San Francisco Planning

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

PLANNING COMMISSION MOTION NO. 21483

HEARING DATE: JANUARY 11, 2024

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

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

PREAMBLE

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

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

a) Transit Facility Component. The Transit Facility Component will occupy the basement to fourth floor levels and include vehicular and bus circulation areas (ramps, drive aisles), mechanical rooms, bus storage locations, bus wash stations, administrative and office spaces, lockers and showers, community rooms, and outdoor open space. A limited portion of the joint development will be located within the Transit Facility Component specifically the ground floor and include residential lobbies along Hampshire and Bryant Streets and retail spaces at the corners of 17th and Hampshire Street, and 17th and Bryant Streets.

b) Housing Component. The Housing Component will include the construction of a total of 513 dwelling units (117 Studios, 184 one-bedroom, 144 two-bedroom, 68 three-bedroom) along Bryant and Hampshire Streets. Along Bryant Street, the proposed housing component will run from the ground floor to the top floor and provide dwelling units that are intended for families and will be offered at a below market rate. Along Hampshire Street, the proposed housing component with the exception of a lobby at the ground floor will commence at the podium level and provide dwelling units intended for workforce and will be offered at a below market rate.

c) Phasing. The Project is proposed to be constructed in three distinct phases, which may or may not overlap. The first phase will include the construction of the Transit Facility Component and is expected to last three years. According to the Project Sponsor team, construction is expected to begin in late 2024 and finish in late 2027. The second phase will include the construction of the Housing Component along Bryant St. up to the fourth level, podium level. Construction for the second phase is expected span two years and start one to two years after the start of construction on the first phase. Lastly, the third phase will construct the remaining Housing Component atop the podium level (both the remaining housing along Bryant St. and workforce housing along Hampshire St.) and is expected to span two years and start no sooner than two years after the start of the first phase. Phases 2 and 3 may also be constructed after the completion of SFMTA's facility.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Jonas P Ionin Digitally signed by Jonas P Ionin Date: 2024.01.17 15:05:49 -08'00'

Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

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

San Francisco Planning

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

ATTACHMENT A

Potrero Yard Modernization Project

2500 Mariposa Street

California Environmental Quality Act Findings: Findings of Fact, Evaluation of Mitigation Measures and Alternatives, and Statement of Overriding Considerations

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION

PREAMBLE

In determining to approve the Project, which refers to either the Refined Project or the Paratransit Variant described in Section I, below, the San Francisco Planning Commission (the "Commission") makes and adopts the following findings of fact and decisions regarding the Project description and objectives, significant impacts, significant and unavoidable impacts, mitigation measures, as well as improvement measures and Public Works Standard Construction Measures, and alternatives, and a statement of overriding considerations, based on substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding and pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, California Public Resources Code Section 21000 *et seq.* ("CEQA"), particularly Section 21081 and 21081.5, the Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, 14 California Code of Regulations Section 15000 *et seq.* ("CEQA Guidelines"), Section 15091 through 15093, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code ("Chapter 31"). The Commission adopts these findings in conjunction with the Approval Actions described in Section I(c), below, as required by CEQA, separate and apart from the Commission's certification of the Project's Final EIR, which the Commission certified prior to adopting these CEQA findings.

These findings are organized as follows:

Section I provides a description of the Project, the environmental review process for the Project, the City approval actions to be taken, and the location and custodian of the record.

Section II lists the Project's less-than-significant impacts or cumulative impacts that do not require mitigation.

Section III identifies potentially significant impacts or cumulative impacts that can be avoided or reduced to less-than-significant levels through mitigation and describes the disposition of the mitigation measures.

Section IV identifies significant Project-specific or cumulative impacts that would not be avoided or reduced to a less-than-significant level and describes any applicable mitigation measures as well as the disposition of

the mitigation measures. The Final EIR identified mitigation measures to address these impacts, but implementation of the mitigation measures will not reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Sections III and IV set forth findings as to the mitigation measures proposed in the Final EIR. The Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR") and the Responses to Comments document ("RTC") together comprise the "Final EIR," or "FEIR." Attachment B to the Planning Commission Motion contains the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program: Mitigation, Improvement and Public Works Standard Construction Measures ("MMRP"), which provides a table setting forth the full text of each mitigation measure listed in the Final Environmental Impact Report that is required to reduce a significant adverse impact.

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

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

The MMRP (Attachment B) is required by CEQA Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091. The MMRP also specifies the party responsible for implementation of each mitigation measure and establishes monitoring actions and a monitoring schedule. For this project, the MMRP includes separate tables for other project requirements and design elements such as Standard Construction Measures and Improvement Measures agreed to by the project sponsor team, which consists of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), San Francisco Public Works (public works) and the Potrero Neighborhood Collective (PNC), a private development consortium.
These findings are based upon substantial evidence in the entire record before the Commission. The references set forth in these findings to certain pages or sections of the Draft EIR or the RTC, which together comprise the Final EIR, are for ease of reference and are not intended to provide an exhaustive list of the evidence relied upon for these findings.

