all encumbrances and liens. Upon acceptance, CITY will provide CALTRANS with a Policy of Title Insurance in CALTRANS' name.

34. The California Transportation Commission is responsible for hearing and adopting Resolutions of Necessity.

Construction

35. As IMPLEMENTING AGENCY for CONSTRUCTION, CITY is responsible for all CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT WORK except those CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT activities and responsibilities that are assigned to another PARTNER in this AGREEMENT and those activities that may be specifically excluded.

36. CALTRANS will be responsible for completing the following CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT activities:

CALTRANS Work Breakdown Structure Identifier (If Applicable)
285.05.15.xx Change Order Review & Approval as required in this Agreement
270.20.45.xx SWPPP/WPCP Review & Approval

37. CITY will advertise, open bids, award, and approve the construction contract in accordance with the California Public Contract Code and the California Labor Code. By accepting responsibility to advertise and award the construction contract, CITY also accepts responsibility to administer the construction contract.

38. CALTRANS will not issue an Encroachment Permit for construction work until CALTRANS accepts:

- The final plans, specifications, and estimate package
- The Right of Way Certification
- The PROJECT SPONSOR verifies full funding of CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT and CONSTRUCTION CAPITAL.
- Quality Management Plan (QMP) for Construction

39. CITY will provide a Resident Engineer and CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT staff that are independent of the construction contractor. The Resident Engineer will be a Civil Engineer, licensed in the State of California, who is responsible for construction contract administration activities.

40. CALTRANS will review and approve:

- Change Orders affecting public safety, public convenience, protected environmental resources, the preservation of property, all design and specification changes, and all major changes as defined in the CALTRANS Construction Manual. These Change Orders must receive written concurrence by CALTRANS prior to implementation.
- The Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) or the Water Pollution Control Plan (WPCP).
- Quality Management Plan (QMP) for Construction.

41. If CONSTRUCTION CAPITAL is funded with state or federal funds then CITY will administer and process all construction contract claims using a CALTRANS-approved process. CALTRANS will provide Independent Quality Assurance for the claims process.

42. CITY will require the construction contractor to furnish payment and performance bonds naming CITY as obligee, and CALTRANS as additional obligee, and to carry liability insurance in accordance with CALTRANS Standard Specifications.

43. CITY is designated as the Approved Signatory Authority responsible for preparing and filing all Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Permit Registration Documents including certifying the accuracy of all documents and its compliance in accordance with the Construction General Permit, and CALTRANS MS4 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for all work within the SHS.

44. The Quality Management Plan will describe how construction material verification and workmanship inspections will be performed at manufacturing sources and the PROJECT job-site. The construction material and source inspection Quality Management Plan is subject to review and approval by the State Materials Engineer.

45. As IMPLEMENTING AGENCY for construction, CITY is responsible for maintenance of the State Highway System within the PROJECT limits as part of the construction contract.

46. After OBLIGATION COMPLETION SHS maintenance will be handled through an existing maintenance agreement.

47. Within one hundred eighty (180) calendar days following the completion and acceptance of the PROJECT construction contract, CITY shall furnish CALTRANS with a complete set of "As-Built" plans and Change Orders, including any changes authorized by CALTRANS, on a CD ROM and in accordance with CALTRANS' then current CADD User's Manual (Section 4.3), Plans Preparation Manual, and CALTRANS practice. The plans will have the Resident Engineers name, contract number, and construction contract acceptance date printed on each plan sheet, and with the Resident Engineer's signature only on the title sheet. The As-Built plans will be in Microstation DGN format, version 7.0 or later. In addition, CITY will provide one set of As-Built plans and addenda in TIFF format.

The submittal must also include all CALTRANS requested contract records, and land survey documents. The land survey documents include monument preservation documents and Records of Surveys prepared to satisfy the requirements of the California Land Surveyors Act (Business and Professions Code sections 8700 – 8805). Copies of survey documents and Records of Surveys filed in accordance with Business & Professions Code, including sections 8762 and 8771, shall contain the filing information provided by the county in which filed.

48. Upon OBLIGATION COMPLETION, ownership or title to all materials and equipment constructed or installed for the operations and/or maintenance of the SHS within SHS right-of-way as part of WORK become the property of CALTRANS.

CALTRANS will not accept ownership or title to any materials or equipment constructed or installed outside the SHS right-of-way.

Schedule

49. PARTNERS will manage the schedule for OBLIGATIONS through the work plan included in the PROJECT MANAGEMENT PLAN.

Additional Provisions

50. PARTNERS will perform all OBLIGATIONS in accordance with federal and California laws, regulations, and standards; FHWA STANDARDS; and CALTRANS STANDARDS.

51. CALTRANS retains the right to reject noncompliant WORK, protect public safety, preserve property rights, and ensure that all WORK is in the best interest of the SHS.

52. Each PARTNER will ensure that personnel participating in OBLIGATIONS are appropriately qualified or licensed to perform the tasks assigned to them.

53. PARTNERS will invite each other to participate in the selection of any consultants who participate in OBLIGATIONS.

54. CALTRANS will issue, upon proper application, the encroachment permits required for WORK within SHS right-of-way. Contractors and/or agents, and utility owners will not work within the SHS right-of-way without an encroachment permit issued in their name. CALTRANS will provide encroachment permits to PARTNERS, their contractors, consultants and agents, and utility owners at no cost. If the encroachment permit and this AGREEMENT conflict, the requirements of this AGREEMENT shall prevail.

55. The IMPLEMENTING AGENCY for a PROJECT COMPONENT will coordinate, prepare, obtain, implement, renew, and amend any encroachment permits needed to complete the PROJECT COMPONENT WORK.

56. If any PARTNER discovers unanticipated cultural, archaeological, paleontological, or other protected resources during WORK, all WORK in that area will stop and that PARTNER will notify all PARTNERS within twenty-four (24) hours of discovery. WORK may only resume after a qualified professional has evaluated the nature and significance of the discovery and a plan is approved for its removal or protection.

57. PARTNERS will hold all administrative drafts and administrative final reports, studies, materials, and documentation relied upon, produced, created, or utilized for the PROJECT in confidence to the extent permitted by law and where applicable, the provisions of California Government Code section 6254.5(e) shall protect the confidentiality of such documents in the event that said documents are shared between PARTNERS.

PARTNERS will not distribute, release, or share said documents with anyone other than employees, agents, and consultants who require access to complete the PROJECT without the written consent of the PARTNER authorized to release them, unless required or authorized to do so by law.

58. If a PARTNER receives a public records request pertaining to OBLIGATIONS, that PARTNER will notify PARTNERS within five (5) working days of receipt and make PARTNERS aware of any disclosed public documents. PARTNERS will consult with each other prior to the release of any public documents related to the PROJECT.

59. If HM-1 or HM-2 is found during a PROJECT COMPONENT, the IMPLEMENTING AGENCY for that PROJECT COMPONENT will immediately notify PARTNERS.

60. CALTRANS, independent of the PROJECT, is responsible for any HM-1 found within the existing SHS right-of-way. CALTRANS will undertake, or cause to be undertaken, HM MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES related to HM-1 with minimum impact to the PROJECT schedule.

CALTRANS, independent of the PROJECT will pay, or cause to be paid, the cost of HM MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES related to HM-1 found within the existing SHS right-of-way.

61. CITY, independent of the PROJECT, is responsible for any HM-1 found within the PROJECT limits and outside the existing SHS right-of-way. CITY will undertake, or cause to be undertaken, HM MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES related to HM-1 with minimum impact to the PROJECT schedule.

CITY, independent of the PROJECT, will pay, or cause to be paid, the cost of HM MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES related to HM-1 found within the PROJECT limits and outside of the existing SHS right-of-way.

62. If HM-2 is found within the PROJECT limits, the public agency responsible for the advertisement, award, and administration (AAA) of the PROJECT construction contract will be responsible for HM MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES related to HM-2.

63. CALTRANS' acquisition or acceptance of title to any property on which any HM-1 or HM-2 is found will proceed in accordance with CALTRANS' policy on such acquisition.

64. CITY will accept, reject, compromise, settle, or litigate claims of any non-AGREEMENT parties hired to complete OBLIGATIONS.

65. PARTNERS will confer on any claim that may affect OBLIGATIONS or PARTNERS' liability or responsibility under this AGREEMENT in order to retain resolution possibilities for potential future claims. No PARTNER will prejudice the rights of another PARTNER until after PARTNERS confer on the claim.

66. If the PROJECT expends state or federal funds, each PARTNER will comply with the federal Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards of 2 CFR, Part 200. PARTNERS will ensure that any for-profit party hired to participate in the OBLIGATIONS will comply with the requirements in 48 CFR, Chapter 1, Part 31. When state or federal funds are expended on the PROJECT these principles and requirements apply to all funding types included in this AGREEMENT.

67. If the PROJECT expends state or federal funds, each PARTNER will undergo an annual audit in accordance with the Single Audit Act and the federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-133.

68. If the PROJECT expends federal funds, any PARTNER that hires an A&E consultant to perform WORK on any part of the PROJECT will ensure that the procurement of the consultant and the consultant overhead costs are in accordance with Chapter 10 of the *Local Assistance Procedures Manual.*

69. If WORK stops for any reason, IMPLEMENTING AGENCY will place the PROJECT right-of-way in a safe and operable condition acceptable to CALTRANS.

70. If WORK stops for any reason, each PARTNER will continue to implement all of its applicable commitments and conditions included in the PROJECT environmental documentation, permits, agreements, or approvals that are in effect at the time that WORK stops, as they apply to each PARTNER's responsibilities in this AGREEMENT, in order to keep the PROJECT in environmental compliance until WORK resumes.

71. Fines, interest, or penalties levied against a PARTNER will be paid by the PARTNER whose action or lack of action caused the levy.

72. CITY will furnish CALTRANS with the Project History Files related to the PROJECT facilities on SHS within sixty (60) days following the completion of each PROJECT COMPONENT. CITY will prepare the Project History File in accordance with the Project Development Procedures Manual, Chapter 7. All material will be submitted neatly in a three-ring binder and on a CD ROM in PDF format.

GENERAL CONDITIONS

73. PARTNERS understand that this AGREEMENT is in accordance with and governed by the Constitution and laws of the State of California. This AGREEMENT will be enforceable in the State of California. Any PARTNER initiating legal action arising from this AGREEMENT will file and maintain that legal action in the Superior Court of the county in which the CALTRANS district office that is signatory to this AGREEMENT resides, or in the Superior Court of the county in which the PROJECT is physically located.

74. All CALTRANS' OBLIGATIONS under this AGREEMENT are subject to the appropriation of resources by the Legislature, the State Budget Act authority, and the allocation of funds by the California Transportation Commission.

75. Neither CITY nor any officer or employee thereof is responsible for any injury, damage or liability occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by CALTRANS, its contractors, sub-contractors, and/or its agents under or in connection with any work, authority, or jurisdiction conferred upon CALTRANS under this AGREEMENT. It is understood and agreed that CALTRANS, to the extent permitted by law, will defend, indemnify, and save harmless CITY and all of its officers and employees from all claims, suits, or actions of every name, kind, and description brought forth under, but not limited to, tortious, contractual, inverse condemnation, or other theories and assertions of liability occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by CALTRANS, its contractors, sub-contractors, and/or its agents under this AGREEMENT.

76. Neither CALTRANS nor any officer or employee thereof is responsible for any injury, damage, or liability occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by CITY, its contractors, sub-contractors, and/or its agents under or in connection with any work, authority, or jurisdiction conferred upon CITY under this AGREEMENT. It is understood and agreed that CITY, to the extent permitted by law, will defend, indemnify, and save harmless CALTRANS and all of its officers and employees from all claims, suits, or actions of every name, kind, and description brought forth under, but not limited to, tortious, contractual, inverse condemnation, or other theories and assertions of liability occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by CITY, its contractors, sub-contractors, and/or its agents under this AGREEMENT.

77. PARTNERS do not intend this AGREEMENT to create a third party beneficiary or define duties, obligations, or rights in parties not signatory to this AGREEMENT. PARTNERS do not intend this AGREEMENT to affect their legal liability by imposing any standard of care for fulfilling OBLIGATIONS different from the standards imposed by law.

78. PARTNERS will not assign or attempt to assign OBLIGATIONS to parties not signatory to this AGREEMENT without an amendment to this AGREEMENT.

79. CITY will not interpret any ambiguity contained in this AGREEMENT against CALTRANS. CITY waives the provisions of California Civil Code section 1654.

A waiver of a PARTNER's performance under this AGREEMENT will not constitute a continuous waiver of any other provision.

80. A delay or omission to exercise a right or power due to a default does not negate the use of that right or power in the future when deemed necessary.

81. If any PARTNER defaults in its OBLIGATIONS, a non-defaulting PARTNER will request in writing that the default be remedied within thirty (30) calendar days. If the defaulting PARTNER fails to do so, the non-defaulting PARTNER may initiate dispute resolution.

82. PARTNERS will first attempt to resolve AGREEMENT disputes at the PROJECT team level. If they cannot resolve the dispute themselves, the CALTRANS district director and the executive officer of CITY will attempt to negotiate a resolution. If PARTNERS do not reach a resolution, PARTNERS' legal counsel will initiate mediation. PARTNERS agree to participate in mediation in good faith and will share equally in its costs.

Neither the dispute nor the mediation process relieves PARTNERS from full and timely performance of OBLIGATIONS in accordance with the terms of this AGREEMENT. However, if any PARTNER stops fulfilling OBLIGATIONS, any other PARTNER may seek equitable relief to ensure that OBLIGATIONS continue.

Except for equitable relief, no PARTNER may file a civil complaint until after mediation, or forty-five (45) calendar days after filing the written mediation request, whichever occurs first.

PARTNERS will file any civil complaints in the Superior Court of the county in which the CALTRANS district office signatory to this AGREEMENT resides or in the Superior Court of the county in which the PROJECT is physically located. The prevailing PARTNER will be entitled to an award of all costs, fees, and expenses, including reasonable attorney fees as a result of litigating a dispute under this AGREEMENT or to enforce the provisions of this article including equitable relief.

83. PARTNERS maintain the ability to pursue alternative or additional dispute remedies if a previously selected remedy does not achieve resolution.

84. If any provisions in this AGREEMENT are found by a court of competent jurisdiction to be, or are in fact, illegal, inoperative, or unenforceable, those provisions do not render any or all other AGREEMENT provisions invalid, inoperative, or unenforceable, and those provisions will be automatically severed from this AGREEMENT.

85. If during performance of WORK additional activities or environmental documentation is necessary to keep the PROJECT in environmental compliance, PARTNERS will amend this AGREEMENT to include completion of those additional tasks.

86. Except as otherwise provided in the AGREEMENT, PARTNERS will execute a formal written amendment if there are any changes to OBLIGATIONS.

87. When WORK performed on the PROJECT is done under contract and falls within the Labor Code section 1720(a)(1) definition of "public works" in that it is construction, alteration, demolition, installation, or repair; or maintenance work under Labor Code section 1771, PARTNERS shall conform to the provisions of Labor Code sections 1720 through 1815, and all applicable provisions of California Code of Regulations found in Title 8, Division 1, Chapter 8, Subchapter 3, Articles 1-7. PARTNERS shall include prevailing wage requirements in contracts for public work and require contractors to include the same prevailing wage requirements in all subcontracts. Work performed by a PARTNER's own employees is exempt from the Labor Code's Prevailing Wage requirements.

88. If WORK is paid for, in whole or part, with federal funds and is of the type of work subject to federal prevailing wage requirements, PARTNERS shall conform to the provisions of the Davis-Bacon and Related Acts, 40 U.S.C. § 276(a).

When applicable, PARTNERS shall include federal prevailing wage requirements in contracts for public work. WORK performed by a PARTNER's employees is exempt from federal prevailing wage requirements.

89. PARTNERS agree to sign a CLOSURE STATEMENT to terminate this AGREEMENT. However, all indemnification, document retention, audit, claims, environmental commitment, legal challenge, maintenance and ownership articles will remain in effect until terminated or modified in writing by mutual agreement or expire by the statute of limitations.

90. PARTNERS intend this AGREEMENT to be their final expression that supersedes any oral understanding or writings pertaining to the OBLIGATIONS. The requirements of this AGREEMENT shall preside over any conflicting requirements in any documents that are made an express part of this AGREEMENT.

DEFINITIONS

AGREEMENT – This agreement, including any attachments, exhibits, and amendments.

CALTRANS STANDARDS – CALTRANS policies and procedures, including, but not limited to, the guidance provided in the Project Development Procedures Manual (PDPM) and the CALTRANS Workplan Standards Guide for the Delivery of Capital Projects (WSG) [which contains the CALTRANS Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) and was previously known as the WBS Guide] and is available at http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/projmgmt/guidance.htm.

CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) – The act (California Public Resources Code, sections 21000 et seq.) that requires state and local agencies to identify the significant environmental impacts of their actions and to avoid or mitigate those significant impacts, if feasible.

CFR (Code of Federal Regulations) – The general and permanent rules published in the Federal Register by the executive departments and agencies of the federal government.

CONSTRUCTION – See PROJECT COMPONENT.

CONSTRUCTION CAPITAL – See PROJECT COMPONENT.

CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT – See PROJECT COMPONENT.

CLOSURE STATEMENT – A document signed by PARTNERS that verifies the completion of all OBLIGATIONS included in this AGREEMENT and in all amendments to this AGREEMENT.

FHWA – Federal Highway Administration.

FHWA STANDARDS – FHWA regulations, policies and procedures, including, but not limited to, the guidance provided at www.fhwa.dot.gov/topics.htm.

FUNDING PARTNER – A PARTNER that commits funds in this AGREEMENT to fulfill OBLIGATIONS. A FUNDING PARTNER accepts the responsibility to provide the funds it commits in this AGREEMENT.

GAAP (Generally Accepted Accounting Principles) – Uniform minimum standards and guidelines for financial accounting and reporting issued by the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board that serve to achieve some level of standardization. See http://www.fasab.gov/accepted.html.

HM-1 – Hazardous material (including, but not limited to, hazardous waste) that may require removal and disposal pursuant to federal or state law whether it is disturbed by the PROJECT or not.

HM-2 – Hazardous material (including, but not limited to, hazardous waste) that may require removal and disposal pursuant to federal or state law only if disturbed by the PROJECT.

HM MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES – Management activities related to either HM-1 or HM-2 including, without limitation, any necessary manifest requirements and disposal facility designations.

IMPLEMENTING AGENCY – The PARTNER responsible for managing the scope, cost, and schedule of a PROJECT COMPONENT to ensure the completion of that component.

IQA (Independent Quality Assurance) – CALTRANS' efforts to ensure that another PARTNER's quality assurance activities are in accordance with the applicable standards and the PROJECT's Quality Management Plan (QMP). When CALTRANS performs Independent Quality Assurance it does not develop, produce, validate, verify, re-check, or quality control another PARTNER's work products.

OBLIGATIONS – All WORK responsibilities and their associated costs.

OBLIGATION COMPLETION – PARTNERS have fulfilled all OBLIGATIONS included in this AGREEMENT and have signed a COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT CLOSURE STATEMENT.

PARTNER – Any individual signatory party to this AGREEMENT.

PARTNERS – The term that collectively references all of the signatory agencies to this AGREEMENT. This term only describes the relationship between these agencies to work together to achieve a mutually beneficial goal. It is not used in the traditional legal sense in which one PARTNER's individual actions legally bind the other PARTNER.

PROJECT COMPONENT – A distinct portion of the planning and project development process of a capital project as outlined in California Government Code, section 14529(b).

- PID (Project Initiation Document) – The work required to deliver the project initiation document for the PROJECT in accordance with CALTRANS STANDARDS.
- PA&ED (Project Approval and Environmental Document) – The work required to deliver the project approval and environmental documentation for the PROJECT in accordance with CALTRANS STANDARDS.
- PS&E (Plans, Specifications, and Estimate) – The work required to deliver the plans, specifications, and estimate for the PROJECT in accordance with CALTRANS STANDARDS.
- R/W (Right of Way) –The project components for the purpose of acquiring real property interests for the PROJECT in accordance with CALTRANS STANDARDS.
  - R/W (Right of Way) SUPPORT –The work required to obtain all property interests for the PROJECT.
  - R/W (Right of Way) CAPITAL – The funds for acquisition of property rights for the PROJECT.
- CONSTRUCTION – The project components for the purpose of completing the construction of the PROJECT in accordance with CALTRANS STANDARDS.
  - CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT – The work required for the administration, acceptance, and final documentation of the construction contract for the PROJECT.
  - CONSTRUCTION CAPITAL – The funds for the construction contract.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT PLAN – A group of documents used to guide the PROJECT's execution and control throughout that project's lifecycle.

PS&E (Plans, Specifications, and Estimate) – See PROJECT COMPONENT.

QMP (Quality Management Plan) – An integral part of the PROJECT MANAGEMENT PLAN that describes IMPLEMENTING AGENCY's quality policy and how it will be used.

R/W (Right of Way) CAPITAL – See PROJECT COMPONENT.

R/W (Right of Way) SUPPORT – See PROJECT COMPONENT.

SHS (State Highway System) – All highways, right-of-way, and related facilities acquired, laid out, constructed, improved, or maintained as a state highway pursuant to constitutional or legislative authorization.

SPONSOR – Any PARTNER that accepts the responsibility to establish scope of the PROJECT and the obligation to secure financial resources to fund the PROJECT COMPONENTS in this AGREEMENT. A SPONSOR is responsible for adjusting the PROJECT scope to match committed funds or securing additional funds to fully fund the PROJECT COMPONENTS in this AGREEMENT. If this AGREEMENT has more than one SPONSOR, funding adjustments will be made by percentage (as outlined in Responsibilities). Scope adjustments must be developed through the project development process and must be approved by CALTRANS as the owner/operator of the SHS.

WORK – All efforts to complete the OBLIGATIONS included in this AGREEMENT as described by the activities in the CALTRANS Workplan Standards Guide for the Delivery of Capital Projects (WSG).

SIGNATURES

PARTNERS are empowered by California Streets and Highways Code sections 114 and 130 to enter into this AGREEMENT and have delegated to the undersigned the authority to execute this AGREEMENT on behalf of the respective agencies and covenants to have followed all the necessary legal requirements to validly execute this AGREEMENT.

