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Ordinance amending the Planning Code and Zoning Map, by adding Section 249.71, to create the Yerba Buena Center Mixed-Use Special Use District (SUD) located at 706 Mission Street, Assessor’s Block No. 3706, Lot No. 093 and portions of Lot No. 277, to facilitate the development of the 706 Mission Street, The Mexican Museum and Residential Tower Project, by modifying specific Planning Code regulations related to permitted uses, the provision of a cultural/museum use within the SUD, floor area ratio limitations, dwelling unit exposure, height of rooftop equipment, bulk limitations, and curb cut locations; amending the Zoning Map to add the SUD and increase the height of property in the SUD from 400 feet to 480 feet; and making environmental findings and findings of consistency with the General Plan.

NOTE: Additions are single-underline italics Times New Roman; deletions are strike-through italics Times New Roman. Board amendment additions are double-underlined; Board amendment deletions are strikethrough normal.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. General Findings. The Board of Supervisors finds as follows:

(a) On October 24, 2012, 706 Mission Street Co. LLC (the “Applicant”) filed entitlement applications with the Planning Department for the development of a mixed-use development project (the “Project”) at the northwest corner of Third and Mission Streets, including an application for a Planning Code text amendment to create a new Yerba Buena Center Mixed-Use Special Use District.

(b) The Project is proposed to be developed on three parcels: (1) the entirety of Assessor’s Block 3706, Lot 093, which is currently owned by the Applicant and which is improved with an existing 10-story, 144-foot-tall building with a 10-foot-tall mechanical
penthouse (the “Aronson Building”); (2) a portion of Assessor’s Block 3706, Lot 277, which is
currently owned by the Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency of the City and
County of San Francisco (“Successor Agency”), and which was chosen by the former
Redevelopment Agency Commission and The Mexican Museum Board of Trustees as the
future permanent home of The Mexican Museum (the “Mexican Museum Parcel”); and (3) a
portion of Assessor’s Block 3706, Lot 277 and the entirety of Assessor’s Block 3706, Lot 275,
which is currently owned by the Successor Agency, and which is improved with the below-
grade, 442 parking space Jessie Square Garage (the “Garage Parcel”). The Aronson Building
is designated as a Category I Significant Building within the New Montgomery-Mission-
Second Street Conservation District.

(c) As part of the Project, and pursuant to transaction documents to be entered into
between the Successor Agency and the Applicant, the Successor Agency would convey the
Garage Parcel and the Mexican Museum Parcel to the Applicant. The Applicant would then
construct a new 44-story, 480-foot-tall tower (with a 30-foot-tall elevator/mechanical
penthouse), with two floors below grade. The new tower would be adjacent to and physically
connected to the existing Aronson Building, which would be rehabilitated in compliance with
the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. The new tower would contain up to 39 floors of
residential space. The Mexican Museum would occupy the ground through fourth floors of the
tower and the second and third floors and possibly some of the ground floor of the Aronson
Building. The overall project would contain up to 190 residential units, space for The Mexican
Museum, a ground-floor retail/restaurant use, and associated building services. The project
would also entail certain reconfigurations of the Jessie Square Garage.

(d) Pursuant to transaction documents to be entered into between the Successor
Agency and the Applicant, the Project would result in several public benefits, including the
rehabilitation of the Category I Aronson Building, the construction of a core-and-shell for future
occupancy by the Mexican Museum, a $5,000,000 operating endowment for the Mexican Museum, and the creation of affordable housing opportunities through the payment of an in-lieu fee equal to 20% of the residential units, pursuant to the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program in Planning Code Sections 415 through 415.9, as well as the payment of an additional affordable housing fee to the Successor Agency equal to 8% of the residential units.

(e) In order for the Project to proceed and be developed as contemplated by the Applicant, the Successor Agency, and The Mexican Museum, amendments to certain provisions of the Planning Code are required.

Section 2. Environmental, Planning Code, and General Plan Findings. The Board of Supervisors finds as follows:

(a) On March 21, 2013, the San Francisco Planning Commission certified that the Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR") for the 706 Mission Street – The Mexican Museum and Residential Tower Project ("Project") was in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act, (California Public Resources Code section 21000, et seq.) ("CEQA"), the CEQA Guidelines, and Administrative Code Chapter 31 in Planning Commission Motion No. 18829. On May 7, 2013, the Board of Supervisors rejected three separate appeals of the Commission's certification of the Final EIR and by Board Motion No. M13-062 affirmed the Planning Commission's certification of the Final EIR. The Final EIR and Planning Commission Motion No. 18829 are on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 130308 and are incorporated by reference.

(b) On May 15, 2013, the Historic Preservation Commission, by Motion No. 0197, approved a Major Permit to Alter for the Project.