Section I. Procedural Background and Project Description

A. Procedural Background

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

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

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

B. Project Description

A. Refined Project

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

a) Transit Facility Component. The Transit Facility Component will occupy the basement to fourth floor levels and include vehicular and bus circulation areas (ramps, drive aisles), mechanical rooms, bus storage locations, bus wash stations, administrative and office spaces, lockers and showers, community rooms, and outdoor open space. A limited portion of the joint development will be located within the Transit Facility Component specifically the ground floor and include residential lobbies along Hampshire and Bryant Streets and retail spaces at the corners of 17th and Hampshire Street, and 17th and Bryant Streets.

b) Housing Component. The Housing Component will include the construction of a total of 513 dwelling units (117 Studios, 184 one-bedroom, 144 two-bedroom, 68 three-bedroom) along Bryant and Hampshire Streets. Along Bryant Street, the proposed housing component will run from the ground floor to the top floor and provide dwelling units that are intended for families and will be offered at a below market rate. Along Hampshire Street, the proposed housing component with the exception of a lobby at the ground floor will commence at the podium level and provide dwelling units intended for workforce and will be offered at a below market rate.

c) Phasing. The Project is proposed to be constructed in three distinct phases, which may or may not overlap. The first phase will include the construction of the Transit Facility Component and is expected to last three years. According to the Project Sponsor team, construction is expected to begin in late 2024 and finish in late 2027. The second phase will include the construction of the Housing Component along Bryant St. up to the fourth level, podium level. Construction for the second phase is expected span two years and start one to two years after the start of construction on the first phase. Lastly, the third phase will construct the remaining Housing Component atop the podium level (both the remaining housing along Bryant St. and

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

B. Paratransit Variant

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

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

C. Project Objectives

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

Basic Objectives

1. Rebuild, expand, and modernize the SFMTA's Potrero Bus Yard by 2027 to efficiently maintain and store a growing Muni bus fleet according to the SFMTA Fleet Plan and Facilities Framework schedule.

2. Construct the first SFMTA transit facility with infrastructure for battery electric buses to facilitate Muni's transition to an all-electric fleet, in accordance with San Francisco and California policy.

3. Construct a new public asset that is resilient to earthquakes and projected climate change effects, and provides a safe, secure environment for the SFMTA's employees and assets.

4. Improve working conditions for the SFMTA's workforce of transit operators, mechanics, and front-line administrative staff through a new facility at Potrero Yard.

5. Achieve systemwide master plan priorities by consolidating two currently scattered transit support functions at Potrero Yard: (a) improve and streamline transit operator hiring by consolidating SFMTA's operator training function in a new, state-of-the-art facility; and (b) support efficient Muni operations by consolidating the Street Operations division in a modern, convenient facility.

6. Implement inclusive and transparent stakeholder engagement in designing this project and completing the CEQA process.

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

Additional Objectives

8. Enhance safety and reduce conflicts between transit, commercial vehicles, bicyclists, drivers, and pedestrians in the project site vicinity.

9. Improve the architectural and urban design character of the project site by replacing the existing fences and blank walls with more active, transparent street walls, to the extent feasible.

10. Maximize the reuse of the 4.4-acre site in a central, mixed-use neighborhood by creating a mixed-use development and providing dense housing and striving to maximize the number of affordable units on the site.

11. Increase the City's supply of housing by contributing to the Mayor's Public Lands for Housing goals, the San Francisco General Plan Housing Element goals, and the Association of Bay Area Governments' Regional Housing Needs Allocation for the City by optimizing the number of dwelling units, including affordable housing, particularly near transit.

12. Support transit-oriented development and promote the use of public transportation through an innovative and comprehensive transportation demand management program.

13. Ensure that joint development is able to fund its own construction and ongoing management without reliance on City subsidy other than what is originally assumed as part of the project budget while ensuring that SFMTA's transportation funds are only allocated for the transit use.

14. Demonstrate the City's leadership in sustainable development by constructing an environmentally low-impact facility intended to increase the site's resource efficiency.

D. Project Approvals

The Project requires the following approvals:

Actions by the City Planning Commission

- Recommendation of approval of a General Plan Amendment which would amend the Urban Design Element by amending Urban Design Element Map 4 ("Urban Design Guidelines for the Height of Buildings") and Urban Design Element Map 5 ("Urban Design Guidelines for the Bulk of Buildings"). Urban Design Element Map 4 would be amended to state that Lot 001 in Assessor's Block 3971 has a height designation of 89-160 feet. Urban Design Element Map 5 would be amended to modify the bulk limits at the site to accommodate the Project's massing.

- Recommendation of approval of a proposed Planning Code Amendment which would add a new Special Use District—the Potrero Yard Special Use District—to the Planning Code permitting the Project's proposed uses at the site and imposing certain development standards upon the Project.

- Recommendation of approval of a proposed Zoning Map Amendment which would amend the City Zoning Map to reflect the new Potrero Yard Special Use District.