Signatories may execute this AGREEMENT through individual signature pages provided that each signature is an original. This AGREEMENT is not fully executed until all original signatures are attached.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Helena (Lenka) Culik-Caro
Deputy District Director, Design

Certified as to funds:

Jeffrey Armstrong
District Budget Manager

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Department of Public Works

Mohammed Muru
Director of Public Works

Attest:

John Thomas
Division Manager

Approved as to form and procedure:

John Malamut
Deputy City Attorney

SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Planning Commission Motion 19105

HEARING DATE: March 27, 2014

Hearing Date:	March 27, 2014
Date:	March 13, 2014
Case No.:	2011.0558E
Project Address:	**Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP), Citywide**
Zoning:	Not applicable
Block/Lot:	Not applicable
Project Sponsor:	Sean Kennedy, TEP Manager San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (the SFMTA) One South Van Ness Avenue, 7th Floor San Francisco, CA 94103
Staff Contact:	Debra Dwyer – (415) 575-9031 Debra.Dwyer@sfgov.org

ADOPTING FINDINGS RELATED TO THE CERTIFICATION OF A FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE TRANSIT EFFECTIVENESS PROJECT AND SERVICE POLICY FRAMEWORK.

MOVED, that the San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") hereby CERTIFIES the Final Environmental Impact Report identified as Case No. 2011.0558E, the Transit Effectiveness Project, a citywide transit infrastructure project (hereinafter "Project"), based upon the following findings:

1. The City and County of San Francisco, acting through the Planning Department (hereinafter "Department") fulfilled all procedural requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Cal. Pub. Res. Code Section 21000 *et seq.*, hereinafter "CEQA"), the State CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Admin. Code Title 14, Section 15000 *et seq.*, (hereinafter "CEQA Guidelines") and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code (hereinafter "Chapter 31").

   A. The Department determined that an Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter "EIR") was required and provided public notice of that determination by publication in a newspaper of general circulation on November 9, 2011.

   B. On July 10, 2013, the Department published the Draft Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter "DEIR") and provided public notice in a newspaper of general circulation of the availability of the DEIR for public review and comment and of the date and time of the Planning Commission public hearing on the DEIR; this notice was mailed to the Department's list of persons requesting such notice and to people that commented on the Initial Study, published January 23, 2013.

   C. Notices of availability of the DEIR and of the date and time of the public hearing were posted at the San Francisco County Clerk's Office, on transit vehicles, and on the Planning Department's

web site by Department staff on July 10, 2013. In addition, copies of the NOA were provided to all public libraries within San Francisco.

D. On July 10, 2013, copies of the DEIR were mailed or otherwise delivered to a list of persons requesting it, to those noted on the distribution list in the DEIR, and to government agencies, the latter both directly and through the State Clearinghouse.

E. Notice of Completion was filed with the State Secretary of Resources via the State Clearinghouse on July 10, 2013.

2. The Commission held a duly advertised public hearing on said DEIR on August 15, 2013 at which opportunity for public comment was given, and public comment was received on the DEIR. The period for acceptance of written comments ended on September 17, 2013.

3. The Department prepared responses to comments on environmental issues received at the public hearing and in writing during the 67-day public review period for the DEIR, prepared revisions to the text of the DEIR in response to comments received or based on additional information that became available during the public review period, and corrected errors in the DEIR. This material was presented in a Responses to Comments document, published on March 13, 2014, distributed to the Commission and all parties who commented on the DEIR, and made available to others upon request at the Department.

4. A Final Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter "FEIR") has been prepared by the Department, consisting of the DEIR, any consultations and comments received during the review process, any additional information that became available, the Responses to Comments document, and any Errata to the FEIR, all as required by law.

5. Project EIR files have been made available for review by the Commission and the public. These files are available for public review at the Department at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, and are part of the record before the Commission.

6. On March 27, 2014, the Commission reviewed and considered the FEIR and hereby does find that the contents of said report and the procedures through which the FEIR was prepared, publicized, and reviewed comply with the provisions of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

7. The Planning Commission hereby does find that the FEIR concerning File No. 2011.0558E reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the City and County of San Francisco, is adequate, accurate and objective, and that the Responses to Comments document contains no significant revisions to the DEIR, and hereby does CERTIFY THE COMPLETION of said FEIR in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines.

8. The Commission, in certifying the completion of said FEIR, hereby does find that the project described in the EIR:

A. will have the following unavoidable significant project-specific effects on the environment:

Program Level Components

Service Policy Framework: Objectives A and C

- **Impact TR-3:** Implementation of the Policy Framework Objective A, Action A.3, and Objective C, Actions C.3 through C.5 may result in significant traffic impacts;
- **Impact TR-5:** Implementation of the Policy Framework Objective A, Action A.3 and Objective C, Actions C.3 through C.5 may result in significant loading impacts;

TPS Toolkit Categories and Program level TTRPs:

- **Impact TR-8:** Implementation of the following TPS Toolkit categories: Lane Modifications and Pedestrian Improvements may result in significant traffic impacts;
- **Impact TR-10:** Implementation of the following TPS Toolkit categories: Transit Stop Changes, Lane Modifications, Parking and Turn Restrictions, and Pedestrian Improvements, may result in significant loading impacts;
- **Impact TR-14:** Implementation of TPS Toolkit elements within the following categories: Lane Modifications and Pedestrian Improvements, along the program-level TTRP corridors may result in significant traffic impacts;

  Affected Intersections by program-level TTRP corridor

  - TTRP.1, at the intersections of: California/Arguello and California/Park Presidio, California/Cherry, California/Locust, California/Presidio, and California/Divisadero
  - TTRP.22_2, at the intersection of: Fillmore/Lombard
  - TTRP.K, at the intersections of: Ocean/Junipero Serra, Ocean/Geneva/Phelan, Ocean/Lee, Ocean/Miramar, Ocean/Brighton

- **Impact TR-16:** Implementation of the following TPS Toolkit categories: Transit Stop Changes, Lane Modifications, Parking and Turn Restrictions, and Pedestrian Improvements, along the program-level TTRP corridors may result in significant loading impacts;

Project Level Components:

TTRP.14 Moderate Alternative Variant 1

- **Impact TR-48:** Implementation of project-level TTRP.14 Moderate Alternative Variant 1 would result in a reduction in on-street commercial loading supply on Mission Street such that the existing loading demand during the peak hour of loading activities could not be accommodated within on-street loading supply and may create a potentially hazardous condition or significant delay that may affect traffic, transit, bicycles, or pedestrians;

TTRP.14 Moderate Alternative Variant 2

- Impact TR-49: Implementation of project-level TTRP.14 Moderate Alternative Variant 2 would result in a reduction in on-street commercial loading supply on Mission Street such

that the existing loading demand during the peak hour of loading activities could not be accommodated within on-street loading supply and may create a potentially hazardous condition or significant delay that may affect traffic, transit, bicycles, or pedestrians;

TTRP.14 Expanded Alternative

- **Impact TR-24:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP.14 Expanded Alternative would result in a significant traffic impact at the intersection of Randall Street/San Jose Avenue that would operate at LOS E or LOS F conditions under Existing plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.14 Expanded Alternative conditions;
- **Impact TR-50:** Implementation of project-level TTRP.14 Expanded Alternative would result in a reduction in on-street commercial loading supply on Mission Street such that the existing loading demand during the peak hour of loading activities could not be accommodated within on-street loading supply and may create a potentially hazardous condition or significant delay that may affect traffic, transit, bicycles, or pedestrians;

TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative

- **Impact TR-26:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative would result in a significant traffic impact at the intersection of 16th/Bryant streets that would operate at LOS E or LOS F conditions under Existing plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative conditions;
- **Impact TR-27:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative would result in a significant traffic impact at the intersection of 16th Street/Potrero Avenue that would operate at LOS E or LOS F conditions under Existing plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative conditions;
- **Impact TR-28:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative would result in a significant traffic impact at the intersection of 16th/Seventh streets that would operate at LOS E or LOS F conditions under Existing plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative conditions;

TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1

- **Impact TR-30:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1 would result in a significant traffic impact at the intersection of 16th/Bryant streets that would operate at LOS E or LOS F conditions under Existing plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1 conditions;
- **Impact TR-31:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1 would result in a significant traffic impact at the intersection of 16th Street/Potrero Avenue that would operate at LOS E or LOS F conditions under Existing plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1 conditions;
- Impact TR-32: Implementation of the project-level TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1 would result in a significant traffic impact at the intersection of 16th/Seventh streets that would operate at LOS E or LOS F conditions under Existing plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative conditions;

TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2

- **Impact TR-34:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 would result in a significant traffic impact at the intersection of 16th/Bryant streets that would operate at LOS E or LOS F conditions under Existing plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 conditions;
- **Impact TR-35:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 would result in a significant traffic impact at the intersection of 16th Street/Potrero Avenue that would operate at LOS E or LOS F conditions under Existing plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 conditions;
- **Impact TR-36:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 would result in a significant traffic impact at the intersection of 16th/Seventh streets that would operate at LOS E or LOS F conditions under Existing plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 conditions;

TTRP.30_1 Moderate Alternative

- **Impact TR-51:** Implementation of project-level TTRP.30_1 Moderate Alternative would result in a reduction in on-street commercial loading supply on Stockton Street such that the existing loading demand during the peak hour of loading activities could not be accommodated within on-street loading supply and may create a potentially hazardous condition or significant delay that may affect traffic, transit, bicycles, or pedestrians;

TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative

- **Impact TR-38:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative would result in a significant traffic impact at the intersection of Columbus Avenue/Green Street/Stockton Street that would operate at LOS E conditions under Existing plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative conditions;
- **Impact TR-52:** Implementation of project-level TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative would result in a reduction in on-street commercial loading supply on Stockton Street such that the existing loading demand during the peak hour of loading activities could not be accommodated within on-street loading supply and may create a potentially hazardous condition or significant delay that may affect traffic, transit, bicycles, or pedestrians;

TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1

- **Impact TR-40:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1 would result in a significant traffic impact at the intersection of Columbus Avenue/Green Street/Stockton Street that would operate at LOS E conditions under Existing plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1 conditions;
- **Impact TR-53:** Implementation of project-level TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1 would result in a reduction in on-street commercial loading supply on Stockton Street such that the existing loading demand during the peak hour of loading activities could not be

accommodated within on-street loading supply and may create a potentially hazardous condition or significant delay that may affect traffic, transit, bicycles, or pedestrians;

TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2

- **Impact TR-42:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 would result in a significant traffic impact at the intersection of Columbus Avenue/Green Street/Stockton Street that would operate at LOS E conditions under Existing plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 conditions;
- **Impact TR-54:** Implementation of project-level TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 would result in a reduction in on-street commercial loading supply on Stockton Street such that the existing loading demand during the peak hour of loading activities could not be accommodated within on-street loading supply and may create a potentially hazardous condition or significant delay that may affect traffic, transit, bicycles, or pedestrians; and

B. will have the following significant cumulative effects on the environment:

- **Impact C-TR-1:** The Service Policy Framework and Service Improvements or Service Variants, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact on transit, resulting in an exceedance of Muni's capacity utilization standard on the Mission corridor within the Southeast screenline of the Downtown screenlines under 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements only conditions;
- **Impact C-TR-2:** The Service Policy Framework, TPS Toolkit elements as applied in the program-level TTRP corridors, and the Service Improvements with the TTRP Moderate Alternative, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would contribute considerably to significant cumulative impacts on transit, resulting in exceedances of Muni's capacity utilization standard on the Fulton/Hayes corridor within the Northwest screenline and on the Mission corridor within the Southeast screenline of the Downtown screenlines under 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP Moderate Alternative conditions;
- **Impact C-TR-3:** The Service Policy Framework, the TPS Toolkit elements as applied in the program-level TTRP corridors, and the Service Improvements with the TTRP Expanded Alternative, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would contribute considerably to significant cumulative impacts on transit, resulting in exceedances of Muni's capacity utilization standard on the Fulton/Hayes corridor within the Northwest screenline and on the Mission corridor within the Southeast screenline of the Downtown screenlines under 2035 Cumulative conditions plus Service Improvements and the TTRP Expanded Alternative conditions;
- Impact C-TR-7: Implementation of the Service Policy Framework Objective A, Action A.3 and Objective C, Actions C.3 through C.5 and TPS Toolkit categories: Lane Modifications and Pedestrian Improvements as applied in program-level TTRP corridors, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would result

in cumulative traffic impacts at intersections along the corridors under 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP Moderate Alternative conditions;

- **Impact C-TR-9:** Implementation of the Service Policy Framework Objective A, Action A.3 and Objective C, Actions C.3 through C.5 and TPS Toolkit categories: Lane Modifications and Pedestrian Improvements as applied in program-level TTRP corridors would result in cumulative traffic impacts at intersections along the corridors under 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP Expanded Alternative conditions;

- **Impact C-TR-43:** Implementation of the Policy Framework Objective A, Action A.3 and Objective C, Actions C.3 through C.5, and TPS Toolkit Categories: Transit Stop Changes, Lane Modifications, Parking and Turn Restrictions, and Pedestrian Improvements as applied to the program-level TTRP corridors in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would result in cumulative loading impacts;

- **Impact C-TR-49:** Implementation of the Service Policy Framework Objective A, Action A.3 and Objective C, Actions C.3, C.4 and C.5, and the TPS Toolkit categories: Lane Modifications, Parking and Turn Restrictions, and Pedestrian Improvements as applied in program-level TTRP corridors, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, may result in significant cumulative parking impacts;

TTRP.J Expanded Alternative

- **Impact C-TR-13:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.J Expanded Alternative would contribute considerably to cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of Market/Church/14th streets during the p.m. peak hour;

TTRP.5 Expanded Alternative

- **Impact C-TR-14:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.5 Expanded Alternative would result in cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of Fulton Street/Masonic Avenue during the p.m. peak hour;

TTRP.8X Expanded Alternative

- **Impact C-TR-15:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.8X Expanded Alternative would result in cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of Geneva Avenue/Carter Street during the p.m. peak hour;
- **Impact C-TR-16:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.8X Expanded Alternative would result in cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of Geneva Avenue/Moscow Street during the p.m. peak hour;

TTRP.14 Variant 1 Moderate Alternative

- Impact C-TR-44: Implementation of the project-level TTRP Moderate Alternative including the TTRP.14 Variant 1, TTRP.14 Variant 2, and TTRP.30_1 in combination with past, present

and other reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would result in cumulative loading impacts;

- **Impact C-TR-52:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP Moderate Alternative for the TTRP.14 Variant 1 or the TTRP.14 Variant 2, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would result in significant cumulative parking impacts;

TTRP.14 Variant 2 Moderate Alternative

- **Impact C-TR-44:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP Moderate Alternative including the TTRP.14 Variant 1, TTRP.14 Variant 2, and TTRP.30_1 in combination with past, present and other reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would result in cumulative loading impacts;
- **Impact C-TR-52:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP Moderate Alternative for the TTRP.14 Variant 1 or the TTRP.14 Variant 2, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would result in significant cumulative parking impacts;

TTRP.14 Expanded Alternative

- **Impact C-TR-17:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.14 Expanded Alternative would result in project and cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of Randall Street/San Jose Avenue during the a.m. peak hour;
- **Impact C-TR-18:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.14 Expanded Alternative would result in cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of Mission/Fifth streets during the a.m. peak hour;
- **Impact C-TR-19:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.14 Expanded Alternative would result in cumulative impacts at the intersection of Mission/16th streets during the p.m. peak hour;
- **Impact C-TR-45:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP Expanded Alternative including the TTRP.14, TTRP.30_1, TTRP.30_1 Variant 1, and TTRP.30_1 Variant 2, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would result in project and cumulative loading impacts;

TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative

- **Impact C-TR-20:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative would result in project and cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th/Bryant streets during the p.m. peak hour;
- **Impact C-TR-23:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative would result in project and cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th/Potrero streets during the p.m. peak hour;

- Impact C-TR-26: Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative would result in cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th/Owens streets during the p.m. peak hour;
- Impact C-TR-29: Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements plus the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative would result in cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th/Fourth streets during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours;
- Impact C-TR-32: Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative would result in project and cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th/Seventh streets during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours;
- Impact C-TR-54: Implementation of the project-level TTRP Expanded Alternative for the TTRP.22_1, TTRP.22_1 Variant 1, or TTRP.22_1 Variant 2, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would result in significant cumulative parking impacts;

TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1

- Impact C-TR-21: Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1 would result in project and traffic cumulative impacts at the intersection of 16th/Bryant streets during the p.m. peak hour;
- Impact C-TR-24: Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1 would result in project and cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th/Potrero streets during the p.m. peak hour;
- Impact C-TR-27: Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1 would result in cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th/Owens streets during the p.m. peak hour;
- Impact C-TR-30: Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1 would result in cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th/Fourth streets during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours;
- Impact C-TR-33: Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1 would result in project and cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th/Seventh streets during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours;
- Impact C-TR-54: Implementation of the project-level TTRP Expanded Alternative for the TTRP.22_1, TTRP.22_1 Variant 1, or TTRP.22_1 Variant 2, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would result in significant cumulative parking impacts;

TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2

- Impact C-TR-22: Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 would result in project and cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th/Bryant streets during the p.m. peak hour;

- **Impact C-TR-25:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 would result in project and cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th/Potrero streets during the p.m. peak hour;
- **Impact C-TR-28:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 would result in cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th/Owens streets during the p.m. peak hour;
- **Impact C-TR-31:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 would result in cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th/Fourth streets during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours;
- **Impact C-TR-34:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 would result in project and cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th/Seventh streets during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours;
- **Impact C-TR-54:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP Expanded Alternative for the TTRP.22_1, TTRP.22_1 Variant 1, or TTRP.22_1 Variant 2, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would result in significant cumulative parking impacts;

TTRP.30_1 Moderate Alternative

- **Impact C-TR-44:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP Moderate Alternative including the TTRP.14 Variant 1, TTRP.14 Variant 2, and TTRP.30_1 in combination with past, present and other reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would result in cumulative loading impacts;

TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative

- **Impact C-TR-35:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative would result in project and cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of Columbus Avenue/Green Street/Stockton Street;
- **Impact C-TR-45:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP Expanded Alternative including the TTRP.14, TTRP.30_1, TTRP.30_1 Variant 1, and TTRP.30_1 Variant 2, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would result in project and cumulative loading impacts;

TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1

- **Impact C-TR-36:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1 would result in project and cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of Columbus Avenue/Green Street/Stockton Street; and
- **Impact C-TR-45:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP Expanded Alternative including the TTRP.14, TTRP.30_1, TTRP.30_1 Variant 1, and TTRP.30_1 Variant 2, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would result in project and cumulative loading impacts; and

TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2

- Impact C-TR-37: Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 would result in project and cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of Columbus Avenue/Green Street/Stockton Street; and
- Impact C-TR-45: Implementation of the project-level TTRP Expanded Alternative including the TTRP.14, TTRP.30_1, TTRP.30_1 Variant 1, and TTRP.30_1 Variant 2, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would result in project and cumulative loading impacts.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Motion was ADOPTED by the Planning Commission at its regular meeting of March 27, 2014.

Jonas Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES: Wu, Fong, Hillis, Borden, Sugaya, and Moore

NOES: Antonini

ABSENT: None

ADOPTED: March 27, 2014

SAN FRANCISCO
MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

RESOLUTION No. 14-041

WHEREAS, The Strategic Plan requires that the SFMTA, in the context of the "Transit First" policy, make transit and other non-personal vehicle-oriented transportation modes the preferred means of travel; and

WHEREAS, The Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP) is a major SFMTA initiative to improve Muni and help meet the Strategic Plan's mode shift goals; and

WHEREAS, The goals of the TEP are to improve Muni travel speed, reliability and safety, make Muni a more attractive transportation mode, improve cost-effectiveness of Muni operations and assist in implementing the City's Transit First policy; and

WHEREAS, The SFMTA applied to the Planning Department for environmental review of the TEP under the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code Sections 21000 *et seq.*, (CEQA), on June 25, 2011, and the Planning Department determined that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was required and provided public notice of that determination by publication in a newspaper of general circulation on November 9, 2011; and

WHEREAS, On July 10, 2013, the Planning Department published the Transit Effectiveness Project Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) and provided public notice in a newspaper of general circulation of the availability of the DEIR for public review and comment and of the date and time of the Planning Commission public hearing on the DEIR; this notice was mailed to the Department's list of persons requesting such notice; and

WHEREAS, Notices of availability of the DEIR and of the date and time of the public hearing were posted at the San Francisco County Clerk's Office, on transit vehicles, and on the Planning Department's web site on July 10, 2013, and copies were provided to all public libraries within San Francisco; and

WHEREAS, On July 10, 2013, copies of the DEIR were mailed or otherwise delivered to a list of persons requesting it, to those noted on the distribution list in the DEIR, and to government agencies, the latter both directly and through the State Clearinghouse; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission held a duly advertised public hearing on the DEIR on August 15, 2013 and received public comment on the DEIR; the period for acceptance of written comments ended on September 17, 2013; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Department prepared responses to comments on environmental issues received at the public hearing and in writing during the 67 day public review period for the DEIR, prepared revisions to the text of the DEIR in response to comments received or based on additional information that became available during the public review period, and corrected errors in the DEIR. This material was presented in a Responses to Comments document, published on March 13, 2014; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Department prepared a Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), consisting of the DEIR, any consultations and comments received during the review process, any additional information that became available, the Responses to Comments document, and the Supplemental Service Variants Memorandum dated March 13, 2014 , all as required by law; and

WHEREAS, Environmental review files have been made available for review by the SFMTA Board and the public. (Planning Department File No. 2011.0558E.)These files are available for public review at the Planning Department at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, and are part of the record before the SFMTA Board; and

WHEREAS, On March 27, 2014, the Planning Commission reviewed and considered the FEIR and found that its contents and the procedures through which the FEIR was prepared, publicized, and reviewed complied with the provisions of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission found that the FEIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the City and County of San Francisco, is adequate, accurate and objective, and that the Responses to Comments document, the Supplemental Service Variants Memorandum, and all relevant errata contain no significant revisions to the DEIR, and certified the completion of the FEIR in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission's CEQA certification motion is on file with the Secretary to the SFMTA Board of Directors and is incorporated herein by this reference; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board of Directors approves the Service Policy Framework as identified in the FEIR and incorporated herein by this reference; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board of Directors approves the Transit Preferential Streets "Toolkit" as identified in the FEIR and incorporated herein by this reference; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board of Directors approves at a programmatic and conceptual level the Service Improvements, Service-Related Capital Improvements and both the Moderate and Expanded Travel Time Reduction Proposals Alternatives identified in the FEIR and incorporated herein by this reference; and be it further

RESOLVED, That, in taking this approval action, the SFMTA Board of Directors adopts CEQA Findings, which include rejecting alternatives identified in the FEIR as infeasible and adopting a statement of overriding considerations, attached to this Resolution as Enclosure A and incorporated herein by this reference; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board of Directors adopts the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) attached to this Resolution as Enclosure B; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board authorizes the Director of Transportation to direct staff to continue with obtaining otherwise necessary approvals and to carry out the actions to implement the Project.

I certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors and the Parking Authority Commission at their meeting of March 28, 2014.

R. Boomer

Secretary, Municipal Transportation Agency
Board and Parking Authority Commission

ENCLOSURE A

TRANSIT EFFECTIVENESS PROJECT, INCLUDING THE SERVICE POLICY FRAMEWORK, CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT FINDINGS: FINDINGS OF FACT, EVALUATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES AND ALTERNATIVES, AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY BOARD OF DIRECTORS

In determining to approve the Transit Effectiveness Project (the "Project") described in Section I, Project Description below, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors (the "SFMTA Board") makes and adopts the following findings of fact and decisions regarding significant impacts, mitigation measures, and alternatives, and adopts the statement of overriding considerations, based on substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding and under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq. ("CEQA"), particularly Sections 21081 and 21081.5, the Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA ("CEQA Guidelines"), 14 California Code of Regulations Sections 15000 et seq., particularly Sections 15091 through 15093, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. These findings comprise **ENCLOSURE A** to the associated Board of Directors Resolution.

This document is organized as follows:

Section I provides a description of the Project proposed for adoption, the environmental review process for the Project, the approval 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 and describes the disposition of the mitigation measures;

Section IV identifies significant impacts that cannot be avoided or reduced to less-than-significant levels and describes any applicable mitigation measures as well as the disposition of the mitigation measures;

Section V 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 VI, that support approval of the Project and the rejection of the alternatives, or elements thereof, analyzed as infeasible; and

Section VI presents a statement of overriding considerations setting forth specific reasons in support of the Board's actions to approve the Project despite its significant and unavoidable

environmental impacts and its rejection of the alternatives not incorporated into the Project as infeasible.

The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") containing the mitigation measures from the Final Environmental Impact Report ("FEIR") that have been proposed for adoption is attached with these findings as **Attachment B** to the associated Board of Directors Resolution. The MMRP is required by CEQA Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091. The MMRP provides a table setting forth each mitigation measure listed in the FEIR for the Project that is required to reduce or avoid a significant adverse impact and that is made a condition of approval. The MMRP also specifies the agency responsible for implementation of each measure and establishes monitoring actions and a monitoring schedule. The full text of the mitigation measures is set forth in the MMRP.

These findings are based upon substantial evidence in the entire record before the SFMTA Board. The references set forth in these findings to certain pages or sections of the Draft Environmental Impact Report ("DEIR" or "DEIR") or the Responses to Comments document ("RTC") are for ease of reference and are not intended to provide an exhaustive list of the evidence relied upon for these findings. The DEIR and the Responses to Comments document, together with the Supplemental Service Variants Memorandum dated March 13, 2014 and Errata dated March 27, 2014, comprise the FEIR.

I. APPROVAL OF THE PROJECT

A. Project Description

The Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP) is comprised of a Service Policy Framework, Service Improvements and Service Variants, Service-related Capital Improvements, and Travel Time Reduction Proposals ("TTRPs"), including the Transit Preferential Streets Toolkit. The TEP includes locations throughout the 49-square-mile City and County of San Francisco and is a program comprised of a group of varied projects and proposals. The TEP components will be implemented on public land and within the public right-of-way throughout the City, on property largely under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Public Works Department and the SFMTA.

The proposals that comprise the TEP vary in the level of detail provided, from highly specific redesigns, including capital improvements, along certain transportation corridors to more conceptual policy recommendations. Accordingly, and pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15161 and 15168, the FEIR analyzed portions of the TEP at a "project-level" where the amount and type of information available for those components lent itself to a detailed and specific analysis of all potential environmental impacts, and other portions were analyzed at a "program-level" (a more conceptual level) when the details about and current level of design for a

component did not allow for a project-level analysis. In particular, the Service Policy Framework, 5 of the 12 Service-related Capital Improvements, and 6 of the 17 Travel Time Reduction Proposals (TTRPs) were analyzed at a program level.

The description provided here summarizes the project description provided in the FEIR, which, as noted above, is comprised of the DEIR, the RTC, and the Supplemental Service Variant Memorandum. Please see Chapter 2 of the FEIR for a more detailed description of the TEP project.

1. The Service Policy Framework

The Service Policy Framework sets forth transit service delivery objectives that support the SFMTA Strategic Plan goals, and identifies a variety of actions to implement these objectives. The Service Policy Framework will guide how investments are made to the Muni system and is intended to improve system reliability and reduce transit travel time as well as improve customer service. These objectives include the effective allocation of transit resources, the efficient delivery of service, the improvement of service reliability and reduction in transit travel time, and an improvement in customer service. Most importantly, the Policy Framework would organize Muni transit service into four distinct transit categories:

- Rapid Network: These heavily used bus and rail lines form the backbone of the Muni system. With vehicles arriving frequently and transit priority enhancements along the routes, the Rapid network delivers speed and reliability whether customers are heading across town, or simply traveling a few blocks.
- Local Network: Also known as "Grid" routes, these long routes combine with the Rapid network to form an expansive core system that lets customers get to their destinations with no more than a short walk, or a seamless transfer.
- Community Connectors: Also known as "Circulators", these lightly used bus routes predominantly circulate through San Francisco's hillside residential neighborhoods, filling in gaps in coverage and connecting customers to the core network.
- Specialized Services: These routes augment existing service during specific times of day to serve a specific need, or serve travel demand related to special events. They include express service, owl service, and special event trips to serve sporting events, large festivals and other San Francisco activities.

2. Service Improvements and Service Variants

The Service Improvements and Service Variants include creation of new transit routes, changes in the alignment of some existing routes, elimination of underused routes or route segments, changes to headways and hours of service, changes to the day of the week for service, and

changes to the mix of local/limited/express service on several routes. The Service Improvements were developed based on a comprehensive evaluation of the overall transit network and public input from community meetings. Specifically, these proposals include:

- Increasing frequency of transit service along heavily used corridors;
- Creating new routes;
- Changing existing route alignments;
- Eliminating underutilized routes or route segments;
- Introducing larger buses on crowded routes;
- Changing the mix of local/limited/express service;
- Expanding limited services.

In addition, the SFMTA included a number of possible variants to these service changes (including recent service variants developed as part of the public outreach process and summarized in the Supplemental Service Variants Memorandum of March 13, 2014) that are proposed as part of the project to allow for flexibility in the phasing and implementation of the Service Improvements. Proposed Service Variants mostly include modifications to portions of some routes or change the type of vehicle used on some routes. In addition, many of the service variants work in concert to improve service along a particular corridor or neighborhood.

3. Service-Related Capital Improvements

Some of the Service Improvements will be supported by Service-related Capital Improvements. The Service-related Capital Improvements include the following: a) Transfer and Terminal Point Improvements, which include installation of overhead wiring and poles; installation of new switches, bypass rails, and/or transit bulbs; expansion of transit zones; and modification of sidewalks at stops to accommodate substantial passenger interchanges and/or to provide for transit vehicle layovers; b) Overhead Wire Expansion capital improvements to support service route changes for electric trolley routes and provide bypass wires to allow trolley coaches to pass one another on existing routes; c) Systemwide Capital Infrastructure projects, such as installation of new accessible platforms to improve system accessibility across the light rail network.

4. Travel Time Reduction Proposals (TTRPs), Using the Transit Preferential Streets (TPS) Toolkit

The Travel Time Reduction Proposals (TTRPs) will implement roadway and transit stop changes to reduce transit delay on the most heavily used routes that make up the backbone of the Muni system, which is referred to as the Rapid Network. The SFMTA has identified a set of 18 standard roadway and traffic engineering elements that can be used to reduce transit travel time

along a transit corridor. Collectively, these tools or elements are called the Transit Preferential Streets Toolkit ("TPS Toolkit"). The TPS Toolkit elements will be applied to 17 Rapid Network transit corridors to improve operation of the Muni system. These elements include:

- Transit Stop Changes: removing or consolidating transit stops; moving stop locations at intersections; adding transit bulbs; adding transit boarding islands; increasing transit stop lengths; converting flag stops to transit zones;
- Land Modifications: establishing transit-only lanes; establishing transit queue jump/bypass lanes; establishing dedicated turn lanes; widening travel lanes through lane reductions;
- Parking and Turn Restrictions: implement turning restrictions; widening travel lanes through parking restrictions; installing traffic signals at uncontrolled and two-way stop-controlled intersections; installing traffic signals at all-way stop-controlled intersections; replacing all-way stop-controls with traffic calming measures at intersections;
- Pedestrian Improvements: installing pedestrian refuge islands; installing pedestrian bulbs; and widening sidewalks.

The TEP proposes to apply the TPS Toolkit to 17 Rapid Network corridors throughout the City. Using the TPS Toolkit, the SFMTA has developed specific corridor designs for 11 of the 17 proposed TTRP corridors. These corridor designs were thus analyzed at a project- level in the FEIR. Project variants were also included as part of these project-level TTRPs. Three of the TTRPs (TTRP.14, TTRP.22 and TTRP.30_1) include variants with different designs on one or more segments of the route. TTRP routes with no design variants at the project level include TTRP.5, TTRP.8x, TTRP.28_1, TTRP.J, TTRP.N, TTRP.9, TTRP.71 and TTRP.L. The SFMTA developed conceptual planning for the remaining 6 TTRP corridors, for which specific corridor designs will be developed at a later stage of the project. These corridor designs were thus analyzed at a programmatic level in the FEIR.

For each of the project-level TTRPs, the SFMTA developed two specific corridor designs comprised of TPS Toolkit elements: a moderate option, referred to as the "TTRP Moderate Alternative;" and an expanded option, referred to as the "TTRP Expanded Alternative." This was done because, although the TEP program was examined in one environmental document in order to understand the full scope of its potential cumulative environmental impacts, the TEP is actually a collection of projects and proposals, which, while related, may be implemented at various times and, in many cases, independently of each other. Thus, these alternatives bracket a range of feasible options that accomplish the SFMTA's objectives for the TEP and describe and analyze the scope of potential physical environmental impacts that would result from implementing a combination of elements from both alternatives. These two alternatives are described and analyzed at an equal level of detail in the FEIR.

Under either alternative, the Service Policy Framework, the Service Improvements, Service Variants, the Service-related Capital Improvements, and the TPS Toolkit as applied to the program-level TTRP corridors would be implemented. The difference between the two alternative projects is that under the TTRP Moderate Alternative, these elements would be implemented in combination with a "moderate" number of TPS Toolkit elements along certain Rapid Network corridors, and, under the TTRP Expanded Alternative, these elements would be implemented in combination with an "expanded" number of TPS Toolkit elements along the same Rapid Network corridors.

Please note that when the DEIR was published, the SFMTA had developed project-level details for only 8 of the 17 TTRP corridors. Subsequently, SFMTA staff developed project-level details for three more of the TTRPs, using the TPS Toolkit. With this additional detail, the TTRP.L, TTRP.9, and TTRP.71_1 Moderate and Expanded Alternatives were analyzed at a project level of detail in the RTC document. These three TTRPs would have the same significant and less-than-significant impacts as the eight project-level TTRPs analyzed in the DEIR and the same mitigation measures would be applicable. Chapter 2 of the RTC document, Project Description Revisions, provides a detailed description of the three additional project-level TTRPs and a summary of their significant and less-than-significant impacts. Chapter 5 of the RTC document, DEIR Revisions, presents the results of the impact analyses of the new three project-level TTRPs as integrated into EIR Chapter 4, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures and Chapter 6, Alternatives. Thus, 11 of the 17 TTRPs are analyzed at the project-level in the FEIR. In addition, the descriptions and analyses of TTRP.N and TTRP.5 Moderate and Expanded Alternatives were updated in the FEIR based on minor design modifications to these two project components that occurred after the DEIR was published.

B. Project Objectives

The FEIR discusses several Project objectives identified by the SFMTA as Project Sponsor. The objectives are:

- To improve, to the greatest extent possible, transit speed, reliability and safety by redesigning routes; to reduce travel time along high-ridership corridors by optimizing transit stop locations, implementing traffic engineering changes, and constructing capital infrastructure projects; and to improve safety for pedestrians, bicyclists, and riders at intersections by introducing infrastructure changes (e.g. pedestrian bulbs, transit bulbs, etc.) that lead to safer transit operation.
- To make Muni a more attractive transportation mode and increase transit ridership through both attracting new riders and increasing use by current riders by: serving major origin-destination patterns, such as between regional transit connections and major employment sites; providing direct and efficient service through reduction or elimination

of circuitous route segments; reducing crowding through shifting resources to improve customer comfort and decreasing pass-ups; and redesigning routes to maximize ridership.

- To improve the cost-effectiveness and productivity of transit operations by improving network efficiency and reducing system redundancy by implementing service modifications that include route restructuring, frequency improvements, vehicle-type changes, and hours of service adjustments.
- To implement more fully the City's Transit First Policy by providing clear direction for managing transportation in San Francisco with the goals of providing service to all residents within a quarter mile of 95 percent of the Muni service area and prioritizing transit operations in high-ridership corridors over automobile delay and on-street parking.

C. Environmental Review

The San Francisco Planning Department, as lead agency, prepared a Notice of Preparation ("NOP") and Notice of Public Scoping Meetings on November 9, 2011, and held two Public Scoping Meetings on December 6 and 7, 2011.

The NOP was distributed to the State Clearinghouse and mailed to local, state, and federal agencies and to other interested parties on November 9, 2011, initiating a 30-day public comment period extending through December 9, 2011. A copy of the NOP is available in Appendix 1 in Volume 2 of the EIR. The Public Scoping Meetings were held at the SFMTA offices, One South Van Ness Avenue, in San Francisco. The purpose of the meetings was to present information about the proposed Project to the public and receive public input regarding the scope of the EIR analyses. Attendees were provided an opportunity to voice comments on concerns regarding the project; translators were available for Chinese- and Spanish-speaking attendees if needed.

Oral comments were provided by 21 individuals at the Public Scoping Meetings. During the public review period, 29 public agencies and/or other interested parties submitted comment letters to the Planning Department. Comments raised the following concerns related to physical environmental effects: aesthetics of various transit facilities, including overhead wires; the potential for impacts on archeological resources; air quality impacts related to potential increases in use of private passenger vehicles; the effects on traffic flow and potential for diversions due to new transit and pedestrian bulbs; locations of and distance between transit stops; the potential for shifts in travel modes; concern about loss of parking and loading; pedestrian safety concerns; the environmental review process; suggested use of different

approaches to the transportation impact analysis such as providing estimates of time saved; and requested variations on some service improvements.

The San Francisco Planning Department published an Initial Study on January 23, 2013. The Initial Study was distributed to the State Clearinghouse and mailed to local, state, and federal agencies and to other interested parties on January 23, 2013, initiating a 30-day public comment period extending from January 24, 2013 through February 22, 2013. A copy of the Initial Study is available in Appendix 2 in Volume 2 of the EIR.

The San Francisco Planning Department then prepared a DEIR, which describes both of the Project Alternatives; presents the environmental setting; identifies potential impacts at a program-level or a project-level of detail for both Alternatives; presents mitigation measures for impacts found to be significant or potentially significant; and summarizes the Project Alternatives and their impacts, and compares their impacts and those of the No Project Alternative. In assessing construction and operational impacts of the Project, the DEIR also considers the contribution of the Project impacts to cumulative impacts associated with the Project in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions with potential for impacts on the same resources.

Each environmental issue presented in the DEIR is analyzed with respect to significance criteria that are based on the San Francisco Planning Department Environmental Planning Division ("EP") guidance regarding the environmental effects to be considered significant. EP guidance is, in turn, based on CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, with some modifications.

The Department published the DEIR on July 10, 2013. The DEIR was circulated to local, state, and federal agencies and to interested organizations and individuals for review and comment beginning on July 11, 2013 for a 67-day public review period, which ended on September 17, 2013. The San Francisco Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing to solicit testimony on the DEIR on August 15, 2013. The Planning Department also received written comments on the DEIR, sent through mail, hand-delivered, or by email.

The San Francisco Planning Department then prepared the Responses to Comments document ("RTC"). This document, which provides written response to each comment received on the DEIR that raises environmental issues, was published on March 12, 2014, and includes copies of all of the comments received on the DEIR and responses to those comments. The RTC provided additional updated information and clarification on issues raised by commenters, as well as Planning Department DEIR text changes. The text changes included more detailed analyses, at a project level, for three transit Travel Time Reduction Proposal (TTRPs) for both the Moderate and Expanded Alternatives that had previously been analyzed in the DEIR at a

program level: the TTRP.L (L Taraval), TTRP.9 (9/9L San Bruno), and TTRP.71_1 (71 Haight-Noriega).

On March 13, 2013, the Planning Department published a Supplemental Service Variants Memorandum, which described and analyzed additional service variants developed as part of the SFMTA's public outreach process. The Planning Department concluded that these additional service variants would have the same environmental impacts and require the same mitigation measures as the service variants already described and analyzed in the DEIR, and thus, no additional environmental review was required nor was recirculation of the DEIR required.

The Planning Commission reviewed and considered the FEIR, which is comprised of the DEIR, the RTC document and the Supplemental Service Variants Memorandum, Errata dated March 27, 2014, and all of the supporting information. In certifying the FEIR, the Planning Commission determined that it does not add significant new information to the DEIR that would require recirculation under CEQA because the FEIR contains no information revealing (1) any new significant environmental impact that would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented, (2) any substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified environmental impact, (3) any feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed that would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the project, but that was rejected by the project's proponents, or (4) that the DEIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded. This SFMTA Board concurs in this determination.

D. Approval Actions

1. Planning Commission Action

On March 27, 2014 the Planning Commission certified the FEIR.

2. San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors Actions

- Approval of the Transit Effectiveness Project, including the Service Policy Framework
- Approval of the implementation of certain parking and traffic measures in accordance with Section 201(c) of the Transportation Code

3. San Francisco Board of Supervisors Actions

The Planning Commission's certification of the FEIR may be appealed to the Board of Supervisors. If appealed, the Board of Supervisors will determine whether to uphold the

certification or to grant the appeal and remand the FEIR to the Planning Department for further review.

Additional actions that may be taken by the Board of Supervisors are:

- Review and approval of system changes related to any route abandonments.
- Approval of sidewalk changes, upon referral from the Department of Public Works.

4. Other San Francisco Agency Actions

- Approval by the Department of Public Works of sidewalk legislation and construction period encroachment permits.
- Approval by the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission of property encroachments, if required.
- Approval by the San Francisco Planning Department of any required General Plan Referrals

5. Other—Local, State, and Federal Agencies

Implementation of the Project will involve consultation with, or required approvals by, other local, state and federal regulatory agencies, including, but not limited to, the following:

- The Transportation Advisory Staff Committee ("TASC"): Coordination of all roadway and transit changes.
- City of Daly City: Approval of installation of a traffic signal and transit bulb in Daly City.
- California Department of Transportation ("Caltrans") District 4: Approval of temporary construction street encroachment permits within Caltrans rights-of-way.

To the extent that the identified mitigation measures require consultation with or approval by these other agencies, the SFMTA Board urges these agencies to assist in implementing, coordinating, or approving the mitigation measures, as appropriate to the particular measure.

6. Location and Custodian of Records

The DEIR and all documents referenced in or relied on by the Draft and FEIR, the DEIR public hearing transcript, a copy of all letters regarding the EIR received during the Notice of Preparation and DEIR public review periods, the administrative record, the Responses to Comments document, and the Supplemental Service Variants Memorandum, and background documentation for the FEIR are located at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, San Francisco. (Planning Department Case File No. 2011.0558E.) The Planning Commission Secretary, Jonas Ionin, is the custodian of records for the Planning Department and the Planning Commission.

All information, including written materials and testimony, concerning approval of the Project and adoption of these findings, presented to the SFMTA Board or incorporated into reports presented to the SFMTA Board, are located at the SFMTA offices at One South Van Ness Avenue, 7th floor, San Francisco.

All files have been available to the SFMTA Board and the public for review in considering these findings and whether to approve the Project.

E. Findings about Significant Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

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

In making these findings, the SFMTA Board has considered the opinions of SFMTA staff and other City staff and experts, other agencies, and members of the public. The SFMTA Board finds that the determination of significance thresholds is a judgment decision within the discretion of the SFMTA and the City and County of San Francisco; the significance thresholds used in the EIR are supported by substantial evidence in the record, including the expert opinion of the SFMTA and City staff; and the significance thresholds used in the EIR provide reasonable and appropriate means of assessing the significance of the adverse environmental effects of the Project.

These findings do not attempt to describe the full analysis of each environmental impact contained in the FEIR. Instead, a full explanation of these environmental findings and conclusions can be found in the FEIR, which includes its Initial Study presented in EIR Appendix 2, and these findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in the FEIR supporting the determinations regarding the Project impacts and mitigation measures designed to address those impacts. In making these findings, the SFMTA Board of Directors ratifies, adopts, and incorporates in these findings the determinations and conclusions of the FEIR relating to environmental impacts and mitigation measures, except to the extent any such determinations are specifically and expressly modified by these findings.