(c) On May 23, 2013, the Planning Commission approved several actions associated with the Project, including a Determination of Compliance with Planning Code
Section 309 by Motion No. 18894, as well as a General Plan Referral by Motion No. 18878. At the same hearing, the Planning Commission and Recreation and Park Commission considered jointly and each approved actions to raise the shadow limit on Union Square, a property within the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department, and allocate shadow to the Project. Planning Commission Resolution No. 18876 and Motion No. 18877 and Recreation and Park Commission Resolution No. 1305-014 and Motion No. 1305-015 are on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 130570 and are incorporated by reference.

(d) At the hearing, both the Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission adopted CEQA Findings, including a Statement of Overriding Considerations and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) as required by CEQA, by Planning Commission Motion No. 18875 and Recreation and Park Commission Motion No. 1305-014, which are on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 130570 and are incorporated by reference.

(e) Since the Planning Commission approved the Project and made CEQA findings, the Board finds that there have been no substantial changes to the Project that would require major revisions to the Final EIR or result in new or substantially more severe significant environmental impacts that were not evaluated in the Final EIR; no substantial changes in circumstances have occurred that would require major revisions to the Final EIR or result in new or substantially more severe significant environmental impacts that were not evaluated in the Final EIR; no new information has become available that was not known and could not have been known at the time the Final EIR was certified as complete and that would result in new or substantially more severe significant environmental impacts not evaluated in the Final EIR; and no mitigation measures or alternatives previously found infeasible would be feasible or mitigation measures or alternatives considerably different than those analyzed in the Final
EIR would substantially reduce significant environmental impacts, but the project proponent declines to adopt them.

(f) In accordance with the actions contemplated herein, this Board has reviewed the Final EIR and adopts and incorporates by reference as though fully set forth herein the findings adopted by the Planning Commission on May 23, 2013 in Motion 18875 and adopts the MMRP. The Board further finds that there is no need for further environmental review for the actions contemplated herein.

(g) On May 23, 2013, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing on the proposed Zoning Map amendments and, found that the public necessity, convenience, and general welfare required the approval of the proposed Zoning Map amendments, and by Resolution No. 18879 recommended them for approval. The Planning Commission found that the proposed Zoning Map amendments were, on balance, consistent with the City’s General Plan, and with Planning Code Section 101.1(b). A copy of said Resolution is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 130570 and is incorporated herein by reference.

(h) The Board finds that these Zoning Map amendments are on balance consistent with the General Plan and with the Priority Policies of Planning Code Section 101.1 for the reasons set forth in Planning Commission Resolution No. 18879 and the Board hereby incorporates such reasons herein by reference.

(i) Pursuant to Planning Code Section 302, the Board finds that the proposed ordinance will serve the public necessity, convenience, and welfare for the reasons set forth in Planning Commission Resolution No. 18879, which reasons are incorporated by reference as though fully set forth.
Section 3: The San Francisco Planning Code is hereby amended by adding Planning
Code Section 249.71, to read as follows:

SEC 249.71. YERBA BUENA CENTER MIXED-USE SPECIAL USE DISTRICT.

(a) General. A special use district entitled the “Yerba Buena Center Mixed-Use
Special Use District”, consisting of Assessor’s Block 3706, Lots 093 and 275, and portions of
Assessor’s Block 3706, Lot 277, is hereby established for the purposes set forth below. The
boundaries of the Yerba Buena Center Mixed-Use Special Use District are designated on
Sectional Map No. 1 SU of the Zoning Map.

(b) Purpose. The purpose of the special use district is to facilitate the development
of a mixed-use project at the corner of Third Street and Mission Street, which will include
cultural/museum, residential, and retail/restaurant. Including a museum component within the
project will strengthen the district of cultural institutions that are already established in the
area, including SFMOMA, the Yerba Buena Center for the Arts, the Museum of the African
Diaspora, the Contemporary Jewish Museum, the Cartoon Art Museum, the Children’s
Creativity Museum, and the California Historical Museum.

(c) Use Controls. The following provisions shall apply to the special use district:

(1) Cultural Uses. The special use district shall require the development of
at least 35,000 net square feet of cultural, museum, or similar public-serving institutional use
with frontage on Jessie Square as part of the project. Pursuant to the terms of the Purchase
and Sale Agreement (the “Purchase Agreement”) between the Successor Agency to the
Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco (the “Successor Agency”)
and the project sponsor, (A) before any other project use may receive a certificate of
occupancy, the “core-and-shell” of the cultural, museum, or similar public-serving institutional
use must be constructed; and (B) the project sponsor must contribute to an operating
endowment to the museum at the times specified in the Purchase Agreement.
(2) **Permitted Uses.** The principally permitted uses in the special use district include (A) the cultural use set forth in Section 249.71(c)(1) above; (B) a residential development with approximately 4,800 square feet of retail/restaurant space; and (C) all uses that are principally permitted in the C-3-R District. The uses in the special use district shall include, at a minimum (A) the cultural use set forth in Section 249.71(c)(1) above; (B) no fewer than 145 dwelling units; and (C) ground-floor retail or cultural space in the Aronson Building. All uses which are conditionally permitted with conditional use authorization in the C-3-R District are conditionally permitted with conditional use authorization in the special use district to the extent such uses are not otherwise designated as principally permitted uses pursuant to this Section 249.71(c)(2).