- Approval of Conditional Use Authorization for a Planned Unit Development for the Project's Residential Uses.

- Adoption of Findings of Fact, Evaluation of Mitigation Measures and Alternatives, and Statement of Overriding Considerations under CEQA.

- Adoption of Shadow Findings that net new shadow on Franklin Square Park by the Project would not be adverse to the use of Franklin Square Park.

Actions by the City and County Board of Supervisors

- Approval of a General Plan Amendment which would amend the Urban Design Element by amending Urban Design Element Map 4 ("Urban Design Guidelines for the Height of Buildings") and Urban Design Element Map 5 ("Urban Design Guidelines for the Bulk of Buildings"). Urban Design Element Map 4 would be amended to state that Lot 001 in Assessor's Block 3971 has a height designation of 89-160 feet. Urban Design Element Map 5 would be amended to modify the bulk limits at the site to accommodate the Project's massing.

- Approval of a proposed Planning Code Amendment which would add a new Special Use District—the Potrero Yard Special Use District—to the Planning Code permitting the Project's proposed uses at the site and imposing certain development standards upon the Project.

- Approval of a proposed Zoning Map Amendment which would amend the City Zoning Map to reflect the new Potrero Yard Special Use District.

Actions by City Public Works

- If sidewalks are used for construction staging and pedestrian walkways are constructed in the curb lanes, approval of a street space permit from the Bureau of Street Use and Mapping.

- Approval of an encroachment permit or a street improvement permit for signage and streetscape improvements.

- Approval of a new curb cut and removal of existing curb cuts.

Approvals by City Recreation and Parks Commission

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

Approvals by City Department of Building Inspection

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

E. Environmental Review

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.

(2) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.

(3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but the project's proponents decline to adopt it.

(4) The Draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

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

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

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

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

F. Content and Location of Record

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

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

- All information (including written evidence and testimony) presented to the Planning Commission, or incorporated into reports presented by the Planning Department, by the environmental consultant and subconsultants who prepared the Final EIR;
- All information (including written evidence and testimony) presented to the city from other public agencies relating to the Project or the final EIR;
- All applications, letters, testimony, and presentations provided to the city by the Department and its consultants in connection with the Project;
- All information (including written evidence and testimony) presented at any public hearing or workshop related to the Final EIR;
- The MMRP; and
- All other documents composing the record pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21167.6(e).

The public hearing transcripts and audio files, a copy of all letters regarding the Final EIR received during the public review period, the administrative record, and background documentation for the Final EIR are located at the San Francisco Planning Department, 49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco. The San Francisco Planning Commission Secretary is the custodian of these documents and materials.

G. Findings about Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

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

In making these findings, the Planning Commission has considered the opinions of the Department and other city staff members and experts, other agencies, and members of the public. The Planning Commission finds that (i) the determination of significance thresholds is a judgment decision within the discretion of the city; (ii) the significance thresholds used in the Final EIR are supported by substantial evidence in the record, including the expert opinion of the Final EIR preparers and city staff members; and (iii) the significance thresholds used in the Final EIR provide reasonable and appropriate means of assessing the significance of the adverse environmental effects of the Project. Thus, although, as a legal matter, the Planning Commission is not bound by the significance determinations in the Final EIR (see Public Resources Code section 21082.2, subdivision [e]), the Planning Commission finds them persuasive and hereby adopts them as its own.

These findings do not attempt to describe the full analysis of each environmental impact contained in the Final EIR. Instead, a full explanation of these environmental findings and conclusions can be found in the Final EIR, and these findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in the Final EIR supporting the determination regarding the Project's impacts and mitigation measures designed to address those impacts. In making these findings, the Planning Commission ratifies, adopts, and incorporates in these findings the determinations and conclusions of the Final EIR relating to environmental impacts and mitigation measures,

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

As set forth below, the Planning Commission adopts and incorporates the mitigation measures for the Project set forth in the Final EIR, which are set forth in the attached MMRP, to reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project. The Planning Commission intends to adopt the mitigation measures proposed in the Final EIR that are within its jurisdiction and urges other city agencies and departments that have jurisdiction over other mitigation measures proposed in the Final EIR, and set forth in the MMRP, to adopt those mitigation measures. Accordingly, in the event a mitigation measure recommended in the Final EIR has inadvertently been omitted in these findings or the MMRP, such mitigation measure is hereby adopted and incorporated in the findings below by reference. In addition, in the event the language describing a mitigation measure set forth in these findings or the MMRP fails to accurately reflect the mitigation measures in the Final EIR due to a clerical error, the language of the policies and implementation measures as set forth in the Final EIR shall control. The impact numbers and mitigation measure numbers used in these findings reflect the information contained in the Final EIR.

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

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

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

Cultural Resources

- CR-2: Construction of the Project would not materially alter, in an adverse manner, the physical characteristics of any off-site historical resource that justifies its inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources.

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

Transportation and Circulation

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

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

Noise and Vibration

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

Air Quality

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

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

Shadow

- SH-1: The Project would not create new shadow that substantially and adversely affects the use and enjoyment of publicly accessible open spaces.