As set forth below, the SFMTA Board adopts and incorporates the mitigation measures set forth in the FEIR and the attached MMRP to substantially lessen or avoid the significant impacts of the Project. The SFMTA Board intends to adopt all the mitigation measures proposed in the FEIR. Accordingly, in the event a mitigation measure identified in the FEIR has inadvertently been omitted in these findings or the MMRP, such mitigation measure is hereby adopted and incorporated in the findings below by reference. In addition, in the event the language describing a mitigation measure set forth in these findings or the MMRP fails to accurately reflect the mitigation measures in the FEIR due to a clerical error, the language of the policies and implementation measures as set forth in the FEIR shall control. The impact numbers and mitigation measure numbers used in these findings reflect the information contained in the FEIR.

In the Sections II, III and IV below, the same findings are made for a category of environmental impacts and mitigation measures. Rather than repeat the identical finding dozens of times to address each and every significant effect and mitigation measure, the initial finding obviates the need for such repetition because in no instance is the SFMTA Board rejecting the conclusions of the FEIR or the mitigation measures identified in the FEIR for the Project.

The findings below include findings relevant to the TTRP Moderate Alternative and to the TTRP Expanded Alternative. Under either alternative, the FEIR assumed that the Service Policy Framework, the Service Improvements, Service Variants, the Service-related Capital Improvements, and the TPS Toolkit as applied to the program-level TTRP corridors would be implemented. It is not known at this time which specific alternative, or mixture of proposals from the two alternatives, will be ultimately approved by the SFMTA Board for each TTRP corridor. It is likely that, over time, a mix of the proposals described in the TTRP Moderate Alternative and the TTRP Expanded Alternative will be adopted and implemented along the various corridors. Because of this, in taking this action, the SFMTA Board makes the following findings regarding the potential for environmental impacts and required mitigation measures for both the TTRP Moderate Alternative and the TTRP Expanded Alternative, as each are described in the FEIR.

II. IMPACTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT AND THUS DO NOT REQUIRE MITIGATION

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant (Pub. Resources Code § 21002; CEQA Guidelines §§ 15126.4(a)(3) and 15091). Based on the evidence in the whole record of this proceeding, the Board finds that implementation of the Proposed Project will not result in any significant impacts in the following areas and that these impact areas therefore do not require mitigation:

Land Use and Land Use Planning

- Impacts LU-1, LU-2, and LU-3: The proposed Project would not physically divide an established community, would not conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, or have a substantial adverse impact on the existing character of the vicinity.
- Impact C-LU-1: The proposed Project, in combination with other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity, would not have a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative land use or land use planning impact.

Aesthetics

- Impacts AE-1 and AE-2: The proposed Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista or on scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and other features of the built or natural environment which contribute to a scenic public setting.
- Impact AE-3: The proposed Project would not degrade existing visual character or quality of the project sites and surroundings.
- Impact AE-4: The proposed Project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would have a substantial adverse effect on day or nighttime views.
- Impact C-AE-1: The proposed Project, in combination with other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future projects would not have a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative aesthetics impact.

Population and Housing

- Impact PH-1: The proposed Project would not induce substantial population growth either directly or indirectly.
- Impact PH-2: The proposed Project would not displace any existing housing units or create any demand for additional housing, or displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing.
- Impact C-PH-1: The proposed Project in combination with other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future projects would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts on population or housing.

Cultural and Paleontological Resources

- Impact CP-1: The proposed Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historic architectural resource.
- Impact C-CP-1: The proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts on cultural resources or archaeological resources.

Transportation and Circulation

- The proposed Project would not result in changes to air traffic patterns because the project site is not located within an airport land use plan area or in the vicinity of a private airstrip.
- The proposed Project would not substantially increase transportation hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses.
- Impact TR-1: Implementation of the Service Policy Framework and the TEP project components would not result in construction-related transportation impacts because of their temporary and limited duration.
- Impact TR-2: Implementation of the Service Policy Framework Objectives A through D would not result in significant impacts to local or regional transit, traffic operations, pedestrians and bicyclists, loading, emergency vehicle access, or parking.
- Impact TR-4: Implementation of the Policy Framework Objective A, Actions A.1, A.2 and A.4, Objective B, Actions B.1 through B.4, Objective C, Actions C.1 and C.2, and Objective D, Actions D.1 through D.4 would not result in significant traffic impacts.
- Impact TR-6: Implementation of the Policy Framework Objective A, Actions A.1, A.2 and A.4, Objective B, Actions B.1 through B.4, Objective C, Actions C.1 and C.2, and Objective D, Actions D.1 through D.4 would not result in significant loading impacts.
- Impact TR-7: Implementation of all of the TPS Toolkit categories: Transit Stop Changes, Lane Modifications, Parking and Turn Restrictions, Traffic Signal and Stop Sign Changes, and Pedestrian Improvements, would not result in significant impacts to local or regional transit, pedestrians and bicycles, emergency vehicle access, or parking.
- Impact TR-9: Implementation of the following TPS Toolkit categories: Transit Stop Changes, Parking and Turn Restrictions, and Traffic Signal and Stop Sign Changes, would not result in significant traffic impacts.
- Impact TR-11: Implementation of TPS Toolkit element category Traffic Signal and Stop Sign Changes would not result in significant loading impacts.
- Impact TR-12: Implementation of program-level Service-related Capital Improvements projects (TTPI.2, TTPI.3, TTPI.4, OWE.6, and SCI.1) would not result in significant impacts to local or regional transit, traffic operations, pedestrians and bicyclists, loading, emergency vehicle access, or parking.
- Impact TR-13: Implementation of any of the TPS Toolkit categories: Transit Stop Changes, Lane Modifications, Parking and Turn Restrictions, Traffic Signal and Stop Sign Changes, and Pedestrian Improvements along the nine program-level TTRP corridors would not result in significant impacts to local or regional transit, pedestrians and bicyclists, emergency vehicle access, or parking.
- Impact TR-15: Implementation of any TPS Toolkit elements within the following categories: Transit Stop Changes, Parking and Turn Restrictions, and Traffic Signal and Stop Sign Changes, along the program-level TTRP corridors would not result in significant impacts on traffic operations.

- Impact TR-17: Implementation of any of the TPS Toolkit elements within the category Traffic Signal and Stop Sign Changes along the program level TTRP corridors would not result in significant loading impacts.
- Impact TR-18: Implementation of the Service Improvements or Service Variants would not result in significant impacts to local or regional transit, traffic operations, pedestrians and bicyclists, loading, emergency vehicle access, or parking.
- Impact TR-19: Implementation of the project-level Service-related Capital Improvement projects (TTPI.2, OWE.1, OWE.1 Variant, OWE.2, OWE.3, OWE.4, OWE.5, and SCI.2) would not result in significant impacts to local or regional transit, traffic operations, pedestrians and bicyclists, loading, emergency vehicle access, or parking.
- Impact TR-20: Implementation of the project-level TTRP Moderate Alternative for the TTRP.J, TTRP.L, TTRP.N, TTRP.5, TTRP.8X, TTRP.9, TTRP.14 Variant 1, TTRP.14 Variant 2, TTRP.22_1, TTRP.28_1, TTRP.30_1, or TTRP.71_1 would not result in significant impacts to local or regional transit.
- Impact TR-21: Implementation of the project-level TTRP Expanded Alternative for the TTRP.J, TTRP.L, TTRP.N, TTRP.5, TTRP.8X, TTRP.9, TTRP.14, TTRP.22_1, TTRP.22_1 Variant 1, TTRP.22_1 Variant 2, TTRP.28_1, TTRP.30_1, TTRP.30_1 Variant 1, TTRP.30_1 Variant 2, or TTRP.71_1 would not result in significant impacts to local or regional transit.
- Impact TR-22: Implementation of the project-level TTRP Moderate Alternative for the TTRP.J, TTRP.L, TTRP.N, TTRP.5, TTRP.8X, TTRP.9, TTRP.14 Variant 1, TTRP.14 Variant 2, TTRP.22_1, TTRP.28_1, TTRP.30_1, or TTRP.71_1 would have less-than-significant traffic impacts at 78 study intersections.
- Impact TR-23: Implementation of the project-level TTRP Expanded Alternative for the TTRP.J, TTRP.L, TTRP.N, TTRP.5, TTRP.8X, TTRP.9, TTRP.28_1, or TTRP.71_1 would have less-than-significant traffic impacts at 40 study intersections.
- Impact TR-25: Implementation of the project-level TTRP.14 Expanded Alternative would have less-than-significant traffic impacts at 19 study intersections under Existing plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.14 Expanded Alternative conditions.
- Impact TR-29: Implementation of the project-level TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative would have less-than-significant traffic impacts at six study intersections that would operate at level of service ("LOS") D or better under Existing plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative conditions.
- Impact TR-33: Implementation of the project-level TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1 would have less-than-significant traffic impacts at six study intersections that would operate at LOS D or better under Existing plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1 conditions.
- Impact TR-37: Implementation of the project-level TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 would have less-than-significant traffic impacts at six study intersections that would operate at LOS D or better under Existing plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 conditions.
- Impact TR-39: Implementation of the project-level TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative would have less-than-significant traffic impacts at nine study intersections that would

operate at LOS D or better under Existing plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative conditions.

- Impact TR-41: Implementation of the project-level TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1 would have less-than-significant traffic impacts at nine study intersections that would operate at LOS D or better under Existing plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1 conditions.
- Impact TR-43: Implementation of the project-level TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 would have less-than-significant traffic impacts at nine study intersections that would operate at LOS D or better under Existing plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 conditions.
- Impact TR-44: Implementation of the project-level TTRP Moderate Alternative for the TTRP.J, TTRP.L, TTRP.N, TTRP.5, TTRP.8X, TTRP.9, TTRP.14 Variant 1, TTRP.14 Variant 2, TTRP.22_1, TTRP.28_1, TTRP.30_1, or TTRP.71_1 would not result in significant impacts to pedestrians and bicyclists.
- Impact TR-45: Implementation of the project-level TTRP Expanded Alternative for the TTRP.J, TTRP.L, TTRP.N, TTRP.5, TTRP.8X, TTRP.9, TTRP.14, TTRP.22_1, TTRP.22_1 Variant 1, TTRP.22_1 Variant 2, TTRP.28_1 Expanded Alternative, TTRP.30_1, TTRP.30_1 Variant 1, TTRP.30_1 Variant 2, or TTRP.71_1 would not result in significant impacts to pedestrians and bicyclists.
- Impact TR-46: Implementation of the project-level TTRP Moderate Alternative for the TTRP.J, TTRP.L, TTRP.N, TTRP.5, TTRP.8X, TTRP.9, TTRP.22_1, TTRP.28_1, or TTRP.71_1 would not result in significant loading impacts.
- Impact TR-47: Implementation of the project-level TTRP Expanded Alternative for the TTRP.J, TTRP.L, TTRP.N, TTRP.5, TTRP.8X, TTRP.9, TTRP.22_1, TTRP.22_1 Variant 1, TTRP.22_1 Variant 2, TTRP.28_1, or TTRP.71_1 would not result in significant loading impacts.
- Impact TR-55: Implementation of the project-level TTRP Moderate Alternative for the TTRP.J, TTRP.L, TTRP.N, TTRP.5, TTRP.8X, TTRP.9, TTRP.14 Variant 1, TTRP.14 Variant 2, TTRP.22_1, TTRP.28_1, TTRP.30_1, or TTRP.71_1 would not result in significant impacts on emergency vehicle access.
- Impact TR-56: Implementation of the project-level TTRP Expanded Alternative for the TTRP.J, TTRP.L, TTRP.N, TTRP.5, TTRP.8X, TTRP.9, TTRP.14, TTRP.22_1, TTRP.22_1 Variant 1, TTRP.22_1 Variant 2, TTRP.28_1, TTRP.30_1, TTRP.30_1 Variant 1, TTRP.30_1 Variant 2, or TTRP.71_1 would not result in significant impacts on emergency vehicle access.
- Impact TR-57: Implementation of the project-level TTRP Moderate Alternative for the TTRP.J, TTRP.L, TTRP.N, TTRP.5, TTRP.8X, TTRP.9, TTRP.14 Variant 1, TTRP.14 Variant 2, TTRP.22_1, TTRP.28_1, TTRP.30_1, or TTRP.71_1 would not result in a significant parking impact.
- Impact TR-58: Implementation of the project-level TTRP Expanded Alternative for the TTRP.J, TTRP.L, TTRP.N, TTRP.5, TTRP.8X, TTRP.9, TTRP.14, TTRP.22_1, TTRP.22_1 Variant 1, TTRP.22_1 Variant 2, TTRP.28_1, TTRP.30_1, TTRP.30_1 Variant 1, TTRP.30_1 Variant 2, or TTRP.71_1 would not result in a significant parking impact.

- Impact C-TR-4: Implementation of the Service Improvements or Service Variants, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would not contribute considerably to ridership at the regional transit screenlines on AC Transit, Caltrain, Golden Gate Transit, SamTrans, and other regional ferry service under 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements only conditions.
- Impact C-TR-5: The TPS Toolkit elements as applied in the program-level TTRP corridors, and Service Improvements with the TTRP Moderate Alternative would not contribute considerably to ridership at the regional transit screenlines on AC Transit, Caltrain, Golden Gate Transit, SamTrans, and other regional ferry service under 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP Moderate Alternative conditions.
- Impact C-TR-6: The TPS Toolkit elements as applied in program-level TTRP corridors, and Service Improvements with the TTRP Expanded Alternative, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would not contribute considerably to ridership at the regional transit screenlines on AC Transit, Caltrain, Golden Gate Transit, SamTrans, and other regional ferry service under 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP Expanded Alternative conditions.
- Impact C-TR-8: Implementation of the Service Policy Framework Objective A, Actions A.1, A.2 and A.4, Objective B, Actions B.1 through B.4, Objective C, Actions C.1 and C.2, and Objective D, Actions D.1 through D.4 and any of the TPS Toolkit elements within categories: Transit Stop Changes, Parking and Turn Restrictions, and Traffic Signal and Stop Sign Changes, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would have less-than-significant traffic impacts under 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP Moderate Alternative conditions, and therefore would not contribute to any significant cumulative traffic impacts.
- Impact C-TR-10: Implementation of the Service Policy Framework Objective A, Actions A.1, A.2 and A.4, Objective B, Actions B.1 through B.4, Objective C, Actions C.1 and C.2, and Objective D, Actions D.1 through D.4 and any of the TPS Toolkit elements within categories: Transit Stop Changes, Parking and Turn Restrictions, and Traffic Signal and Stop Sign Changes, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would have less-than-significant traffic impacts under 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP Expanded Alternative conditions, and therefore would not contribute to any significant cumulative traffic impacts.
- Impact C-TR-11: Implementation of the Service Improvements or Service Variants, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would have less-than-significant traffic impacts under 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements only conditions, and therefore would not contribute to any significant cumulative traffic impacts.
- Impact C-TR-12: Implementation of the TTRP Moderate Alternative for the TTRP.J, TTRP.L, TTRP.N, TTRP.5, TTRP.8X, TTRP.9, TTRP.14 Variant 1, TTRP.14 Variant 2, TTRP.22_1, TTRP.28_1, TTRP.30_1, or TTRP.71_1 would have less-than-significant traffic impacts under 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP Moderate Alternative conditions, and therefore would not contribute to any significant cumulative traffic impacts.

- Impact C-TR-38: Implementation of the TTRP Expanded Alternative for the TTRP.J, TTRP.L, TTRP.N, TTRP.5, TTRP.8X, TTRP.9, TTRP.14, TTRP.22_1, TTRP.22_1 Variant 1, TTRP.22_1 Variant 2, TTRP.28_1, TTRP.30_1, TTRP.30_1 Variant 1, TTRP.30_1 Variant 2, or TTRP.71_1, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would not contribute considerably to significant cumulative traffic impacts at 16 study intersections that would operate at LOS E or LOS F under 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP Expanded Alternative conditions.
- Impact C-TR-39: Implementation of the TTRP Expanded Alternative for the TTRP.J, TTRP.L, TTRP.N, TTRP.5, TTRP.8X, TTRP.9, TTRP.14, TTRP.22_1, TTRP.22_1 Variant 1, TTRP.22_1 Variant 2, TTRP.28_1, TTRP.30_1, TTRP.30_1 Variant 1, TTRP.30_1 Variant 2, or TTRP.71_1 would not result in significant cumulative traffic impacts at 48 study intersections that would operate at LOS D or better under 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP Expanded Alternative conditions.
- Impact C-TR-40: Implementation of the Service Policy Framework and any of the TPS Toolkit elements within categories: Transit Stop Changes, Lane Modifications, Parking and Turn Restrictions, and Traffic Signal and Stop Sign Changes, and Pedestrian Improvements as applied in program-level TTRP corridors, Service Improvements or Service Variants, and Service-related Capital Improvements, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would have less-than-significant cumulative pedestrian and bicycle impacts.
- Impact C-TR-41: Implementation of the Service Improvements or Service Variants and the project-level TTRP Moderate Alternative for the TTRP.J, TTRP.L, TTRP.N, TTRP.5, TTRP.8X, TTRP.9, TTRP.14 Variant 1 and TTRP Variant 2, TTRP.22_1, TTRP.28_1, TTRP.30_1, or TTRP.71_1, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would have less-than-significant cumulative pedestrian and bicycle impacts.
- Impact C-TR-42: Implementation of the Service Improvements or Service Variants and the project-level TTRP Expanded Alternative for the TTRP.J, TTRP.L, TTRP.N, TTRP.5, TTRP.8X, TTRP.9, TTRP.14, TTRP.22_1, TTRP.22_1 Variant 1, TTRP.22_1 Variant 2, TTRP.28_1, TTRP.30_1, TTRP.30_1 Variant 1, TTRP.30_1 Variant 2, or TTRP.71_1, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would have less-than-significant cumulative pedestrian and bicycle impacts.
- Impact C-TR-46: Implementation of the Policy Framework Objective A, Actions A.1, A.2 and A.4, Objective B, Actions B.1 through B.4, Objective C, Actions C.1 and C.2, and Objective D, Actions D.1 through D.4, TPS Toolkit Category Traffic Signal and Stop Sign Changes as applied in program-level TTRP corridors, Service Improvements or Service Variants, and Service-related Capital Improvements, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would have less-than-significant cumulative loading impacts.
- Impact C-TR-47: Implementation of the project-level TTRP Moderate Alternative for the TTRP.J, TTRP.L, TTRP.N, TTRP.5, TTRP.8X, TTRP.9, TTRP.22_1, TTRP.28_1, or TTRP.71_1, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would have less-than-significant cumulative loading impacts.

- Impact C-TR-48: Implementation of the project-level TTRP Expanded Alternative for the TTRP.J, TTRP.L, TTRP.N, TTRP.5, TTRP.8X, TTRP.9, TTRP.22_1, TTRP.22_1 Variant 1, TTRP.22_1 Variant 2, TTRP.28_1, or TTRP.71_1, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would have less-than-significant cumulative loading impacts.
- Impact C-TR-50: Implementation of the Service Policy Framework Objective A, Actions A.1, A.2, and A.4, Objective B all actions, Objective C, Actions C.1 and C.2, and Objective D all actions, and any of the TPS Toolkit elements within categories: Transit Stop Changes and Traffic Signal and Stop Sign Changes, and Pedestrian Improvements as applied in program-level TTRP corridors, Service Improvements, and Service-related Capital Improvements, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would have less-than-significant cumulative parking impacts.
- Impact C-TR-51: Implementation of the project-level TTRP Moderate Alternative for the TTRP.J, TTRP.L, TTRP.N, TTRP.5, TTRP.8X, TTRP.9, TTRP.22_1, TTRP.28_1, TTRP.30_1, or TTRP.71_1, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would have less-than-significant cumulative parking impacts.
- Impact C-TR-53: Implementation of the project-level TTRP Expanded Alternative for the TTRP.J, TTRP.L, TTRP.N, TTRP.5, TTRP.8X, TTRP.9, TTRP.14, TTRP.28_1, TTRP.30_1, TTRP.30_1 Variant 1, TTRP.30_1 Variant 2, or TTRP.71_1, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would have less-than-significant cumulative parking impacts.

Noise and Vibration

- The proposed Project is not located within an airport land use plan area, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip, and therefore would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.
- Impact NO-1: Construction activities, occurring indirectly as a result of the proposed Service Policy Framework, and as proposed under the TEP for the Service Improvements and Service Variants, Service-related Capital Improvements, and TTRPs and TTRP Variants would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in noise levels above existing ambient conditions.
- Impact NO-2: Construction activities, occurring indirectly as a result of the proposed Service Policy Framework, and as proposed under the TEP for the Service Improvements and Service Variants, Service-related Capital Improvements, and TTRPs and TTRP Variants would not expose persons and structures to excessive temporary ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels.
- Impact NO-3: The proposed Service Policy Framework and operation of the Service Improvements and Service Variants would not result in a substantial increase in permanent noise levels along affected transit routes above existing ambient conditions.
- Impact NO-4: The proposed Service Policy Framework and the Service Improvements and Service Variants proposed by the TEP would not expose people to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or noise levels along affected transit routes.

- Impact C-NO-1: The Service Policy Framework and the construction and operation of the proposed TEP, including Service Improvements and Service Variants, Service-related Capital Improvements, and TTRPs and TTRP Variants, in combination with other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not increase construction noise and vibration or operational noise and vibration levels along affected transit routes substantially above existing ambient conditions.