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

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

CEQA requires agencies to adopt mitigation measures that would avoid or substantially lessen a project's identified significant impacts or potential significant impacts if such measures are feasible. The findings in this Section III concern mitigation measures set forth in the EIR to mitigate the potentially significant impacts of the Project. These mitigation measures are included in the MMRP, which is included as Attachment B to the Planning Commission motion adopting these findings.

The project sponsor team has agreed to implement the mitigation measures identified below to address the potential impacts identified in the EIR. As authorized by CEQA section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines sections 15091, 15092, and 15093, based on substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding, the Planning Commission finds that, unless otherwise stated, the Project will be required to incorporate mitigation measures identified in the EIR into the Project to mitigate or avoid significant or potentially significant environmental impacts. These mitigation measures will reduce or avoid the potentially significant impacts described in the EIR, and the Planning Commission finds that these mitigation measures are feasible to implement and are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the city to implement or enforce. In addition, the required mitigation measures are fully enforceable and will be included as conditions of approval for project approvals under the Project, as applicable, and also will be enforced through conditions of approval in building permits issued for the Project by the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection, as applicable. With the required mitigation measures, these Project impacts would be avoided or reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Noise and Vibration

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Air Quality

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

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

Wind

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

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

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

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

Tribal Cultural Resources

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

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

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

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

Geology and Soils

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

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

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

Based on substantial evidence in the whole record of these proceedings, the Planning Commission finds that there are significant Project-specific and cumulative impacts that would not be eliminated or reduced to an insignificant level by the mitigation measures listed in the MMRP. The Final EIR identifies significant impacts in two significant impact topic areas—Cultural Resources and Air Quality–that would remain significant and unavoidable, even with implementation of mitigation measures; those impacts topics and the mitigation measures that reduce the impacts, although not to a less-than-significant level, are listed below.

The Planning Commission further finds based on the analysis contained within the Final EIR, other considerations in the record, and the significance criteria identified in the Final EIR, that feasible mitigation measures are not available to reduce the significant Project impacts to less-than-significant levels, and thus those impacts remain significant and unavoidable. The Planning Commission also finds that, although measures were considered in the Final EIR that could reduce some significant impacts, certain measures, as described below, are infeasible for reasons set forth below; therefore, those impacts remain significant and unavoidable or potentially significant and unavoidable.

The following significant impacts on the environment, as reflected in the Final EIR, are unavoidable. But, as more fully explained in Section VII, below, under Public Resources Code section 21081(a)(3) and (b) and CEQA Guidelines sections 15091(a)(3), 15092(b)(2)(B), and 15093, the Planning Commission finds that these impacts are acceptable in light of the legal, environmental, economic, social, technological and other benefits of the Project. This finding is supported by substantial evidence in the record of this proceeding.

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

Cultural Resources

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

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

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

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

Air Quality

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

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

sensitive receptors.

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

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

SECTION V. Evaluation of Project Alternatives

This section describes the EIR alternatives and the reasons for rejecting the alternatives as infeasible. CEQA mandates that an EIR evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the Project or the project location that would feasibly attain most of the project's basic objectives, but that would avoid or substantially lessen any identified significant adverse environmental effects of the project. An EIR is not required to consider every conceivable alternative to a Project. Rather, it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision-making and public participation. CEQA requires that every EIR also evaluate a "no project" alternative. Alternatives provide a basis of comparison to the Project in terms of their significant impacts and their ability to meet project objectives. This comparative analysis is used to consider reasonable, potentially feasible options for minimizing environmental consequences of the Project.

A. Alternatives Analyzed in the Final EIR

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

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

B. Evaluation of Project Alternatives

CEQA provides that alternatives analyzed in an EIR may be rejected if "specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible ... the project alternatives identified in the EIR" (CEQA Guidelines section 15091[a][3]). The Planning Commission has reviewed each of the alternatives to the Project as described in the Final EIR that would reduce or avoid the impacts of the Project and finds that there is substantial evidence of specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations that make these alternatives infeasible, for the reasons set forth below.

In making these determinations, the Planning Commission is aware that CEQA defines "feasibility" to mean "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors." The Planning Commission is also aware that under CEQA case law, the concept of "feasibility" encompasses (i) the question of whether a particular alternative promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project, and (ii) the question of whether an alternative is "desirable" from a policy standpoint to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SECTION VI. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

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

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

discussed below. Any one of the reasons for approval cited below is sufficient to justify approval of the Project. Thus, even if a court were to conclude that not every reason is supported by substantial evidence, the Planning Commission will stand by its determination that each individual reason is sufficient. The substantial evidence supporting the various benefits can be found below, and in the record of proceedings.

On the basis of the above findings and the substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding, the Planning Commission specifically finds that there are significant benefits of the Project to support approval of the Project in spite of the unavoidable significant impacts, and therefore makes this statement of overriding considerations. The Planning Commission further finds that, as part of the process of obtaining Project approvals, significant effects on the environment from implementation of the Project have been eliminated or substantially lessened, where feasible. All mitigation measures and improvement measures identified in the Final EIR and MMRP are adopted as part of the Approval Actions described in Section I, above.