Air Quality

- The proposed Project would not result in significant odor impacts.
- Impact AQ-1: The Service Policy Framework and construction activities proposed under the Service Improvements and Service Variants, Service-related Capital Improvements, and TTRPs and TTRP Variants would not result in a violation of air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; nor would it result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria air pollutants, for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable ambient air quality standard.
- Impact AQ-2: The Service Policy Framework and construction activities proposed under the Service Improvements and Service Variants, Service-related Capital Improvements, and TTRPs and TTRP Variants would not generate emissions of $PM_{2.5}$ and toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, at levels that would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
- Impact AQ-3: The Service Policy Framework and the proposed project-level Service Improvements and Service Variants in combination with the TTRPs and TTRP Variants would not result in a violation of air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation nor result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria air pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable ambient air quality standard.
- Impact AQ-4: The Service Policy Framework and proposed project-level Service Improvements and Service Variants would not generate emissions of $PM_{2.5}$ and toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, at levels that would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
- Impact AQ-5: The Service Policy Framework, and construction and operation of the proposed TEP, including the Service Improvements and Service Variants, Service-related Capital Improvements, and TTRPs and TTRP Variants, would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the 2010 Clean Air Plan, the Bay Area's applicable air quality plan.
- Impact C-AQ-1: The Service Policy Framework, and construction and operation of the proposed TEP, including the Service Improvements and Service Variants, Service-related Capital Improvements, and TTRPs and TTRP Variants, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria air pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under applicable ambient air quality standards.
- Impact C-AQ-2: The Service Policy Framework, and construction and operation of the proposed TEP, including the Service Improvements and Service Variants, Service-related Capital Improvements, and TTRPs and TTRP Variants, in combination with past,

present and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not generate emissions of $PM_{2.5}$ and toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, at levels that would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- Impact C-GG-1: The proposed Project would generate greenhouse gas emissions, but not in levels that would result in a significant impact on the environment or conflict with any policy, plan, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Wind and Shadow

- Impact WS-1: The proposed Project would not alter winds in a manner that would substantially affect public areas.
- Impact WS-2: The proposed Project would not create new shadow that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas.

Recreation

- Impact RE-1, RE-3: The proposed Project would not result in the increased use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreation facilities such that substantial physical deterioration would occur or be accelerated, nor result in the degradation of recreational resources.
- Impact RE-2: The proposed project would not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.
- Impact C-RE-1: The proposed project in combination with other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future projects would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts on recreation.

Utilities and Services Systems

- Impact UT-1, UT-2: The proposed Project would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board; result in a determination that the wastewater treatment provider has inadequate capacity to serve the project; or require or result in the construction of new or the expansion of existing water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage facilities
- Impact UT-3: The proposed Project would have sufficient water supply available from existing entitlements and would not require new or expanded water supply resources or entitlements.
- Impact UT-4: The proposed Project would increase the amount of solid waste generated on the project sites, but would be adequately served by the City's landfill and would comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

- Impact C-UT-1: The proposed Project in combination with other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future projects would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts on utilities and service systems.

Public Services

- Impact PS-1: The proposed Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of police protection, fire protection, schools, and library services in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives.
- Impact C-PS-1: The proposed Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant impacts on police services, fire protection, emergency services, schools, or libraries such that new or altered facilities are required.

Biological Resources

- Impact Bl-1, B-2, Bl-3: The proposed Project would not affect any special status species, riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community, or federally protected wetlands; would not interfere with the movement of native resident or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors; and would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.
- Impact C-Bl-4: The proposed Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts on biological resources.

Geology and Soils

- Impact GE-1: Implementation of the proposed Project would not result in exposure of people and structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, seismic ground-shaking, liquefaction, lateral spreading, or landslides.
- Impact GE-2: The implementation of the proposed Project would not result in substantial erosion, loss of topsoil, or adverse impacts to topographical features.
- Impact GE-3: The implementation of the proposed Project would not locate sensitive land uses on geologic units or soils that are expansive, unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of future uses, and potentially result in on-or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.
- Impact C-GE-1: The proposed Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts on geology and soils.

Hydrology and Water Quality

- Impact HY-1: The implementation of the proposed Project would not violate water quality or waste discharge standards, exceed the capacity of existing drainage systems,

provide additional sources of polluted runoff, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.

- Impact HY-2, HY-3: The proposed Project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, and would not substantially alter existing drainage patterns in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation.
- Impact HY-4, HY-5: The implementation of the proposed Project would not expose people or structures to substantial risk of loss due to flooding, or to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow, or as a result of the failure of a reservoir.
- Impact C-HY-1: The proposed Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts on water quality and hydrology.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- Impact HZ-3: Implementation of the proposed Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment by location on a hazardous materials site.
- Impact HZ-4: Implementation of the proposed Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving fires, and would not interfere with the implementation of an emergency response plan.
- Impact C-HZ-1: The proposed Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts with respect to hazards and hazardous materials.

Mineral and Energy Resources

- Impact ME-1: The proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource or a locally-important mineral resource recovery site,
- Impact ME-2: The proposed Project would not result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use these in a wasteful manner.
- Impact C-ME-1: The proposed Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts on mineral and energy resources.

Agriculture and Forest Resources

- Impact AF-1: The proposed Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on agriculture or forest resources.

Growth-Inducing Impacts

- Impact GR-1: Implementation of the Service Policy Framework and the TEP project components would not result in growth inducing impacts.

III. FINDINGS OF POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS THAT CAN BE AVOIDED OR REDUCED TO A LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT LEVEL THROUGH MITIGATION AND THE DISPOSITION OF THE MITIGATION MEASURES

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 (unless mitigation to such levels is achieved through adoption of a project alternative). The findings in this Section III and in Section IV concern mitigation measures set forth in the EIR. These findings discuss mitigation measures as identified in the FEIR and recommended for adoption by the SFMTA Board of Directors. The full text of the mitigation measures is contained in the FEIR and in **Attachment B**, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

The SFMTA Board adopts all of the mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. The SFMTA Board finds that all of the mitigation measures are appropriate and feasible. Based on the analysis contained in the FEIR, other considerations in the record, and the significance thresholds in the EIR, the SFMTA Board finds that the impacts identified in this Section III will be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of the mitigation measures contained in the FEIR, imposed as conditions of approval, and set forth in **Attachment B**.

Cultural and Paleontological Resources

- Impact CP-2: The proposed Project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5.

There is a reasonable presumption that construction of the proposed program-level and project-level TEP components will not require an excavation depth and/ or be located in an area where the potential for effect on archaeological resources is likely. However, to avoid potential adverse impacts on archaeological resources where the presence of the resource cannot be known, foreseen, or predicted, the Accidental Discovery Archaeological Mitigation Measure will be implemented for all TEP components. This mitigation measure requires that upon accidental discovery of an archaeological resource during construction (including human remains), the appropriate treatment of the resource will be carried out by a qualified archaeological consultant.

Mitigation Measure M-CR-2a: Accidental Discovery of Archeological Resources.

The construction of the following four TEP components has the potential to adversely affect archaeological resources: TTRP.22_2; TTRP.9; and two Service-related Capital Improvements, OWE.1 New Overhead Wiring – Reroute 33 Stanyan onto Valencia Street, and SC1.2 Sansome Street Contraflow Lane. TTRP.9 includes a segment of Bayshore Boulevard, and TTRP. 22_2 includes a segment of Richardson Avenue. These segments occur along the historic shoreline,

estuary, tidal marsh or lagoon, or watercourse and such sites may include prehistoric archaeological resources. The installation of overhead wire support poles and duct banks along a two-block portion of Valencia Street (OWE.1) will be constructed in the Mission Dolores area in which there is a potential for significant archaeological resources from the Hispanic Period. The installation of traffic mast arms along a three-block portion of Sansome Street (SCI.2) will occur in an area with the potential for impacts to archaeological resources from the Yerba Buena period. Construction in these areas could result in significant impacts on archaeological resources if the Archaeological Monitoring mitigation measure is not implemented. Implementation of the Archaeological Monitoring mitigation measure requires review by the Planning Department archeologist once engineering design details are known. If determined necessary by the Planning Department, the SFMTA would be required to hire an archaeological consultant to be present and monitor construction activities associated with these four TEP components (as necessary), redirect construction activities if an intact archaeological deposit is encountered, evaluate the deposit, and either re-design the project or implement a data recovery program.

Mitigation Measure M-CR-2b: Archaeological Monitoring

- Impact CP-3: The proposed Project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

Given the shallow excavation depths of TEP construction activities and previous ground disturbance that is common within the public right-of-way, there is a low probability of encountering significant paleontological resources in the course of project construction. However, the presence of shallow paleontological resources within areas of excavation under the proposed Project cannot be conclusively ruled out. Disturbance of paleontological resources could impair the ability of paleontological resources to yield important scientific information. The Paleontological Resources Accidental Discovery mitigation measure will apply in the event that any indication of a paleontological resource is encountered in the course of TEP project construction activities, and if the resource may be important, a qualified paleontological consultant will be retained to design and implement a sampling and data recovery program.

Mitigation Measure M-CP-3: Paleontological Resources Accidental Discovery

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- Impact HZ-1: Implementation of the proposed Project would not create a significant hazard through routine transport, use, disposal, handling, or emission of hazardous materials or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

The use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials is regulated by numerous local, state, and federal laws and regulations. Excavation in the public-right-of-way is regulated under the Public Works Code, which states that excavation contractors are subject to all applicable hazardous material guidelines for disposal, handling, release, and treatment of hazardous material; site remediation; and worker safety and training. Additionally, Article 20 of the Public Works Code and Article 22A of the San Francisco Health Code require environmental investigation at construction sites where contaminated fill materials may be encountered. The SFMTA and construction contractors will adhere to these regulations. However, to ensure that potential significant impacts from release of hazardous materials during construction are reduced to less-than-significant levels, the SFMTA and construction contractors are required to implement the Hazardous Materials Soil Testing mitigation measure, which requires that soil to be removed from an excavation area and not encapsulated within the same area be tested and, if found to contain hazardous materials, be transported and disposed of in compliance with local, state and federal requirements.

Mitigation Measure M-HZ-1: Hazardous Materials Soil Testing

- Impact HZ-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not substantially emit hazardous emissions or acutely hazardous materials near schools.

To ensure that construction and operation of the program- and project-level TEP components will not result in significant hazardous materials emissions or the handling of acutely hazardous materials near schools, the SFMTA and construction contractors are required to implement the Hazardous Materials Soil Testing mitigation measure listed above.

Mitigation Measure M-HZ-1: Hazardous Materials Soil Testing

IV. SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS THAT CANNOT BE AVOIDED OR REDUCED TO A LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

Based on substantial evidence in the whole record of these proceedings, the SFMTA Board of Directors finds that, where feasible, changes or alterations have been required, or incorporated into, the Project to reduce the significant environmental impacts as identified in the FEIR. The SFMTA Board finds that the mitigation measures in the FEIR and described below are appropriate, and that changes have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21002 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, may substantially lessen, but do not avoid (i.e., reduce to less-than-significant levels), the potentially significant environmental effects associated with implementation of the Project that are described below. The SFMTA Board adopts all of the mitigation measures and improvement measures set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP), attached as **Attachment B**. But, the SFMTA Board further finds that for the impacts listed below, despite

the implementation of all feasible mitigation measures, the effects remain significant and unavoidable.

Based on substantial evidence in the whole record, including the expert opinion of SFMTA and Planning Department staff and consultants to those staff, the SFMTA Board also finds that for some impacts identified in the FEIR, as noted below in this Section IV, no feasible mitigation measures were identified in the FEIR and those impacts remain significant and unavoidable. For a detailed explanation of the lack of feasible mitigation measures for some of the following impacts, and of the reasons why certain mitigation measures, although technologically feasible, may be subject to uncertainty, including funding-related uncertainty, please see the relevant discussions in the FEIR.

The SFMTA Board determines that the following significant impacts on the environment, as reflected in the FEIR, are unavoidable, but under Public Resources Code §§ 21081(a)(3) and (b), and CEQA Guidelines §§ 15091(a)(3), 15092(b)(2)(B), and 15093, the SFMTA Board determines that the impacts are acceptable due to the overriding considerations described in Section VI below. This finding is supported by substantial evidence in the record of this proceeding.

Transportation and Circulation

- **Impact TR-3:** Implementation of the Policy Framework Objective A, Action A.3, and Objective C, Actions C.3 through C.5 may result in significant traffic impacts.

  – *Mitigation Measure M-TR-8: Optimization of Intersection Operations.*

Because this measure may not be adequate to mitigate impacts to intersection traffic operations to less-than-significant levels, and because the feasibility of providing additional vehicle capacity is unknown and it is not always possible to optimize an intersection such that level of service will improve to level of service ("LOS") D or better, the impact on traffic operations remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact TR-5:** Implementation of the Policy Framework Objective A, Action A.3 and Objective C, Actions C.3 through C.5 may result in significant loading impacts.

  – *Mitigation Measure M-TR-10: Provision of Replacement Commercial Loading Spaces*

  – *Mitigation Measure M-TR-48: Enforcement of Parking Violations,*

These measures could reduce significant loading impacts to a less-than-significant level. However, in some locations on-street parking may not be available to convert to commercial loading spaces on the same block and side of the street or within 250 feet on an adjacent side

street, the feasibility of providing replacement commercial loading spaces pursuant to Mitigation Measure M-TR-10 cannot be assured in every situation. And because the effectiveness of the use of camera video enforcement of parking regulations along new transit-only lanes is not known, the feasibility of Mitigation Measure M-TR-48 is uncertain. Therefore, the impact of loss of on-street commercial loading spaces remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact TR-8:** Implementation of the following TPS Toolkit categories: Lane Modifications and Pedestrian Improvements may result in significant traffic impacts.
  - *Mitigation Measure M-TR-8: Optimization of Intersection Operations*

Because this measure may not be adequate to mitigate intersection traffic operations to less-than-significant levels, and because the feasibility of providing additional vehicle capacity is unknown and it is not always possible to optimize an intersection such that level of service will improve to LOS D or better, the impact on traffic operations remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact TR-10:** Implementation of the following TPS Toolkit categories: Transit Stop Changes, Lane Modifications, Parking and Turn Restrictions, and Pedestrian Improvements, may result in significant loading impacts.
  - *Mitigation Measure M-TR-10: Provision of Replacement Commercial Loading Spaces*

While this measure could reduce significant loading impacts, in some locations on-street parking may not be available to convert to commercial loading spaces on the same block and side of the street or within 250 feet on an adjacent side street, the feasibility of providing replacement commercial loading spaces pursuant to Mitigation Measure M-TR-10 cannot be assured. Therefore, the impact of loss of on-street commercial loading spaces remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact TR-14:** Implementation of TPS Toolkit elements within the following categories: Lane Modifications and Pedestrian Improvements, along the program-level TTRP corridors may result in significant traffic impacts.
  - *Mitigation Measure M-TR-8: Optimization of Intersection Operations*

Because this measure may not be adequate to mitigate intersection traffic operations to less-than-significant levels, and because the feasibility of providing additional vehicle capacity is unknown and it is not always possible to optimize an intersection such that level of service will improve to LOS D or better, the impact on traffic operations remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact TR-16:** Implementation of the following TPS Toolkit categories: Transit Stop Changes, Lane Modifications, Parking and Turn Restrictions, and Pedestrian Improvements, along the program-level TTRP corridors may result in significant loading impacts.

  – *Mitigation Measure M-TR-10: Provision of Replacement Commercial Loading Spaces*

While this measure could reduce significant loading impacts, in some locations on-street parking may not be available to convert to commercial loading spaces on the same block and side of the street or within 250 feet on an adjacent side street, the feasibility of providing replacement commercial loading spaces pursuant to Mitigation Measure M-TR-10 cannot be assured. Therefore, the impact of loss of on-street commercial loading spaces remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact TR-24:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP.14 Expanded Alternative would result in a significant traffic impact at the intersection of Randall Street/San Jose Avenue that would operate at LOS E or LOS F conditions under Existing plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.14 Expanded Alternative conditions.

No feasible mitigation measures are available and the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact TR-26:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative would result in a significant traffic impact at the intersection of 16th/Bryant streets that would operate at LOS E or LOS F conditions under Existing plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative conditions.

  – *Mitigation Measure M-TR-26: Intersection Restriping at 16th/Bryant streets.*

Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-26 would reconfigure the intersection of 16th and Bryant Streets such that the westbound approach would be a through lane and dedicated right turn-pocket and the eastbound approach would be to a shared through/right lane. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-26 would not improve intersection operations to LOS D or better during the p.m. peak hour; therefore, traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th and Bryant streets remain significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact TR-27:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative would result in a significant traffic impact at the intersection of 16th Street/Potrero Avenue that would operate at LOS E or LOS F conditions under Existing plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative conditions.

No feasible mitigation measures are available and the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact TR-28:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative would result in a significant traffic impact at the intersection of 16th/Seventh streets that would operate at LOS E or LOS F conditions under Existing plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative conditions.

No feasible mitigation measures are available and the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact TR-30:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1 would result in a significant traffic impact at the intersection of 16th/Bryant streets that would operate at LOS E or LOS F conditions under Existing plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1 conditions.

  - *Mitigation Measure M-TR-26: Intersection Restriping at 16th/Bryant streets*

Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-26 would not improve intersection operations to LOS D or better during the p.m. peak hour; therefore, traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th and Bryant streets remain significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact TR-31:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1 would result in a significant traffic impact at the intersection of 16th Street/Potrero Avenue that would operate at LOS E or LOS F conditions under Existing plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1 conditions.

No feasible mitigation measures are available and the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact TR-32:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1 would result in a significant traffic impact at the intersection of 16th/Seventh streets that would operate at LOS E or LOS F conditions under Existing plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative conditions.

No feasible mitigation measures are available and the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact TR-34:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 would result in a significant traffic impact at the intersection of 16th/Bryant streets that would operate at LOS E or LOS F conditions under Existing plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 conditions.

  - *Mitigation Measure M-TR-26: Intersection Restriping at 16th/Bryant streets*

Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-26 would not improve intersection operations to LOS D or better during the p.m. peak hour; therefore, traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th and Bryant streets would remain significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact TR-35:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 would result in a significant traffic impact at the intersection of 16th Street/Potrero Avenue that would operate at LOS E or LOS F conditions under Existing plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 conditions.

No feasible mitigation measures are available and the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact TR-36:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 would result in a significant traffic impact at the intersection of 16th/Seventh streets that would operate at LOS E or LOS F conditions under Existing plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 conditions.

No feasible mitigation measures are available and the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact TR-38:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative would result in a significant traffic impact at the intersection of Columbus Avenue/Green Street/Stockton Street that would operate at LOS E conditions under Existing plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative conditions.

No feasible mitigation measures are available and the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact TR-40:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1 would result in a significant traffic impact at the intersection of Columbus Avenue/Green Street/Stockton Street that would operate at LOS E conditions under Existing plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1 conditions.

No feasible mitigation measures are available and the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact TR-42:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 would result in a significant traffic impact at the intersection of Columbus Avenue/Green Street/Stockton Street that would operate at LOS E conditions under Existing plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 conditions.

No feasible mitigation measures are available and the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact TR-48:** Implementation of project-level TTRP.14 Moderate Alternative Variant 1 would result in a reduction in on-street commercial loading supply on Mission Street

such that the existing loading demand during the peak hour of loading activities could not be accommodated within on-street loading supply and may create a potentially hazardous condition or significant delay that may affect traffic, transit, bicycles, or pedestrians.

– *Mitigation Measure M-TR-48: Enforcement of Parking Violations*

With implementation of this Mitigation Measure, the impacts related to loss of commercial loading spaces on transit and traffic operations would be reduced. However, because the effectiveness of the use of camera video enforcement of parking regulations along new transit-only lanes is not known, the feasibility of this measure is uncertain and impacts on this corridor remain significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact TR-49:** Implementation of project-level TTRP.14 Moderate Alternative Variant 2 would result in a reduction in on-street commercial loading supply on Mission Street such that the existing loading demand during the peak hour of loading activities could not be accommodated within on-street loading supply and may create a potentially hazardous condition or significant delay that may affect traffic, transit, bicycles, or pedestrians.

  – *Mitigation Measure M-TR-48: Enforcement of Parking Violations*

Because the effectiveness of the use of camera video enforcement of parking regulations along new transit-only lanes is not known, the feasibility of this measure is uncertain and impacts on this corridor remain significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact TR-50:** Implementation of project-level TTRP.14 Expanded Alternative would result in a reduction in on-street commercial loading supply on Mission Street such that the existing loading demand during the peak hour of loading activities could not be accommodated within on-street loading supply and may create a potentially hazardous condition or significant delay that may affect traffic, transit, bicycles, or pedestrians.

  – *Mitigation Measure M-TR-48: Enforcement of Parking Violations*

Because the effectiveness of the use of camera video enforcement of parking regulations along new transit-only lanes is not known, the feasibility of this measure is uncertain and impacts on this corridor remain significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact TR-51:** Implementation of project-level TTRP.30_1 Moderate Alternative would result in a reduction in on-street commercial loading supply on Stockton Street such that the existing loading demand during the peak hour of loading activities could not be accommodated within on-street loading supply and may create a potentially hazardous condition or significant delay that may affect traffic, transit, bicycles, or pedestrians.

  – *Mitigation Measure M-TR-48: Enforcement of Parking Violations*

Because the effectiveness of the use of camera video enforcement of parking regulations along new transit-only lanes is not known, the feasibility of this measure is uncertain and impacts on this corridor remain significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact TR-52:** Implementation of project-level TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative would result in a reduction in on-street commercial loading supply on Stockton Street such that the existing loading demand during the peak hour of loading activities could not be accommodated within on-street loading supply and may create a potentially hazardous condition or significant delay that may affect traffic, transit, bicycles, or pedestrians.
  - *Mitigation Measure M-TR-48: Enforcement of Parking Violations*

Because the effectiveness of the use of camera video enforcement of parking regulations along new transit-only lanes is not known, the feasibility of this measure is uncertain and impacts on this corridor remain significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact TR-53:** Implementation of project-level TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1 would result in a reduction in on-street commercial loading supply on Stockton Street such that the existing loading demand during the peak hour of loading activities could not be accommodated within on-street loading supply and may create a potentially hazardous condition or significant delay that may affect traffic, transit, bicycles, or pedestrians.
  - *Mitigation Measure M-TR-48: Enforcement of Parking Violations*

Because the effectiveness of the use of camera video enforcement of parking regulations along new transit-only lanes is not known, the feasibility of this measure is uncertain and impacts on this corridor remain significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact TR-54:** Implementation of project-level TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 would result in a reduction in on-street commercial loading supply on Stockton Street such that the existing loading demand during the peak hour of loading activities could not be accommodated within on-street loading supply and may create a potentially hazardous condition or significant delay that may affect traffic, transit, bicycles, or pedestrians.
  - *Mitigation Measure M-TR-48: Enforcement of Parking Violations*

Because the effectiveness of the use of camera video enforcement of parking regulations along new transit-only lanes is not known, the feasibility of this measure is uncertain and impacts on this corridor remain significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-1:** The Service Policy Framework and Service Improvements or Service Variants, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact on

transit, resulting in an exceedance of Muni's capacity utilization standard on the Mission corridor within the Southeast screenline of the Downtown screenlines under 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements only conditions.