Furthermore, the Planning Commission has determined that any remaining significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable are acceptable due to the following specific overriding economic, technological, legal, social, and other considerations. The Project would meet all of the objectives, as described in the Draft EIR.

The Project would have the following benefits:

- The Project would advance SFMTA's Building Progress Program, which has a goal of repairing, renovating, and modernizing SFMTA's aging facilities and facilitating improvement of the overall transportation service delivery system in the City.

- The Project would replace an aging facility a new multilevel bus facility that will not only improve maintenance and storage capabilities, but also contribute to a greener, more sustainable, and reliable transportation system for the City.

- The Project would ensure resiliency to climate change and natural disasters and improve transit service by reducing vehicle breakdowns, increasing on-time performance, and reducing passenger overcrowding. Relatedly, the Project will provide a safer, more secure environment for SFMTA's employees and physical assets.

- The Project would directly address and support the City's housing goals—memorialized in its General Plan Housing Element and the Mayor's Public Lands for Housing Goals—by constructing a range of new housing units (up to 513)on the site.

- The Project would enhance safety and reduce conflicts between transit, commercial vehicles, bicyclists, drivers, and pedestrians in the project site vicinity.

- The Project would support transit-oriented development and promote the use of public transportation through an innovative and comprehensive transportation demand management program.

- The Project would demonstrate the City's leadership in sustainable development by constructing an environmentally low-impact facility intended to increase the site's resource efficiency.

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

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

Attachment B

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM: MITIGATION, IMPROVEMENT & PUBLIC WORKS STANDARD CONSTRUCTION MEASURES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Continues on next page)

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

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

Signatures:

I agree to implement the attached mitigation measure(s) and standard construction measures as described herein as conditions of project approval.

Private Project Co-Sponsor (Developer)

December 22, 2023
Date

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

(Continues on next page)

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Table 4: MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE POTRERO YARD MODERNIZATION PROJECT

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

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM[1]

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

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM[1]

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

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM[1]

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

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM[1]

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

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM[1]

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

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM[1]

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria
construction activities not resulting in a noise level greater than 90 dBA at noise-sensitive receptors and 10 dBA above the ambient noise level at noise-sensitive receptors. The project sponsor team shall ensure that requirements of the construction noise control plan are included in contract specifications. If nighttime construction is required, the plan shall include specific measures to reduce nighttime construction noise. The plan shall also include measures for notifying the public of construction activities, complaint procedures, and a plan for monitoring construction noise levels in the event complaints are received. The construction noise control plan shall include the following measures to the degree feasible, or other effective measures, to reduce construction noise levels: • Use construction equipment that is in good working order, and inspect mufflers for proper functionality; • Select "quiet" construction methods and equipment (e.g., improved mufflers, use of intake silencers, engine enclosures); • Use construction equipment with lower noise emission ratings whenever possible, particularly for air compressors; • Prohibit the idling of inactive construction equipment for more than five minutes; • Locate stationary noise sources (such as compressors) as far from nearby noise-sensitive receptors as possible (including future onsite noise-sensitive receptors at the Phase 2 Bryant Street Housing under the phased construction scenarios for the Refined Project), muffle such noise sources, and construct barriers around such sources and/or the construction site. • Avoid placing stationary noise-generating equipment (e.g., generators, compressors) within noise-sensitive buffer areas (as determined by the acoustical engineer) immediately adjacent to neighbors (including future onsite noise-				

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM[1]

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria
sensitive receptors at the Phase 2 Bryant Street Housing under the phased construction scenarios for the Refined Project). • Enclose or shield stationary noise sources from neighboring noise-sensitive properties (including the future onsite noise-sensitive receptors at the Phase 2 Bryant Street Housing under the phased construction scenarios for the Refined Project) with noise barriers to the extent feasible. To further reduce noise, locate stationary equipment in pit areas or excavated areas, if feasible; and • Install temporary barriers, barrier-backed sound curtains and/or acoustical panels around working powered impact equipment and, if necessary, around the perimeter of active construction areas or phases. When temporary barrier units are joined together, the mating surfaces shall be flush with each other. Gaps between barrier units, and between the bottom edge of the barrier panels and the ground, shall be closed with material that completely closes the gaps, and dense enough to attenuate noise. • Under the phased construction scenarios for the Refined Project, develop strategies to reduce exposure to construction noise in coordination with future onsite noise-sensitive receptors at the Phase 2 Bryant Street Housing. Some options to reduce noise include limiting noise to Phase 2 Bryant Street receptors by delaying or limiting occupancy in units closest to the construction zone or notifying receptors of loud construction periods. These options should be explored as part of the noise control plan prepared by a qualified noise consultant and the construction contractor. The construction noise control plan shall include the following measures for notifying the public of construction activities, complaint procedures, and monitoring construction noise levels:				

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM[1]

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria
• Designate an on-site construction noise manager for the project; • Notify neighboring noise-sensitive receptors within 300 feet of the project construction area at least 30 days in advance of high-intensity noise-generating activities (e.g., pier drilling, pile driving, and other activities that may generate noise levels greater than 90 dBA at noise-sensitive receptors) about the estimated duration of the activity (including future onsite noise-sensitive receptors at the Phase 2 Bryant Street Housing under the phased construction scenarios for the Refined Project); • Post a sign onsite describing noise complaint procedures and a complaint hotline number that shall always be answered during construction; • Implement a procedure for notifying the planning department of any noise complaints within one week of receiving a complaint; • Establish a list of measures for responding to and tracking complaints pertaining to construction noise. Such measures may include the evaluation and implementation of additional noise controls at sensitive receptors (residences, hospitals, convalescent homes, schools, churches, hotels and motels, and sensitive wildlife habitat); and • Conduct noise monitoring (measurements) at the beginning of major construction phases (e.g., demolition, grading, excavation) and during high-intensity construction activities to determine the effectiveness of noise attenuation measures and, if necessary, implement additional noise control measures. The construction noise control plan shall include the following additional measures in the event of pile-driving activities:				

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM[1]

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria
• When pile driving is to occur within 600 feet of a noise-sensitive receptor, implement "quiet" pile-driving technology (such as pre-drilling of piles, sonic pile drivers, auger cast-in-place, or drilled-displacement, or the use of more than one pile driver to shorten the total pile-driving duration [only if such measure is preferable to reduce impacts to sensitive receptors]) where feasible, in consideration of geotechnical and structural requirements and conditions; • Where the use of driven impact piles cannot be avoided, properly fit impact pile driving equipment with an intake and exhaust muffler and a sound-attenuating shroud, as specified by the manufacturer; and • Conduct noise monitoring (measurements) before, during, and after the pile-driving activity.				
Mitigation Measure M-NO-2: Vibration-Sensitive Equipment at 2601 Mariposa Street (KQED Building)				
Prior to construction, the SFMTA and private project co-sponsor and/or its contractors on SFMTA's behalf (referred to below as project sponsor team) shall designate and make available a community liaison to respond to vibration complaints from building occupants at the KQED building, located at 2601 Mariposa Street. Contact information for the community liaison shall be posted in a conspicuous location so that it is clearly visible to building occupants most likely to be disturbed. Through the community liaison, the project sponsor team shall provide notification to property owners and occupants of 2601 Mariposa Street at least 10 days prior to construction activities involving equipment that can generate vibration capable of interfering with vibration-sensitive equipment, informing them of the estimated start date and duration of vibration-generating construction activities. Equipment types capable of generating such vibration include an impact pile	Project Sponsor Team, and qualified consultant, at the direction of the ERO	Prior to the issuance building and construction permits	Project sponsor, project acoustical engineer and Planning Department	Considered complete after construction activities are completed and after buildings and/or structures are remediated to their pre-construction condition at the conclusion of vibration-generating activity on the site, should any damage occur

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM[1]

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria
driver, or similar equipment, operating within 250 feet of the building or a vibratory roller, or similar equipment, operating within 125 feet of the building. If feasible, the project sponsor team shall identify potential alternative equipment and techniques that could reduce construction vibration levels. Alternative equipment and techniques may include, but are not limited to: • pre-drilled piles, • caisson drilling, • oscillating or rotating pile installation, • jetting piles into place using a water injection at the tip of the pile could be substituted for driven piles, if feasible, based on soil conditions, • static rollers could be substituted for vibratory rollers in some cases. If concerns prior to construction or complaints during construction related to equipment interference are identified, the community liaison shall work with the project sponsor team and the affected building occupants to resolve the concerns such that the vibration control measures would meet a performance target of the 65 VdB vibration level threshold for vibration sensitive equipment, as set forth by Federal Transit Authority (FTA). To resolve concerns raised by building occupants, the community liaison shall convey the details of the complaint(s) to the project sponsor team, such as who shall implement specific measures to ensure that the project construction meets the performance target of 65 VdB vibration level for vibration sensitive equipment. These measures may include evaluation by a qualified noise and vibration consultant, scheduling certain construction activities outside the hours of operation or recording periods of specific vibration-sensitive equipment if feasible, and/or conducting ground-borne vibration monitoring to document that the project can meet the performance target of 65 VdB at specific distances and/or locations. Ground-borne				

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM[1]