– *Mitigation Measure M-C-TR-1: SFMTA Monitoring of Muni Service*

Implementation of this Mitigation Measure would reduce the cumulative impact on the affected corridor to a less-than-significant level. However, because the SFMTA cannot commit to future funding appropriations nor be certain of its ability to provide additional service citywide to maintain the capacity utilization standard, among other service goals, the feasibility of this mitigation measure is uncertain, and the cumulative impact on transit remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-2:** The Service Policy Framework, TPS Toolkit elements as applied in the program-level TTRP corridors, and the Service Improvements with the TTRP Moderate Alternative, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would contribute considerably to significant cumulative impacts on transit, resulting in exceedances of Muni's capacity utilization standard on the Fulton/Hayes corridor within the Northwest screenline and on the Mission corridor within the Southeast screenline of the Downtown screenlines under 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP Moderate Alternative conditions.

  – *Mitigation Measure M-C-TR-1: SFMTA Monitoring of Muni Service*

Implementation of this Mitigation Measure would reduce the cumulative impact on the affected corridor to a less-than-significant level. However, because the SFMTA cannot commit to future funding appropriations nor be certain of its ability to provide additional service citywide to maintain the capacity utilization standard, among other service goals, the feasibility of this mitigation measure is uncertain, and the cumulative impact on transit remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-3:** The Service Policy Framework, the TPS Toolkit elements as applied in the program-level TTRP corridors, and the Service Improvements with the TTRP Expanded Alternative, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would contribute considerably to significant cumulative impacts on transit, resulting in exceedances of Muni's capacity utilization standard on the Fulton/Hayes corridor within the Northwest screenline and on the Mission corridor within the Southeast screenline of the Downtown screenlines under 2035 Cumulative conditions plus Service Improvements and the TTRP Expanded Alternative conditions.

  – *Mitigation Measure M-C-TR-1: SFMTA Monitoring of Muni Service*

Implementation of this Mitigation Measure would reduce the cumulative impact on the affected corridor to a less-than-significant level. However, because the SFMTA cannot commit to future funding appropriations nor be certain of its ability to provide additional service citywide to

maintain the capacity utilization standard, among other service goals, the feasibility of this mitigation measure is uncertain, and the cumulative impact on transit remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-7:** Implementation of the Service Policy Framework Objective A, Action A.3 and Objective C, Actions C.3 through C.5 and TPS Toolkit categories: Lane Modifications and Pedestrian Improvements as applied in program-level TTRP corridors, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would result in cumulative traffic impacts at intersections along the corridors under 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP Moderate Alternative conditions.

  – *Mitigation Measure M-TR-8: Optimization of Intersection Operations*

Because this measure may not be adequate to mitigate intersection traffic operations to less-than-significant levels, and because the feasibility of providing additional vehicle capacity is unknown and it is not always possible to optimize an intersection such that level of service will improve to LOS D or better, the feasibility of mitigation is not assured. Therefore, the cumulative impact on traffic operations remains significant and unavoidable

- **Impact C-TR-9:** Implementation of the Service Policy Framework Objective A, Action A.3 and Objective C, Actions C.3 through C.5 and TPS Toolkit categories: Lane Modifications and Pedestrian Improvements as applied in program-level TTRP corridors would result in cumulative traffic impacts at intersections along the corridors under 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP Expanded Alternative conditions.

  – *Mitigation Measure M-TR-8: Optimization of Intersection Operations*

Because this measure may not be adequate to mitigate intersection traffic operations to less-than-significant levels, and because the feasibility of providing additional vehicle capacity is unknown and it is not always possible to optimize an intersection such that level of service will improve to LOS D or better, the effectiveness of this mitigation measure is not assured, and mitigation is infeasible. Therefore, the cumulative impact on traffic operations remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-13:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.J Expanded Alternative would contribute considerably to cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of Market/Church/14th streets during the p.m. peak hour.

No feasible mitigation measures are available and the cumulative impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-14:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.5 Expanded Alternative would result in cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of Fulton Street/Masonic Avenue during the p.m. peak hour.

No feasible mitigation measures are available and the cumulative impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-15:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.8X Expanded Alternative would result in cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of Geneva Avenue/Carter Street during the p.m. peak hour.

No feasible mitigation measures are available and the cumulative impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-16:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.8X Expanded Alternative would result in cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of Geneva Avenue/Moscow Street during the p.m. peak hour.

No feasible mitigation measures are available and the cumulative impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-17:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.14 Expanded Alternative would result in project and cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of Randall Street/San Jose Avenue during the a.m. peak hour.

No feasible mitigation measures are available and the cumulative impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-18:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.14 Expanded Alternative would result in cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of Mission/Fifth streets during the a.m. peak hour.

No feasible mitigation measures are available and the cumulative impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-19:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.14 Expanded Alternative would result in cumulative impacts at the intersection of Mission/16th streets during the p.m. peak hour.

No feasible mitigation measures are available and the cumulative impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-20:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative would result in project and cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th/Bryant streets during the p.m. peak hour.

  – *Mitigation Measure M-TR-26: Intersection Restriping at 16th/Bryant streets*

Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-26 would not improve intersection operations to LOS D or better during the p.m. peak hour; therefore, cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th and Bryant streets remain significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-21:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1 would result in project and traffic cumulative impacts at the intersection of 16th/Bryant streets during the p.m. peak hour.
  - *Mitigation Measure M-TR-26: Intersection Restriping at 16th/Bryant streets*

Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-26 would not improve intersection operations to LOS D or better during the p.m. peak hour; therefore, cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th and Bryant streets remain significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-22:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 would result in project and cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th/Bryant streets during the p.m. peak hour.
  - *Mitigation Measure M-TR-26: Intersection Restriping at 16th/Bryant streets*

Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-26 would not improve intersection operations to LOS D or better during the p.m. peak hour; therefore, cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th and Bryant streets remain significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-23:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative would result in project and cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th/Potrero streets during the p.m. peak hour.

No feasible mitigation measures are available and the cumulative impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-24:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1 would result in project and cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th/Potrero streets during the p.m. peak hour.

No feasible mitigation measures are available and the cumulative impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-25:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 would result in project and cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th/Potrero streets during the p.m. peak hour.

No feasible mitigation measures are available and the cumulative impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-26:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative would result in cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th/Owens streets during the p.m. peak hour.

No feasible mitigation measures are available and the cumulative impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-27:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1 would result in cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th/Owens streets during the p.m. peak hour.

No feasible mitigation measures are available and the cumulative impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-28:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 would result in cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th/Owens streets during the p.m. peak hour.

No feasible mitigation measures are available and the cumulative impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-29:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements plus the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative would result in cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th/Fourth streets during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

No feasible mitigation measures are available and the cumulative impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-30:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1 would result in cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th/Fourth streets during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

No feasible mitigation measures are available and the cumulative impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-31:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 would result in cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th/Fourth streets during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

No feasible mitigation measures are available and the cumulative impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-32:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative would result in project and cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th/Seventh streets during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

No feasible mitigation measures are available and the cumulative impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-33:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1 would result in project and cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th/Seventh streets during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

No feasible mitigation measures are available and the cumulative impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-34:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.22_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 would result in project and cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of 16th/Seventh streets during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

No feasible mitigation measures are available and the cumulative impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-35:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative would result in project and cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of Columbus Avenue/Green Street/Stockton Street.

No feasible mitigation measures are available and the cumulative impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-36:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 1 would result in project and cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of Columbus Avenue/Green Street/Stockton Street.

No feasible mitigation measures are available and the cumulative impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-37:** Implementation of the 2035 Cumulative plus Service Improvements and the TTRP.30_1 Expanded Alternative Variant 2 would result in project and cumulative traffic impacts at the intersection of Columbus Avenue/Green Street/Stockton Street.

No feasible mitigation measures are available and the cumulative impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-43:** Implementation of the Policy Framework Objective A, Action A.3 and Objective C, Actions C.3 through C.5, and TPS Toolkit Categories: Transit Stop Changes, Lane Modifications, Parking and Turn Restrictions, and Pedestrian Improvements as applied to the program-level TTRP corridors in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would result in cumulative loading impacts.

  – *Mitigation Measure M-TR-10: Provision of Replacement Commercial Loading Spaces.*

While this measure could reduce significant loading impacts, in some locations on-street parking may not be available to convert to commercial loading spaces on the same block and side of the street or within 250 feet on an adjacent side street, the feasibility of providing replacement commercial loading spaces pursuant to Mitigation Measure M-TR-10 cannot be assured. Therefore, the cumulative impact of loss of on-street commercial loading spaces remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-44:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP Moderate Alternative including the TTRP.14 Variant 1, TTRP.14 Variant 2, and TTRP.30_1 in combination with past, present and other reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would result in cumulative loading impacts.

  – *Mitigation Measure M-TR-48: Enforcement of Parking Violations*

Because the effectiveness of the use of camera video enforcement of parking regulations along new transit-only lanes is not known, the feasibility of this mitigation measure is uncertain and cumulative impacts on this corridor remain significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-45:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP Expanded Alternative including the TTRP.14, TTRP.30_1, TTRP.30_1 Variant 1, and TTRP.30_1 Variant 2, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would result in project and cumulative loading impacts.

  – *Mitigation Measure M-TR-48: Enforcement of Parking Violations*

Because the effectiveness of the use of camera video enforcement of parking regulations along new transit-only lanes is not known, the feasibility of this mitigation measure is uncertain and cumulative impacts on these corridors remain significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-49:** Implementation of the Service Policy Framework Objective A, Action A.3 and Objective C, Actions C.3, C.4 and C.5, and the TPS Toolkit categories: Lane Modifications, Parking and Turn Restrictions, and Pedestrian Improvements as applied in program-level TTRP corridors, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, may result in significant cumulative parking impacts.

– *Mitigation Measure M-C-TR-49: Explore the Implementation of Parking Management Strategies.*

It is uncertain whether parking management strategies would mitigate this significant cumulative parking impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, feasibility of this mitigation measure cannot be assured, and the cumulative impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-52:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP Moderate Alternative for the TTRP.14 Variant 1 or the TTRP.14 Variant 2, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would result in significant cumulative parking impacts.

  – *Mitigation Measure M-C-TR-49: Explore the Implementation of Parking Management Strategies*

It is uncertain whether parking management strategies would mitigate this significant cumulative parking impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, feasibility of this mitigation measure cannot be assured, and the cumulative impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Impact C-TR-54:** Implementation of the project-level TTRP Expanded Alternative for the TTRP.22_1, TTRP.22_1 Variant 1, or TTRP.22_1 Variant 2, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would result in significant cumulative parking impacts.

  – *Mitigation Measure M-C-TR-49: Explore the Implementation of Parking Management Strategies*

It is uncertain whether parking management strategies would mitigate this significant cumulative parking impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, feasibility of this mitigation measure cannot be assured, and the cumulative impact remains significant and unavoidable.

V. EVALUATION OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

This Section describes the alternatives to the project analyzed in the FEIR 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 reasons for approving the TEP as proposed.

CEQA mandates that an EIR evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the project that 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 14126.6(a).) CEQA requires that every EIR also evaluate a "No Project" alternative. Alternatives provide the decisionmakers with a basis of comparison to the Project in terms of their significant impacts and their ability to meet project objectives. This comparative

analysis is used to consider reasonably, potentially feasible options for minimizing environmental consequences of the Proposed 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 VI below, which is incorporated herein by reference.

A. Reasons for Approving Proposed Project

As discussed above in Section I and in Chapter 2 of the FEIR, the TEP consists of a Service Policy Framework, Service Improvements, 12 Service-Related Capital Improvements, and Travel Time Reduction Proposals (TTRPs) (which apply various items from the Transit Preferential Streets "Toolkit") along 17 transit corridors. For the purposes of environmental review, the FEIR described and analyzed two possible TEP projects—referred to as the TTRP Moderate Alternative and the TTRP Expanded Alternative—at an equal level of detail and analysis. This was done because, although the "TEP" was examined in one environmental document in order to understand the full scope of its potential environmental impacts, the TEP is actually a collection of projects and proposals, which, while related, may be implemented at various times and, in many cases, independently of each other.

Thus, the FEIR defined and analyzed the proposed project as two alternatives in order to capture the reasonable range of TEP proposals the SFMTA may chose to implement over time and to evaluate the potential environmental impacts resulting from that range. Both alternatives would implement the Service Policy Framework, the Service Improvements, Service Variants, the Service-related Capital Improvements, and the TPS Toolkit as applied to the program-level TTRP corridors. The difference between the two alternative projects is that under the TTRP Moderate Alternative, these elements would be implemented in combination with a "moderate" number of TPS Toolkit elements along certain Rapid Network corridors and, under the TTRP Expanded Alternative, these elements would be implemented in combination with an "expanded" number of TPS Toolkit elements along the same Rapid Network corridors. The rationale behind this is that the TTRP Moderate Alternative would capture a project with fewer and less substantial physical environmental effects and the TTRP Expanded Alternative would capture a project with more substantial physical environmental effects.

It is not known at this time when or if the full scope of all the TTRP proposals included in the TEP will be implemented. Implementation of various TTRP proposals will depend on community and stakeholder input, as well as a myriad of policy and budgetary considerations. It is likely that, over time, the SFMTA will implement at a project-level a collection of TTRP proposals that fall somewhere in between the TTRP Moderate and Expanded Alternatives analyzed in the FEIR. However, at this time, it is not known whether a given project along a TTRP corridor will include components of the Moderate Alternative or the Expanded Alternative, or a mixture of the

two. Because of this, the SFMTA Board is not now rejecting either the TTRP Moderate Alternative or the TTRP Expanded Alternative. Rather, the SFMTA Board is taking action to approve both alternatives at a conceptual and programmatic level and to direct staff to continue to develop specific project proposals for each TTRP corridor. Once any such projects are proposed for approval, the SFMTA Board would adopt as necessary findings to reject alternatives to those proposed TTRP projects.

The SFMTA Board finds that the Project will provide the following benefits:

- Support and implement the City's Transit First Policy by providing clear direction for managing modal allocation of space on the transportation system for the City of San Francisco.
- Improve the cost-effectiveness and productivity of transit operations.
- Improve the customer experience on the transit system.
- Improve transit system reliability.
- Improve transit travel times.
- Improve safety for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit riders.
- Realign transit routes to eliminate underused routes and increase headways on heavily-used routes.
- Reduce crowding on heavily-used routes.
- Improve accessibility to the transit system.
- Attract more passengers to the transit system and increase the use of transit by existing riders.
- Reduce the use of automobiles on City streets.

B. Alternatives Rejected and Reasons for Rejection

The SFMTA Board of Directors rejects the No Project Alternative described and analyzed in the FEIR because the SFMTA Board finds that there is substantial evidence, including evidence of economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations described in this Section in addition to those described in Section VI below under CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), that make this alternative infeasible. In making these determinations, the SFMTA Board is aware that CEQA defines "feasibility" to mean "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors." The SFMTA Board is also aware that under CEQA case law the concept of "feasibility" encompasses (i) the question of whether a particular alternative promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project; and (ii) the question of whether an

alternative is "desirable" from a policy standpoint to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors.

Because both of the other alternatives analyzed in the FEIR—the TTRP Moderate Alternative and the TTRP Expanded Alternative—included implementation of the Service Policy Framework, the Service Improvements, Service Variants, the Service-related Capital Improvements, and the TPS Toolkit as applied to the program-level TTRP corridors, rejecting the No Project Alternative rejects every alternative that would fail to implement these TEP proposals as infeasible.

1. Alternative A: No Project

Under the No Project Alternative, the Service Policy Framework would not be adopted. The SFMTA would not implement the transit service changes included in the Service Improvements and Service Variants, and would not construct the Service-related Capital Improvements or the Travel Time Reduction Proposals. The SFMTA regularly monitors performance of the transit system and routinely makes adjustments to improve service when funding and resources are available. Therefore, under the No Project Alternative, some of the features of the TEP, such as elements in the TPS Toolkit, would be implemented; for example, transit bulbs and pedestrian bulbs would continue to be installed and accessible boarding platforms would continue to be added on a location-by-location basis when feasible. However, no scheduled program of improvements would be implemented without adoption of the TEP. With the No Project Alternative, the significant physical impacts related to traffic, loading, and cumulative parking conditions identified in the FEIR for the Project and set forth above would not occur, and the mitigation measures identified in the EIR and the Initial Study would not be necessary.

The No Project Alternative would not provide for an organized, comprehensive, coordinated program of transit system improvements. Transit system reliability and efficiency would not improve, and crowding on some routes would not be expected to change substantially from existing conditions. Under cumulative conditions with the No Project Alternative, the transit system would become more crowded as growth and development continue to occur in the City. Transit travel times would not improve on a coordinated basis. A mode shift from automobiles to transit use would not occur, resulting in additional automobile congestion. The No Project Alternative would not help the City support the Transit First Policy. Additionally, traffic congestion will continue to degrade the performance of the surface transit system leading to increasing operating costs born by the City of San Francisco tax payers. As costs continue to increase, and on time performance continues to degrade, resources that had originally been identified to provide additional service will be used to supplement existing operations. This spiral of increased operational subsidies with no increase in service may result in lower

ridership, which leads to decreasing revenue and a downward spiral in the sustainability of the transit system and mobility for residents and visitors to the City of San Francisco.

For these reasons, the SFMTA Board finds that, on balance, the Project is preferable to the No Project Alternative and the No Project Alternative is rejected as infeasible.

2. Alternatives Considered and Rejected in the EIR

Alternative locations for the TEP would not be feasible because the Project is a systemwide program to improve the existing transit infrastructure and service in San Francisco; therefore, alternative locations outside of San Francisco are rejected. Alternative locations for transit improvements on streets other than those proposed are rejected as infeasible because of the need to maintain connectivity and geographic coverage within the existing transit and overall transportation network.

The SFMTA considered several potential alternatives to aspects of the TEP's TTRP Moderate and Expanded Alternatives. These alternatives include the following:

- Transit-only streets along high transit ridership corridors.
- Transit-only lanes along the entirety of all existing four-lane (or more) transit corridors.
- Stop sign removal and replacement with traffic signals at all stop sign locations on transit corridors.
- Stop consolidation and optimization standards as recommended in best practices literature.
- Route terminal relocation and optimization for some routes with terminal locations at unproductive route segments or in low transit demand locations.
- Fleet mode change by route, such as servicing some routes that currently operate with existing trolley vehicles with the diesel fleet or vice versa.
- Additional extensions to existing routes.
- Modification of route tails (swapping one route segment with a different route segment to serve the same transit corridor).
- Route discontinuations and other route segment eliminations.
- Use of higher capacity vehicles on certain routes (note that the TEP includes service on some routes, such as the 5 Fulton, with higher capacity vehicles, but not on others).
- Streamlining all routes for improved directness by, for example, reducing the number of turns (streamlining is included in the TEP for some routes).
- Modifying frequency for all routes (frequency modifications, both increased and decreased frequency, is included in the TEP for some routes).
- Reducing the span of service for some routes.

- Farside boarding at all signalized intersections (farside boarding at signalized intersections is included in the TEP for many routes, but not all).

These alternatives were removed from consideration during development of the TEP for a variety of reasons as set forth in Section 6.5 of the FEIR. The SFMTA Board concurs with the findings in the EIR, and rejects these alternatives as infeasible for the reasons set forth therein.

VII. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Pursuant to CEQA § 21081 and CEQA Guidelines § 15093, the SFMTA Board of Directors hereby finds, after consideration of the FEIR and the evidence in the record, that each of the specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological and other benefits of the Project as set forth below independently and collectively outweighs the significant and unavoidable impacts and is an overriding consideration warranting approval of the Project. Any one of the reasons for approval cited below is sufficient to justify approval of the Project. Thus, even if a court were to conclude that not every reason is supported by substantial evidence, the SFMTA Board will stand by its determination that each individual reason is sufficient. The substantial evidence supporting the various benefits can be found in the preceding findings, which are incorporated by reference into this Section, and in the documents found in the Record of Proceedings, as defined in Section I.

On the basis of the above findings and the substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding, the SFMTA Board specially finds that there are significant benefits of the Project in spite of the unavoidable significant impacts, and therefore makes this Statement of Overriding Considerations. The SFMTA Board further finds that, as part of the process of obtaining Project approval, all significant effects on the environment from implementation of the Project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible. All mitigation measures identified in the EIR for the Project are adopted as part of this approval action. The SFMTA Board has determined that any remaining significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable are acceptable due to the following specific overriding economic, technical, legal, social and other considerations.

The Project will have the following benefits:

- The Service Policy Framework and the TEP will support and implement the City's Transit First Policy.
- Improved transit service with the TEP, including improved (reduced) transit travel times, increased efficiency and improved reliability, will make Muni a more attractive transportation mode, resulting in more use of transit and less automobile travel throughout the City.

- Implementing the TEP will improve safety for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit riders.
- Improved network efficiency and reduced system redundancy with implementation of the TEP will improve the cost-effectiveness of transit operations.
- Implementation of the TEP capital projects will support increased access for seniors and people with disabilities by expanding accessible rail stops and making platform upgrades.
- Enhanced transit service on the busiest lines will drastically improve the customer experience by reducing crowding.
- Service level expansion will improve system-wide neighborhood connectivity and access to regional transit by providing more frequent service between neighborhoods.
- Finite public resources will be redirected to better match travel demand and trip patterns based on existing community needs.

Having considered these benefits, the SFMTA Board of Directors finds that the benefits of the TEP outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, and that the adverse environmental effects are therefore acceptable.