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria
vibration monitoring, if appropriate to resolve concerns, shall be conducted by a qualified noise and vibration consultant.				
Mitigation Measure NO-3: Fixed Mechanical Equipment Noise Control for Building Operations				
The SFMTA and a private project co-sponsor and/or its contractors on SFMTA's behalf (referred to below as project sponsor team) shall prepare operational noise control documentation as detailed below. Prior to approval of a building permit, the project sponsor team shall submit documentation to the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) or the officer's designee, demonstrating with reasonable certainty that the building's fixed mechanical equipment (such as heating, ventilation and air conditioning [HVAC] equipment) meets the noise limits specified in sections 2909 (b) and 2909 (d) of the noise ordinance (i.e., an 8-dB increase above the ambient noise level at the property plane for commercial or mixed-use properties; and interior noise limits of 55 dBA and 45 dBA for daytime and nighttime hours inside any sleeping or living room in a nearby dwelling unit on a residential property assuming windows open, respectively). Acoustical treatments required to meet the noise ordinance may include, but are not limited to: • Enclosing noise-generating mechanical equipment; • Installing relatively quiet models of air handlers, exhaust fans, and other mechanical equipment; • Using mufflers or silencers on equipment exhaust fans; • Orienting or shielding equipment to protect noise-sensitive receptors (residences, hospitals, convalescent homes, schools, churches, hotels and motels, and sensitive wildlife habitat) to the greatest extent feasible; • Increasing the distance between noise-generating equipment and noise-sensitive receptors; and/or	Project Sponsor Team and qualified consultant, at the direction of the ERO	Prior to the issuance building permit	Environmental Review Officer (ERO) or designee	Considered complete after receipt and acceptance of the appropriate documentation to the ERO

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM[1]

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria
• Placing barriers around the equipment to facilitate the attenuation of noise. Compliance with this fixed-mechanical equipment noise control for building operations standard requirement does not obviate the need for the equipment to demonstrate compliance with the noise ordinance throughout the lifetime of the project.				
AIR QUALITY				
Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1: Off-Road Construction Equipment Emissions Minimization				
The SFMTA and private project co-sponsor and/or its contractors on SFMTA's behalf (referred to below as project sponsor team) shall comply with the following: A. Engine Requirements. 1. All off-road equipment greater than or equal to 25 horsepower shall have engines that meet U.S. EPA or California Air Resources Board Tier 4 Final off-road emission standards. 2. Where access to alternative sources of power is available, portable diesel engines shall be prohibited. If access to alternative sources of power is infeasible, portable diesel engines shall meet the requirements of Subsection (A)(1). 3. Diesel engines, whether for off-road or on-road equipment, shall not be left idling for more than two minutes, at any location, except as provided in exceptions to the applicable state regulations regarding idling for off-road and on-road equipment (e.g., traffic conditions, safe operating conditions). The project sponsor team shall post legible and visible signs in English, Spanish, and Chinese, in designated queuing	Project Sponsor Team, construction contractors	Prior to issuance of a construction permit; implementation ongoing during construction	Environmental Review Officer (ERO) or designee/ project sponsor	Considered complete upon Planning Department review and approval of Construction Emissions Minimization Plan, ongoing review and approval of biannual reports, and review and approval of final construction report

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM[1]

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

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM[1]

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

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM[1]

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria
Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3: Emergency Diesel Generator Health Risk Reduction Plan				
The SFMTA and private project co-sponsor and/or its contractors on SFMTA's behalf (referred to below as the project sponsor team) shall comply with the following: 1. Require all emergency diesel generators to meet Tier 4 Final emission standards and reduce annual testing limit to 20 hours per year for each generator; or 2. Require all emergency generators to be battery-powered; or 3. The project sponsor team shall retain a qualified air quality consultant to develop an Emergency Diesel Generator Health Risk Reduction Plan. The project sponsor team shall submit the plan to the San Francisco Planning Department Environmental Review Officer (ERO) for review and approval prior to issuance of a permit for emergency diesel generators from the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection or the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. The plan must include, for each emergency diesel generator, a description of the anticipated venting location, engine specifications, and annual maintenance testing procedures. The plan must demonstrate with substantial evidence that annual maintenance testing will not result in the project's overall construction and operational cancer risk exceeding 7 per one million persons exposed at nearby offsite sensitive receptors. Additionally, the operator of the facility at which the generators are located (including the private project co-sponsor as applicable) shall be required to maintain records of the testing schedule for each emergency diesel generator for the life of that generator and to	Project Sponsor Team and construction contractor	Prior to issuance of a permit for emergency diesel generator	Project Sponsor Team, facility maintenance contractor, and the Planning Department	Considered complete upon Planning Department review and approval of Emergency Diesel Generator Health Risk Reduction Plan

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM[1]

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria
provide this information for review to the planning department within three months of requesting such information.				
WIND				
Mitigation Measure M-WI-1(a): Design Measures to Reduce Project-Specific Wind Impacts				
The project sponsor team shall retain a qualified wind consultant to prepare, in consultation with the San Francisco Planning Department (planning department), a wind impact mitigation report that identifies design measures to reduce the project's wind impacts in the project scenario. Prior to certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report, the project sponsor team shall submit the wind impact mitigation report to the planning department for its final review and approval. The wind impact mitigation report shall incorporate updated information on the building design based on a list of potential wind reduction measures identified below, along with the estimated effectiveness of each measure to reduce the identified off-site wind hazards. • Porous façades on portions of the north, east and west sides for natural ventilation as part of the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning strategy for the new transit facility at the second and third levels • Recessed building corner up to 12 feet in height at the southwest corner of proposed building near Bryant/Mariposa intersection • Vertical elevated screens on portions of the second and third levels of the west façade (Bryant Street) • Vertical wind screens at grade level on the adjacent Bryant Street sidewalk near the Bryant/Mariposa intersection Such wind reduction design measures may include additional on-site landscaping, or equivalent wind-reducing features; and off-site wind reduction measures such as landscaping, streetscape	Project Sponsor Team/qualified consultant	Prior to completion of the environmental review	Project Sponsor Team, and the Planning Department	Completion of and acceptance of the wind impact mitigation report by the Planning Department

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM[1]

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

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM[1]

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

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM[1]

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

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM[1]

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria
identification procedures; 3) curation of paleontological resources of scientific importance into an appropriate repository; and 4) preparation of a Paleontological Resources Report (report or paleontology report) at the conclusion of ground disturbing activities. The report shall include dates of field work, results of monitoring, fossil identifications to the lowest possible taxonomic level, analysis of the fossil collection, a discussion of the scientific significance of the fossil collection, conclusions, locality forms, an itemized list of specimens, and a repository receipt from the curation facility. The project sponsor shall be responsible for the preparation and implementation of the mitigation program, in addition to any costs necessary to prepare and identify collected fossils, and for any curation fees charged by the paleontological repository. The paleontology report shall be submitted to the ERO for review within 30 business days from conclusion of ground disturbing activities, or as negotiated following consultation with the ERO.				
Mitigation Measure M-GE-6b: Preconstruction Paleontological Evaluation and Monitoring Plan during Construction				
The project sponsor shall engage a qualified paleontologist to develop a site-specific monitoring plan prior to commencing soil-disturbing activities at the project site. The Preconstruction Paleontological Monitoring Plan would determine project construction activities requiring paleontological monitoring based on those may affect sediments with moderate sensitivity for paleontological resources. Prior to issuance of any demolition permit, the project sponsor shall submit the Preconstruction Paleontological Monitoring Plan to the ERO for approval. At a minimum, the plan shall include: 1. Project Description 2. Regulatory Environment – outline applicable federal, state and local regulations	Project Sponsor Team, construction contractors, and qualified consultant, at the direction of the ERO	Prior to construction commencement	Project Sponsor Team and the Planning Department	Completion of and acceptance of the Preconstruction Paleontological Evaluation by the Planning Department

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM[1]

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

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM[1]

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

Continues on the next page.

Table 5: IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE POTRERO YARD MODERNIZATION PROJECT

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM[1]

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

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM[1]

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

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

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

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

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM[1]

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

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM[1]

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

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM[1]

Adopted Public Works Standard Construction Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring / Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Actions / Completion Criteria
Nighttime lighting will be directed away from residential areas and have shields to prevent light spillover effects. Upon project completion, project sites on City-owned lands will be returned to their general pre-project condition, including re-grading of the site and re-vegetation or re-paving of disturbed areas to the extent this is consistent with Public Works Bureau of Urban Forestry Policy and San Francisco Code. Project sites on non-City land will be restored to their general pre-project condition so that the owner may return them to their prior use, unless otherwise arranged with the property owner.				
Public Works Standard Construction Measure #9, Cultural Resources				
All projects that will alter a building or structure, produce vibrations, or include soil disturbance will be screened to assess whether cultural resources are or may be present and could be affected, as detailed below. Soil is defined as native earthen deposits or introduced earthen fill. Soil does not include materials that were previously introduced as part of roadway pavement section including asphalt concrete wearing roadway base and subbase. *Archeological Resources.* The EP Archeologist has determined that Standard Archeological Measure III (Testing/Data Recovery) shall be implemented by Public Works to protect and/or treat significant archeological resources identified as being present within the site and potentially affected by the project (see Attachment H: Public Works Archeological Measure III (Testing / Data Recovery)). 1. Public Works shall implement the EP Archeologist's recommendations prior to and/or during project construction consistent with Standard Archeological Measure III and shall consult with the EP Archeologist in	Project Sponsor Team, construction contractors	Prior to issuance of a construction permit	Project Sponsor Team, the EP Archeologist staff, Public Works and the ERO	Considered complete upon compliance with Standard Archeological Measure III (Testing/Data Recovery) requirements

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

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM[1]

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

[1] *Definitions of MMRP Column Headings:*
Adopted Mitigation, Improvement or Public Works Standard Construction Measures: Full text of the mitigation measures, improvement measures or Public Works Standard Construction Measures copied verbatim from the final CEQA document.
Implementation Responsibility: Entity who is responsible for implementing the mitigation measures, improvement measures or Public Works Standard Construction Measures. In most cases this is the project sponsor and/or project's sponsor's contractor/consultant and at times under the direction of the planning department.
Mitigation Schedule: Identifies milestones for when the actions in the mitigation measure, improvement measure or Public Works Standard Construction Measure need to be implemented.

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