EXHIBIT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE TRANSIT EFFECTIVENESS PROJECT

Adopted Mitigation Measures	MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM				
	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
MITIGATION MEASURES AGREED TO BY SFMTA					
Cultural and Paleontological Resources					
Mitigation Measure M-CP-2a: Accidental Discovery of Archeological Resources 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 CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a)(c). The project sponsor shall distribute the Planning Department archaeological and paleontological resource "ALERT" sheet to the project prime contractor; to any project subcontractor (including demolition, excavation, grading, foundation, pile driving, etc. firms); and to any utilities firm involved in soils disturbing activities within the project site. Prior to any soils disturbing activities being undertaken, each contractor is responsible for ensuring that the "ALERT" sheet is circulated to all field personnel, including machine operators, field crew, pile drivers, supervisory personnel, etc. The project sponsor shall provide the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) with a signed affidavit from the responsible parties (prime contractor, subcontractor(s), and utilities firm) to the ERO confirming that all field personnel have received copies of the Alert Sheet.	SFMTA and project contractors	Prior to soils disturbance activities	SFMTA to distribute Planning Department "ALERT" sheet and provide signed affidavit from project contractor, subcontractor(s) and utilities firm(s) stating that all field personnel have received copies of the "ALERT" sheet.	ERO to receive signed affidavit.	Prior to any soil disturbing activities. Following distribution of "ALERT" sheet but prior to any soils disturbing activities.

EXHIBIT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (continued)

	MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM				
Adopted Mitigation Measures	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Mitigation Schedule**	**Mitigation Action**	**Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility**	**Monitoring Schedule**
Should any indication of an archaeological 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.	SFMTA and project contractor's Head Foreman	During soils disturbance activities	SFMTA and project contractor's Head Foreman to inform ERO and suspend soils disturbing activities.	ERO to determine if additional measures are necessary	During soils disturbance activities
If the ERO determines that an archaeological resource may be present within the project site, the project sponsor shall retain the services of an archaeological consultant from the pool of qualified archaeological consultants maintained by the Planning Department archaeologist. The archaeological consultant shall advise the ERO as to whether the discovery is an archaeological resource, retains sufficient integrity, and is of potential scientific/historical/cultural significance. If an archaeological resource is present, the archaeological consultant shall identify and evaluate the archaeological resource. The archaeological 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 archaeological resource, an archaeological monitoring program, or an archaeological testing program. If an archaeological monitoring program or archaeological testing program is required, it shall be consistent with the Environmental Planning division guidelines for such programs. The ERO may also require that the project sponsor immediately implement a site security program if the archaeological resource is at risk from vandalism, looting, or other damaging actions.	SFMTA and project archaeological consultant	When determined necessary by the ERO	If required, SFMTA to retain an archaeological consultant from the pool of qualified archaeological consultants. Project archaeological consultant to advise ERO regarding the status of the archeological resource. ERO to determine whether the need for an archaeological monitoring program, an archaeological testing program, or site security program is needed.	ERO to determine if additional measures are necessary to implement	

EXHIBIT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (continued)

	MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM				
Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
The project archaeological consultant shall submit a Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archaeological resource and describing the archaeological and historical research methods employed in the archaeological monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archaeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the final report. 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 Environmental Planning division of the Planning Department shall receive one bound copy, one unbound copy, and one unlocked searchable Portable Document Format (PDF) copy on CD of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the NRHP/CRHR. 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.	SFMTA and project archaeological consultant	When determined necessary by the ERO	SFMTA and project archaeological consultant to prepare draft and final FARR	ERO to review and approve final FARR	

EXHIBIT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (continued)

	MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM				
Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
Mitigation Measure M-CP-2b: Archaeological Monitoring Based on the reasonable potential that archaeological resources may be present within the project site, the following measures shall be undertaken to avoid any potentially significant adverse effect from the proposed project on buried or submerged historical resources. Once engineering design details for the identified projects (OWE.1, OWE.1 Variant,SCI.2, TTRP.9 and TTRP.22_2) and other projects in archaeologically sensitive areas, as identified by the Environmental Review Officer, are known, the project sponsor shall consult with the Planning Department archeologist regarding the specific aspects of these proposals that would require monitoring. If required by the Planning Department archeologist, the project sponsor shall retain the services of an archaeological consultant from the pool of qualified archaeological consultants maintained by the Planning Department archaeologist. The archaeological consultant shall undertake an archaeological monitoring program. All plans and reports prepared by the consultant as specified herein shall be submitted first and directly to the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) for review and comment, and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Archaeological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction of the project for up to a maximum of four weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of *construction* can be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce to a less than significant level potential effects on a significant archaeological resource as defined in *CEQA Guidelines* Sect. 15064.5 (a)(c).	SFMTA and Planning Department	Prior to soils disturbance	SFMTA to consult with Planning Department archaeologist. If required, SFMTA to choose archaeological consultant from the pool of qualified archaeological consultants	Project archeological consultant, Planning Department	Consultation with Planning Department Archeologist to occur once engineering design details for the identified projects are known; timeline for subsequent actions determined following meeting.

EXHIBIT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (continued)

	MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM				
Adopted Mitigation Measures	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Mitigation Schedule**	**Mitigation Action**	**Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility**	**Monitoring Schedule**
Archaeological monitoring program (AMP). The archaeological monitoring program shall minimally include the following provisions: ▪ The archaeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the AMP reasonably prior to any project-related soils disturbing activities commencing. The ERO, in consultation with the project archaeologist, shall determine what project activities shall be archaeologically monitored. In most cases, any soils disturbing activities, such as demolition, foundation removal, excavation, grading, utilities installation, foundation work, driving of piles (foundation, shoring, etc.), site remediation, etc., shall require archaeological monitoring because of the potential risk these activities pose to archaeological resources and to their depositional context. ▪ The archaeological consultant shall advise all project contractors to be on the alert for evidence of the presence of the expected resource(s), of how to identify the evidence of the expected resource(s), and of the appropriate protocol in the event of apparent discovery of an archaeological resource. ▪ The archaeological monitor(s) shall be present on the project site according to a schedule agreed upon by the archaeological consultant and the ERO until the ERO has, in consultation with the archaeological consultant, determined that project construction activities could have no effects on significant archaeological deposits. ▪ The archaeological monitor shall record and be authorized to collect soil samples and artifactual/ecofactual material as warranted for analysis.	SFMTA and project archaeological consultant, in consultation with ERO Archaeological monitor and SFMTA and SFMTA's construction contractors	If archaeological monitoring is implemented, prior to any soils-disturbing activities, and during soils disturbing construction at any location. If monitoring is implemented, as construction contractors are retained, prior to any soils-disturbing activities If monitoring is implemented, schedules for monitoring to be established in the AMP, in consultation with ERO	Project archaeological consultant to prepare Archaeological Monitoring Program (AMP) in consultation with the ERO Archaeological consultant to advise all construction contractors Archaeological monitor shall temporarily redirect construction activities as necessary and consult with ERO	SFMTA and project archaeological consultant, in consultation with ERO Archaeological monitor to observe construction according to the schedules established in the AMP for each site.	Considered complete on finding by ERO that AMP is implemented.

EXHIBIT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (continued)

Adopted Mitigation Measures	MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
▪ If an intact archaeological deposit is encountered, all soils disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit shall cease. The archaeological monitor shall be empowered to temporarily redirect demolition/excavation/ pile driving/construction crews and heavy equipment until the deposit is evaluated. If in the case of pile driving activity (foundation, shoring, etc.), the archaeological monitor has cause to believe that the pile driving activity may affect an archaeological resource, the pile driving activity shall be terminated until an appropriate evaluation of the resource has been made in consultation with the ERO. The archaeological consultant shall immediately notify the ERO of the encountered archaeological deposit. The archaeological consultant shall, after making a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archaeological deposit, present the findings of this assessment to the ERO.					

EXHIBIT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (continued)

	MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM				
Adopted Mitigation Measures	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Mitigation Schedule**	**Mitigation Action**	**Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility**	**Monitoring Schedule**
Consultation with Descendant Communities: On discovery of an archaeological site[1] associated with descendant Native Americans or the Overseas Chinese, an appropriate representative[2] of the descendant group and the ERO shall be contacted. The representative of the descendant group shall be given the opportunity to monitor archaeological field investigations of the site and to consult with ERO regarding appropriate archaeological treatment of the site, of recovered data from the site, and, if applicable, any interpretative treatment of the associated archaeological site. A copy of the Final Archaeological Resources Report shall be provided to the representative of the descendant group. If the ERO, in consultation with the archaeological consultant, determines that a significant archaeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the proposed project, at the discretion of the project sponsor, either: A) The proposed project shall be re-designed so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archaeological resource; or B) An archaeological data recovery program shall be implemented, unless the ERO determines that the archaeological resource is of greater interpretive than research significance and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible.	Archaeological monitor and SFMTA and SFMTA's construction contractors	For the duration of soil-disturbing activities, the representative of the descendant group shall be given the opportunity to monitor archaeological field investigations on the site and consult with the ERO regarding appropriate archaeological treatment of the site, of recovered data from the site, and, if applicable, any interpretative treatment of the associated archaeological site.	SFMTA shall contact ERO and descendant group representative upon discovery of an archaeological site.	Project archaeological consultant shall prepare a FARR in consultation with the ERO. A copy of the FARR shall be provided to the representative of the descendant group	Considered complete on notification of the appropriate descendant group, provision of an opportunity to monitor construction site work, and completion and approval of the FARR by ERO, if necessary.

[1] The term "archaeological site" is intended here to minimally include any archaeological deposit, feature, burial, or evidence of burial.

[2] An "appropriate representative" of the descendant group is here defined to mean, in the case of Native Americans, any individual listed in the current Native American Contact List for the City and County of San Francisco maintained by the California Native American Heritage Commission, and in the case of the Overseas Chinese, the Chinese Historical Society of America.

EXHIBIT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (continued)

	MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM				
Adopted Mitigation Measures	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Mitigation Schedule**	**Mitigation Action**	**Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility**	**Monitoring Schedule**
If an archaeological data recovery program is required by the ERO, the archaeological data recovery program shall be conducted in accord with an archaeological data recovery plan (ADRP). The project archaeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the ADRP. The archaeological consultant shall prepare a draft ADRP that shall be submitted to the ERO for review and approval. The ADRP shall identify how the proposed data recovery program will preserve the significant information the archaeological resource is expected to contain. That is, the ADRP will identify what scientific/historical research questions are applicable to the expected resource, what data classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions. Data recovery, in general, should be limited to the portions of the historical property that could be adversely affected by the proposed project. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be applied to portions of the archaeological resources if nondestructive methods are practical. The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements: ▪ *Field Methods and Procedures.* Descriptions of proposed field strategies, procedures, and operations. ▪ *Cataloguing and Laboratory Analysis.* Description of selected cataloguing system and artifact analysis procedures. ▪ *Discard and Deaccession Policy.* Description of and rationale for field and post-field discard and deaccession policies.	SFMTA and project archaeological consultant, in consultation with ERO	Considered complete once verification of curation occurs.	Consultant to prepare Archaeological Data Recovery Program in consultation with ERO.	Final ADRP to be submitted to ERO	Considered complete on finding by ERO that ADRP is implemented.

EXHIBIT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (continued)

Adopted Mitigation Measures	MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM				
	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
▪ *Interpretive Program.* Consideration of an on-site/off-site public interpretive program during the course of the archaeological data recovery program. ▪ *Security Measures.* Recommended security measures to protect the archaeological resource from vandalism, looting, and non-intentionally damaging activities. ▪ *Final Report.* Description of proposed report format and distribution of results. ▪ *Curation.* Description of the procedures and recommendations for the curation of any recovered data having potential research value, identification of appropriate curation facilities, and a summary of the accession policies of the curation facilities.					

EXHIBIT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (continued)

	MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM				
Adopted Mitigation Measures	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Mitigation Schedule**	**Mitigation Action**	**Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility**	**Monitoring Schedule**
Human Remains, Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects. The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and federal Laws, including immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and, in the event of the Coroner's determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (Pub. Res. Code Sec. 5097.98). The archaeological consultant, project sponsor, and MLD shall make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of, with appropriate dignity, human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects (*CEQA Guidelines* Sec. 15064.5(d)). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, curation, possession, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects.	SFMTA and project archaeological consultant, in consultation with ERO	Ongoing throughout soils-disturbing activities	If applicable, upon discovery of human remains and/or associated or unassociated funerary objects, the consultant shall notify the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco, and in the event of the Coroner's determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) who, along with the archaeological consultant and the SFMTA, shall make reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of human remains and/or associated or unassociated funerary objects	Project archaeological consultant and/or archaeological monitor	Considered complete on notification of the San Francisco County Coroner and NAHC, if necessary.

EXHIBIT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (continued)

Adopted Mitigation Measures	MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM				
	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
Final Archaeological Resources Report. The archaeological consultant shall submit a Draft Final Archaeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archaeological resource and describes the archaeological and historical research methods employed in the archaeological testing/monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archaeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the draft final report. 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 Environmental Planning division of the Planning Department shall receive one bound, one unbound, and one unlocked searchable PDF copy on CD of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the NRHP/CRHR. 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.	SFMTA and project archaeological consultant, in consultation with ERO	If applicable, upon completion of cataloguing and analysis of recovered data and findings If applicable, upon approval of Final Archaeological Resources Report by ERO	If applicable, consultant to prepare draft and final Archeological Resources Report reports.	If applicable, the ERO to review and approve the Final Archeological Resources Report If applicable, consultant to transmit final, approved documentation to NWIC and San Francisco Planning Department If applicable, consultant shall prepare all plans and recommendations for interpretation by the consultant shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment, and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO.	Considered complete on approval of final FARR.

EXHIBIT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (continued)

	MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM				
Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
Mitigation Measure M-CP-3: Paleontological Resources Accidental Discovery In order to avoid any potential adverse effect in the event of accidental discovery of a paleontological resource during construction of the project, the project sponsor shall be responsible for ensuring that all project contractors and subcontractors involved in soil-disturbing activities associated with the project comply with the following procedures in the event of discovery of a paleontological resource. Paleontological remains, or resource, can take the form of whole or portions of marine shell, bones, tusk, horn and teeth from fish, reptiles, mammals, and lower order animals. In the case of Megafauna, the remains, although partial, may be large in scale. Also paleontological resources include petrified wood and rock impressions of plant or animal parts. Should any indication of a paleontological resource be encountered during any soil- disturbing activity of the project, the project foreman and/or project sponsor shall immediately notify the City Planning Department's Environmental Review Officer (ERO) and one of its designated paleontologists (currently, Dr. Jean De Mouthe/Dr. Peter Roopnarine in the Geology Department of the California Academy of Sciences) and immediately suspend any soil-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the discovery until the ERO has determined what additional measures are needed.	SFMTA and project contractor's Head Foreman	During construction	Project contractor/SFMTA to notify the ERO and one of its designated paleontologists and suspend soils-disturbing activities.	SFMTA and ERO	During construction, upon indication that a paleontological resource has been encountered

EXHIBIT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (continued)

	MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM				
Adopted Mitigation Measures	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Mitigation Schedule**	**Mitigation Action**	**Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility**	**Monitoring Schedule**
If the ERO determines that a potentially-significant paleontological resource may be present within the project site, the project sponsor shall retain the services of a qualified paleontological consultant with expertise in California paleontology to design and implement a Paleontological Resources Mitigation Plan (PRMMP). The PRMMP shall include a description of discovery procedures; sampling and data recovery procedures; procedures for the preparation, identification, analysis, and curation of fossil specimens and data recovered; and procedures for the preparation and distribution of a final paleontological discovery report (PDR) documenting the paleontological find. The PRMMP shall be consistent with the Society for Vertebrate Paleontology Standard Guidelines for the mitigation of construction-related adverse impacts to paleontological resources and the requirements of the designated repository for any fossils collected. In the event of a verified paleontological discovery, the remaining construction and soil-disturbing activities within those geological units specified as paleontologically sensitive in the PRMMP shall be monitored by the project paleontological consultant. The consultant's work shall be conducted in accordance with this mitigation measure and at the direction of the City's ERO. Plans and reports prepared by the consultant shall be submitted for review and approval by the ERO.	SFMTA and project paleontological consultant in consultation with the ERO.	The project paleontological consultant to consult with the ERO as indicated; completed when ERO accepts final report	SFMTA to retain appropriately qualified consultant to prepare PRMMP, carry out monitoring, and reporting	ERO to approve final PRMMP Project paleontological consultant shall provide brief monthly reports to ERO during monitoring or as identified in the PRMMP, and notify the ERO immediately if work should stop for data recovery during monitoring. The ERO to review and approve the final documentation as established in the PRMMP	Considered complete on approval of final PRMMP. Considered complete on approval of final documentation by ERO.

EXHIBIT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (continued)

Adopted Mitigation Measures	MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM				
	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
Hazards and Hazardous Materials					
Mitigation Measure M-HZ-1: Hazardous Materials Soil Testing In order to protect both construction workers and the public from exposure to hazardous materials in soils encountered during construction of the proposed project, the project sponsor agrees to adhere to the following requirements: 1) Any soil excavated and then, encapsulated under concrete and/or asphalt covering within the same area as its excavation shall not require testing for the presence of hazardous materials in levels exceeding those acceptable to government agencies unless the TEP project or construction manager determines any extenuating circumstances exist, such as odors, unusual color or presence of foreign material. The reuse, remediation, or disposal of any soil tested and found to contain hazardous materials under these circumstances shall be in compliance with the requirements of the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) and other agencies. The project sponsor shall be responsible for reporting the test results of any soil with hazardous material content to DPH within 21 days of the completion of testing, accompanied with a map showing the excavation location. 2) Any excavated soil not reused and encapsulated under concrete and/or asphalt covering within the same area as its excavation, shall be tested for the presence of hazardous materials in levels exceeding those acceptable to government agencies, before it is moved from the area of excavation. The transportation and disposal of the soil shall be in	SFMTA	Soil and groundwater test results containing any hazardous materials shall be submitted to the Department of Public Health (DPH) within 21 days of the completion of testing.	SFMTA project construction contractor shall be responsible for the implementation of Steps 1 – 3.	Department of Public Health	Considered complete on review and approval by DPH of the soil and groundwater testing results, along with maps showing the location of the excavated soil and/ or groundwater containing the hazardous materials.

EXHIBIT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (continued)

Adopted Mitigation Measures	MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
compliance with DPH, state, and federal requirements. The project sponsor shall be responsible for reporting the test results of any soil with hazardous material content to DPH within 21 days of the completion of testing, accompanied with a map showing the excavation location. 3) If the proposed excavation activities encounter groundwater, the groundwater shall be tested for hazardous materials. Copies of the test results shall be submitted to DPH within 21 days of the completion of testing. Any dewatering shall adhere to DPH, SFPUC, and state requirements. In the event that a subsequent ordinance or regulations are adopted by DPH governing the handling and testing of hazardous materials encountered during construction within the public right-of-way, DPH shall be given the option to require the project sponsor to adhere to the implementation of the new ordinance or regulations in lieu of the above requirements if they provide similar safety protection for both construction workers and the public.					

EXHIBIT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (continued)

Adopted Mitigation Measures	MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM				
	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
MITIGATION MEASURES IN DEIR					
Transportation and Circulation					
Mitigation Measure M-TR-8: Optimization of Intersection Operations The final design of program-level TTRPs that include TPS Toolkit elements from the Lane Modifications and Pedestrian Improvements categories shall integrate design elements from the following intersection geometries and traffic control measures to the greatest extent feasible without compromising the purpose of the project. Potential intersection geometry optimization measures include left or right turn pockets, turn prohibitions, restriping to add additional mixed-flow capacity, lane widening to provide for transit-only or mixed-flow lanes, and parking prohibitions. Potential traffic control measures include signalization, exclusive signal phases, and changes to the signal cycle. The final design shall ensure that transit, pedestrian, and bicycle travel are accommodated, is within the confines of feasible traffic engineering solutions, and does not conflict with overall City policies related to transportation.	SFMTA	During development of detailed designs for the program-level TTRP proposals.	Optimize intersection geometries and traffic control measures	SFMTA, Planning Department	Prior to completion of detailed designs for the program-level TTRP proposals.
Mitigation Measure M-TR-10: Provision of Replacement Commercial Loading Spaces Where feasible, the SFMTA shall install new commercial loading spaces of similar length on the same block and side of the street, or within 250 feet on adjacent side streets, of where commercial loading spaces would be permanently removed, in order to provide equally convenient loading space(s). These loading spaces shall only be replaced on streets with commercial uses.	SFMTA	During development of detailed designs for the program-level TTRP proposals.	Where feasible, install new commercial loading spaces.	SFMTA with review by Planning Department,	Prior to or concurrent with the removal of on-street commercial loading spaces.

EXHIBIT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (continued)

Adopted Mitigation Measures	MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM				
	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
Mitigation Measure M-TR-26: Intersection Restriping at 16th/Bryant streets The SFMTA shall reconfigure the proposed changes at the intersection of 16th/Bryant streets converting the westbound approach of 16th Street at Bryant Street from what is proposed to be a shared through-right turn lane to a through lane and a dedicated right-turn pocket adjacent to the through lane, and reconfigure the eastbound approach from what is proposed to be a separate through lane and a dedicated right-turn pocket adjacent to the through lane to a shared through/right lane	SFMTA	During project implementation	Reconfigure westbound and eastbound approaches of 16th Street at Bryant Street	Planning Department, SFMTA	Prior to completion of detailed design for project-level improvements at 16th/Bryant streets.
Mitigation Measure M-TR-48: Enforcement of Parking Violations On streets where implementation of project-level TTRPs would result in a net reduction of on-street commercial loading spaces, the SFMTA shall enforce parking regulations in transit-only lanes through the use of video cameras on transit vehicles and/ or other parking enforcement activities.	SFMTA	Ongoing after implementation of TTRP improvements.	Enforce parking regulations and/or install video cameras on transit vehicles.	SFMTA	Ongoing
Mitigation Measure M-C-TR-1: SFMTA Monitoring of Muni Service The SFMTA, shall, to the extent feasible and consistent with annual budget appropriations, continue to monitor Muni service citywide, reporting as required on service goals, including the capacity utilization standard, and where needed, and as approved by decision makers and under budgetary appropriations, strive to improve upon Muni operations, including peak hour transit capacity on screenlines and corridors.	SFMTA	Ongoing, after implementation of TEP improvements.	SFMTA to monitor transit service goals and proposed improvements to Muni operations.	SFMTA	Ongoing.

EXHIBIT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (continued)

	MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM				
Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
Mitigation Measure M-C-TR-49: Explore the Implementation of Parking Management Strategies. SFMTA shall explore whether implementation of parking management strategies would be appropriate and effective in this and other parts of the City to more efficiently manage the supply of on-street parking over time.	SFMTA	Ongoing during implementation of TEP.	Identify and explore new parking management strategies, particularly along the TTRP corridors	SFMTA report to SF Planning	Ongoing during project implementation.

EXHIBIT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (continued)

					MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE TRANSIT EFFECTIVENESS PROJECT					
Improvement Measure I-TR-1: Construction Measures During the construction of all TEP projects, the SFMTA shall require the following: 1) Construction contractors shall be prohibited from scheduling any truck trips, such as concrete mixers, heavy construction equipment and materials delivery, etc., to the construction sites during the a.m. (7 to 9 a.m.) and p.m. (4 to 6 p.m.) peak commute periods. 2) All construction activities shall adhere to the provisions in the City of San Francisco's Regulations for Working in San Francisco Streets (Blue Book), including those addressing sidewalk and lane closures. To minimize construction impacts on nearby businesses and residents, the SFMTA shall alert motorists, bicyclists, and nearby property owners of upcoming construction through its existing website and other available means, such as distribution of flyers, emails, and portable message or informational signs. Information provided shall include contact name(s) for the SFMTA project manager, public information officer, and/or the SFMTA General Enforcement Division contact number (311). 3) Construction contractors shall encourage construction workers to use carpooling and transit to the construction site in order to minimize parking demand.	SFMTA and project construction contractor(s)	Throughout the construction duration for any TEP component requiring construction.	SFMTA and project construction contractor(s) to coordinate construction related activities with DPW, the Fire Department, the Planning Department, and any other City agencies.	SFMTA	Considered complete after completion of construction activities.

Edwin M. Lee
Mayor

Mohammed Nuru
Director

San Francisco Public Works
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
Room 348
San Francisco, CA 94102
tel 415-554-6920

sfpublicworks.org
facebook.com/sfpublicworks
twitter.com/sfpublicworks
twitter.com/mrcleansf

DPW Order No: 184706

TRANSMITTING TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC WORKS TO ENTER INTO A COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT WITH THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (CALTRANS) FOR **DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE 19TH AVENUE COMBINED CITY PROJECT** AND APPROVING SAID AGREEMENT.

This Order contains a Cooperative Agreement for the City to design, construct, and finance the 19th Avenue Combined City project; and for Caltrans to provide Independent Quality Assurance for the work within the state highway system right-of-way, provide review and approval of project documents, and issue encroachment permits required for project completion.

The following is hereby transmitted to the Board of Supervisors for your approval:

1. Board Resolution on the Cooperative Agreement
2. Cooperative Agreement
3. MTA Board Resolution No. 15-107 approving the traffic and parking modifications included in the 19th Avenue Combined City Project
4. MTA Board Resolution No. 14-041 approving CEQA findings and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Transit Effectiveness Project Final Environmental Impact Report.
5. Planning Commission Motion No. 19105 that certified the TEP Final EIR

It is recommended that the Board of Supervisors adopt this legislation and authorize the Director of Public Works to sign the Agreement on behalf of the City.

3/21/2016

X

Sweiss, Fuad
Approver 2
Signed by: Sweiss, Fuad

3/21/2016

X Mohammed Nuru

Nuru, Mohammed
Approver 3
Signed by: Nuru, Mohammed

SAN FRANCISCO
MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

RESOLUTION No. 15-107

WHEREAS, The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency has proposed the installation of traffic and parking modifications along the 28 19th Avenue rapid Muni transit corridor included in the Muni Forward Service-Related Capital Improvements and Travel Time Reduction Proposals as follows:

A. RESCIND – BUS ZONE - 19th Avenue, west side, from Lincoln Way to 105 feet southerly (bus stop to remain with bus bulb); 19th Avenue, west side, from Irving Street to 75 feet northerly; 19th Avenue, east side, from Irving Street to 75 feet southerly; 19th Avenue, west side, from Judah Street to 70 feet southerly (bus stop to remain with bus bulb); 19th Avenue, east side, from Judah Street to 60 feet southerly (bus stop relocate to farside); 19th Avenue, west side, from Kirkham Street to 85 feet northerly; 19th Avenue, east side, from Kirkham Street to 75 feet northerly; 19th Avenue, west side, from Lawton Street to 75 feet southerly (bus stop to remain with bus bulb); 19th Avenue, east side, from Lawton Street to 70 feet southerly (bus stop relocate to farside); 19th Avenue, west side, from Moraga Street to 70 feet northerly; 19th Avenue, east side, from Moraga Street to 75 feet southerly; 19th Avenue, west side, from Noriega Street to 75 feet southerly (bus stop to remain with bus bulb); 19th Avenue, east side, from Noriega Street to 70 feet southerly (bus stop relocate to farside); 19th Avenue, west side, from Ortega Street to 75 feet southerly (bus stop to remain with bus bulb); 19th Avenue, east side, from Ortega Street to 90 feet northerly (bus stop to remain with bus bulb); 19th Avenue, west side, from Pacheco Street to 75 feet southerly; 19th Avenue, east side, from Pacheco Street to 75 feet southerly; 19th Avenue, west side, from Quintara Street to 90 feet southerly (bus stop to remain with bus bulb); 19th Avenue, west side, from Rivera Street to 75 feet southerly (bus stop to remain with bus bulb); 19th Avenue, east side, from Rivera Street to 80 feet southerly (bus stop relocate to farside); 19th Avenue, west side, from Santiago Street to 75 feet northerly; 19th Avenue, east side, from Santiago Street to 80 feet northerly; 19th Avenue, west side, from Taraval Street to 135 feet northerly (bus stop relocate to farside); 19th Avenue, east side, from Taraval Street to 125 feet northerly (bus stop to remain with bus bulb); 19th Avenue, west side, from Ulloa Street to 70 feet northerly; 19th Avenue, east side, from Ulloa Street to 75 feet northerly; 19th Avenue, west side, from Vicente Street to 75 feet southerly (bus stop to remain with bus bulb); 19th Avenue, west side, from Wawona Street to 67 feet northerly; 19th Avenue, east side, from Wawona Street to 75 feet southerly; 19th Avenue, west side, from Sloat Boulevard to 80 feet southerly (bus stop to remain with bus bulb); Sloat Boulevard, south side, from 19th Avenue to 100 feet westerly (bus stop to remain); 19th Avenue, east side, from Sloat Boulevard to 75 feet northerly (bus stop to remain with bus bulb); 19th Avenue, west side, from Eucalyptus Drive to 100 feet northerly (bus stop relocate to farside); 19th Avenue, east side, from Eucalyptus Drive to 100 feet southerly (bus stop relocate to farside); and 19th Avenue, east side, from Holloway Avenue to 95 feet northerly (bus stop to remain with bus bulb).

B. RESCIND – BUS FLAG STOP - 19th Avenue, east side, south of Vicente Street (bus stop relocated to farside); 19th Avenue, west side, north of Ocean Avenue; and 19th Avenue, east side, south of Ocean Avenue.

C. ESTABLISH – BUS ZONE - 19th Avenue, east side, from Quintara Street to 145 feet southerly (extends existing 75-foot bus zone by 70 feet).

D. ESTABLISH – SIDEWALK WIDENING AND TOW-AWAY NO STOPPING ANYTIME - 19th Avenue, west side, from Lincoln Way to 83 feet southerly (6-foot wide bus bulb replaces bus zone); 19th Avenue, west side, from Judah Street to 174 feet southerly (6-foot wide bus bulb replaces bus zone); 19th Avenue, east side, from Judah Street to 148 feet northerly (6-foot wide bus bulb – bus stop relocated to farside, shortens existing 54-foot part-time passenger loading zone by 17 feet); 19th Avenue, west side, from Lawton Street to 83 feet southerly (6-foot wide bus bulb replaces bus zone); 19th Avenue, east side, from Lawton Street to 99 feet northerly (6-foot wide bus bulb – bus stop relocated to farside); 19th Avenue, west side, from Noriega Street to 83 feet southerly (6-foot wide bus bulb replaces bus zone); 19th Avenue, east side, from Noriega Street to 83 feet northerly (6-foot wide bus bulb – bus stop relocated to farside); 19th Avenue, west side, from Ortega Street to 83 feet southerly (6-foot wide bus bulb replaces bus zone); 19th Avenue, east side, from Ortega Street to 83 feet northerly (6-foot wide bus bulb replaces bus zone); 19th Avenue, west side, from Quintara Street to 148 feet southerly (6-foot wide bus bulb replaces bus zone); 19th Avenue, west side, from Rivera Street to 83 feet southerly (6-foot wide bus bulb replaces bus zone); 19th Avenue, east side, from Rivera Street to 108 feet northerly (6-foot wide bus bulb – bus stop relocated to farside); 19th Avenue, west side, from Taraval Street to 169 feet southerly (6-foot wide bus bulb – bus stop relocated to farside); 19th Avenue, east side, from Taraval Street to 171 feet northerly (6-foot wide bus bulb replaces bus zone); 19th Avenue, west side, from Vicente Street to 83 feet southerly (6-foot wide bus bulb replaces bus zone); 19th Avenue, east side, from Vicente Street to 96 feet northerly (6-foot wide bus bulb – bus stop relocated to farside); 19th Avenue, west side, from Sloat Boulevard to 83 feet southerly (6-foot wide bus bulb replaces bus zone); 19th Avenue, east side, from Sloat Boulevard to 83 feet northerly (6-foot wide bus bulb replaces bus zone); 19th Avenue, west side, from Eucalyptus Drive to 83 feet southerly (6-foot wide bus bulb – bus stop relocated to farside); 19th Avenue, east side, from Eucalyptus Drive to 83 feet northerly (6-foot wide bus bulb – bus stop relocated to farside); 19th Avenue, east side, from Holloway Avenue to 148 feet northerly (8-foot wide bus bulb replaces bus zone); 19th Avenue, west side, from Irving Street to 23 feet southerly (6-foot wide corner bulb); Irving Street, south side, from 19th Avenue to 23 feet westerly (6-foot wide corner bulb, removes meter #1803); 19th Avenue, east side, from Irving Street to 57 feet northerly (6-foot wide corner bulb); Irving Street, north side, from 19th Avenue to 56 feet easterly (6-foot wide corner bulb, removes meter #1724); 19th Avenue, west side, from Kirkham Street to 23 feet southerly (6-foot wide corner bulb); Kirkham Street, south side, from 19th Avenue to 23 feet westerly (6-foot wide corner bulb); 19th Avenue, east side, from Kirkham Street to 23 feet northerly (6-foot wide corner bulb); Kirkham Street, north side, from 19th Avenue to 23 feet easterly (6-foot wide corner bulb); Lawton Street, south side, from 19th Avenue to 23 feet westerly (6-foot wide corner bulb); Lawton Street, north side, from 19th Avenue to 23 feet easterly (6-foot wide corner bulb); 19th Avenue, west side, from 18 feet south to 49 feet north of Moraga Street (6-foot sidewalk widening at southern crosswalk); 19th Avenue, east side, from Moraga Street to 23 feet northerly (6-foot wide corner bulb); Moraga Street, north side, from 19th Avenue to 23 feet easterly (6-foot wide corner bulb); 19th Avenue, west side, from Pacheco Street to 23 feet southerly (6-foot wide corner bulb); Pacheco Street, south side, from 19th Avenue to 31 feet westerly (6-foot wide corner bulb); 19th Avenue, east side, from Pacheco Street to 23 feet northerly (6-foot wide corner bulb); Pacheco Street, north side, from 19th Avenue to 23 feet easterly (6-foot wide corner bulb); Quintara Street, south side, from 19th Avenue to 28 feet westerly (6-foot wide corner bulb);

19th Avenue, east side, from Quintara Street to 23 feet northerly (6-foot wide corner bulb); Quintara Street, north side, from 19th Avenue to 28 feet easterly (6-foot wide corner bulb); Rivera Street, south side, from 19th Avenue to 23 feet westerly (6-foot wide corner bulb); Rivera Street, north side, from 19th Avenue to 23 feet easterly (6-foot wide corner bulb); 19th Avenue, west side, from Santiago Street to 56 feet southerly (6-foot wide corner bulb); Santiago Street, south side, from 19th Avenue to 49 feet westerly (6-foot wide corner bulb); 19th Avenue, east side, from Santiago Street to 23 feet northerly (6-foot wide corner bulb); Santiago Street, north side, from 19th Avenue to 42 feet easterly (6-foot wide corner bulb); 19th Avenue, west side, from Ulloa Street to 23 feet southerly (6-foot wide corner bulb); Ulloa Street, south side, from 19th Avenue to 23 feet westerly (6-foot wide corner bulb); 19th Avenue, east side, from Ulloa Street to 23 feet northerly (6-foot wide corner bulb); Ulloa Street, north side, from 19th Avenue to 23 feet easterly (6-foot wide corner bulb); Vicente Street, south side, from 19th Avenue to 23 feet westerly (6-foot wide corner bulb); Vicente Street, north side, from 19th Avenue to 23 feet easterly (6-foot wide corner bulb); 19th Avenue, east side, from 18 feet south to 141 feet north of Wawona Street (6-foot sidewalk widening opposite stem of T-intersection); Sloat Boulevard, south side, from 19th Avenue to 30 feet westerly (7-foot wide corner bulb); Sloat Boulevard, south side, from 19th Avenue to 25 feet easterly (7-foot wide corner bulb); Sloat Boulevard, north side, from 19th Avenue to 41 feet westerly (6-foot wide corner bulb); 19th Avenue, west side, from Ocean Avenue to 23 feet southerly (6-foot wide corner bulb); Ocean Avenue, south side, from 19th Avenue to 25 feet westerly (7-foot wide corner bulb); 19th Avenue, east side, from Ocean Avenue to 23 feet northerly (6-foot wide corner bulb); Ocean Avenue, north side, from 19th Avenue to 25 feet easterly (7-foot wide corner bulb, removes meters #2666 and #2668); Eucalyptus Drive, south side, from 19th Avenue to 23 feet westerly (6-foot wide corner bulb); Eucalyptus Drive, north side, from 19th Avenue to 28 feet easterly (6-foot wide corner bulb); 19th Avenue, east side, from Holloway Avenue to 30 feet southerly (7-foot wide corner bulb); and Holloway Avenue, south side, from 19th Avenue to 30 feet easterly (9-foot wide corner bulb).

E. ESTABLISH – TOW-AWAY NO STOPPING ANYTIME - 19th Avenue, west side, from Irving Street to 40 feet northerly; 19th Avenue, east side, from Irving Street to 40 feet southerly; 19th Avenue, west side, from Kirkham Street to 30 feet northerly; 19th Avenue, west side, from Lawton Street to 25 feet northerly; 19th Avenue, east side, from Lawton Street to 40 feet southerly; 19th Avenue, west side, from Moraga Street to 20 feet northerly; 19th Avenue, east side, from Noriega Street to 32 feet southerly; 19th Avenue, west side, from Pacheco Street to 40 feet northerly; 19th Avenue, east side, from Pacheco Street to 40 feet southerly; 19th Avenue, west side, from Quintara Street to 32 feet northerly; 19th Avenue, west side, from Rivera Street to 40 feet northerly; 19th Avenue, east side, from Rivera Street to 40 feet southerly; 19th Avenue, west side, from Santiago Street to 40 feet northerly; 19th Avenue, east side, from Santiago Street to 35 feet southerly; 19th Avenue, west side, from Ulloa Street to 30 feet northerly; 19th Avenue, east side, from Ulloa Street to 40 feet southerly; 19th Avenue, west side, from 20 feet to 40 feet north of Vicente Street; 19th Avenue, east side, from Vicente Street to 25 feet southerly; 19th Avenue, west side, from Wawona Street to 40 feet northerly; Wawona Street, south side, from 19th Avenue to 20 feet westerly; 19th Avenue, east side, from Sloat Boulevard to 40 feet southerly; 19th Avenue, west side, from Ocean Avenue to 40 feet northerly; 19th Avenue, east side, from Ocean Avenue to 40 feet southerly; 19th Avenue, west side, from Eucalyptus Drive to 40 feet northerly; and 19th Avenue, east side, from Eucalyptus Drive to 40 feet southerly.

F. ESTABLISH – TO-AWAY NO STOPPING, SUNSET TO SUNRISE, DAILY - 19th Avenue, west side, from Vicente Street to 20 feet northerly.

G. ESTABLISH – BLUE ZONE - 19th Avenue, west side, from 83 feet to 105 feet south of Eucalyptus Drive.

WHEREAS, This project was analyzed in the Transit Effectiveness Project Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) certified by the San Francisco Planning Commission in Motion No. 19105 on March 27, 2014; and,

WHEREAS, Approval for traffic and parking modifications to implement various projects along the 28 19th Avenue Muni transit corridor included in the Service-Related Capital Improvements of the Muni Forward program, which was previously referred to as the Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP), relies on said FEIR, and information pertaining to the FEIR is set forth in a SFMTA Resolution No 14-041, which is on file with the Secretary to the SFMTA Board of Directors and are incorporated herein by reference; and,

WHEREAS, As part of the Resolution No. 14-041, the SFMTA Board of Directors adopted approval findings under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31 of the Administrative Code (CEQA Findings) and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), which Resolution, CEQA Findings, and MMRP are on file with the Secretary to the SFMTA Board of Directors and are incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth; and,

WHEREAS, SFMTA staff proposes to adopt the proposed project's Expanded Alternative, which includes all of the same parking and traffic improvements that are included in the Moderate Alternative, as well as the one proposal to shorten one of two northbound left turn lanes at 19th Avenue/Winston Drive, which is not included in the Moderate Alternative; and,

WHEREAS, The existing left-turn lane configuration in the northbound direction of 19th Avenue at the intersection of 19th Avenue with Winston Drive, where one of two left-turn lanes is used for both left-turning vehicles and through Muni light rail trains causes substantial delays for all inbound (north) M Ocean View trains, which currently must wait for the left turn queue to dissipate before proceeding through the intersection; and,

WHEREAS, Shortening a portion of the leftmost left-turn lane will reduce the stacking length available to non-transit vehicles to queue in front of a train, allowing both non-transit vehicles and trains to clear the intersection in one left-turn signal phase; and,

WHEREAS With more reliable light rail transit service on one of the busiest lines, SFMTA will have fewer needs for last-minute service adjustments, a more stable service environment for resource-need assessment, and will be able to more reliably and effectively allocate transit resources and deliver service overall; and,

WHEREAS, The SFMTA Board has reviewed the FEIR and hereby finds that since certification of the FEIR, no changes have occurred in the proposed project or in the circumstances under which the project would be implemented that would cause new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts identified and analyzed in the FEIR, and that no new

information has emerged that would materially change the analyses or conclusions set forth in the FEIR. The actions approved herein would no necessitate implementation or additional or considerably different mitigation measures that those identified in the FEIR; and,

WHEREAS, The public has been notified about the proposed modifications and has been given the opportunity to comment on those modifications through the public hearing process; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors approves these traffic and parking modifications set forth in items A through G above along the 28 19th Avenue Muni transit corridor included in the Muni Forward Service-Related Capital Improvements and Travel Time Reduction Proposals and support the SFMTA's Vision Zero program.

I certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors at its meeting of July 7, 2015.

R. Boomer

Secretary to the Board of Directors
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

Print Form

Introduction Form

By a Member of the Board of Supervisors or the Mayor

Time stamp
or meeting date

I hereby submit the following item for introduction (select only one):

☐ 1. For reference to Committee.
An ordinance, resolution, motion, or charter amendment.

☒ 2. Request for next printed agenda without reference to Committee.

☐ 3. Request for hearing on a subject matter at Committee.

☐ 4. Request for letter beginning "Supervisor [ ] inquires"

☐ 5. City Attorney request.

☐ 6. Call File No. [ ] from Committee.

☐ 7. Budget Analyst request (attach written motion).

☐ 8. Substitute Legislation File No. [ ]

☐ 9. Request for Closed Session (attach written motion).

☐ 10. Board to Sit as A Committee of the Whole.

☐ 11. Question(s) submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the BOS on [ ]

Please check the appropriate boxes. The proposed legislation should be forwarded to the following:

☐ Small Business Commission ☐ Youth Commission ☐ Ethics Commission

☐ Planning Commission ☐ Building Inspection Commission

Note: For the Imperative Agenda (a resolution not on the printed agenda), use a Imperative

Sponsor(s):

Supervisors Tang and Yee

Subject:

Resolution approving a Cooperative Agreement with Caltrans for Design and Construction along 19th Avenue between Junipero Serra Boulevard and Lincoln Way

The text is listed below or attached:

Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor: 

For Clerk's Use Only:

Bo 1, Land Use, B+F, Leg. Dep., Dep. City Atty, CoB, Mayor's Office

President, District 5
BOARD of SUPERVISORS

City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-7630
Fax No. 554-7634
TDD/TTY No. 544-5227

London Breed

PRESIDENTIAL ACTION

Date: May 18, 2016

To: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Madam Clerk,
Pursuant to Board Rules, I am hereby:

☐ Waiving 30-Day Rule (Board Rule No. 3.23)

File No. _____ _____ (Primary Sponsor)

Title. _____

☒ Transferring (Board Rule No. 3.3)

File No. 160559 Tang (Primary Sponsor)

Title. TANG- RESOLUTION - COOPERATIVE

From: Land Use & Transportation Committee

To: Budget & Finance Committee

☐ Assigning Temporary Committee Appointment (Board Rule No. 3.1)

Supervisor _____

Replacing Supervisor _____

For: _____ (Date) _____ (Committee) Meeting

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2016 MAY 18 PM 4:16
BY

London Breed

London Breed, President
Board of Supervisors