(3) **Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program.** Development within the special use district shall be subject to the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program, as set forth in Sections 415 through 415.9, through the payment of an in-lieu fee, which is currently equal to 20% of the total number of residential units in the principal project. Additional affordable housing requirements are expected to be imposed through negotiations with the Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency above and beyond the requirements of Sections 415 through 415.9.

(4) **Floor Area Ratio.** The floor area ratio limits set forth in Sections 123 and 124 for C-3-R Districts shall not apply within the special use district.

(5) **Dwelling Unit Exposure.** The dwelling unit exposure requirements of Section 140 shall not apply within the special use district.

(6) **Rooftop Screening.** Section 260(b)(1)(F) shall apply within the special use district, except that the rooftop form created by any additional building volume shall not exceed 30 feet in height, measured as provided in Section 260(a), and shall not exceed a total volume, including the volume of the features being enclosed, equal to three-fourths of the
horizontal area of all upper tower roof areas of the building measured before the addition of
any exempt features times 30.

(7) **Bulk.** The bulk limits for new construction in the special use district at
heights above 160 feet shall be as set forth in Table 1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Max Floor Plate</th>
<th>13,000 gsf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max Plan Length</td>
<td>124 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Diagonal</td>
<td>157 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(8) **Protected Street Frontages.**

(A) Section 155(r)(3) shall not apply within the special use district.

(B) For the purposes of Section 155(r)(4), the project does not have
alternative frontage to Third Street and Mission Street, and therefore curb cuts accessing off-
street parking or loading off Third Street and Mission Street may be permitted as an exception
pursuant to Section 309 and Section 155(r)(4).

(9) ** Dwelling Unit Density.** No conditional use authorization pursuant to
Section 303(c) is required for a dwelling unit density which exceeds the density ratios
specified in Section 215 for the C-3-R District.

(d) **Interpretation.** In the event of inconsistency or conflict between any provision
of this Section 249.71 and any other provision of the Planning Code, this Section 249.71 shall
prevail.

(e) **Sunset Provision.** This Section 249.71 shall be repealed 5 years after its initial
effective date unless the Project has received a first construction document or the Board of
Supervisors, on or before that date, extends or re-enacts it.
Section 4. The San Francisco Planning Code is hereby amended by amending Sectional Map HT01 of the Zoning Map of the City and County of San Francisco, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Property</th>
<th>Height and Bulk</th>
<th>Height and Bulk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessor's Block/Lot 3706/Lot 093 and portions of Lot 277</td>
<td>400-I</td>
<td>480-I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 5. The San Francisco Planning Code is hereby amended by amending Sectional Map SU01 of the Zoning Map of the City and County of San Francisco, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Property</th>
<th>Special Use District Hereby Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessor's Block/Lot 3706/Lot 093 and portions of Lot 277</td>
<td>Yerba Buena Center Mixed-Use Special Use District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 6.

(a) Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days from the date of passage.

(b) Scope of Ordinance. In enacting this ordinance, the Board intends to amend only those words, phrases, paragraphs, subsections, sections, articles, numbers, letters, punctuation marks, charts, diagrams, tables, or any other constituent part of the Planning Code that are explicitly shown in this legislation as additions, deletions, Board amendment additions, and Board amendment deletions in accordance with the "Note" that appears under the official title of the legislation.
(c) Severability. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of
this ordinance is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional by a decision of any
court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining
portions of the ordinance. The Board of Supervisors hereby declares that it would have
passed this ordinance and each and every section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, and
word not declared invalid or unconstitutional without regard to whether any other portion of
this ordinance would be subsequently declared invalid or unconstitutional.

(d) Undertaking for the General Welfare. In enacting and implementing this
ordinance, the City is assuming an undertaking only to promote the general welfare. It is not
assuming, nor is it imposing on its officers and employees, an obligation for breach of which it
is liable in money damages to any person who claims that such breach proximately caused
injury.

(e) No Conflict with State or Federal Law. Nothing in this ordinance shall be
interpreted or applied so as to create any requirement, power, or duty in conflict with any
federal or state law.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney

By: ______________________________
Marieba G. Byrne
Deputy City Attorney
LEGISLATIVE DIGEST

[Planning Code - Yerba Buena Center Mixed-Use Special Use District]

Ordinance amending the Planning Code and Zoning Map, by adding Section 249.71, to create the Yerba Buena Center Mixed-Use Special Use District (SUD) located at 706 Mission Street, Assessor's Block No. 3706, Lot No. 093 and portions of Lot No. 277, to facilitate the development of the 706 Mission Street, The Mexican Museum and Residential Tower Project, by modifying specific Planning Code regulations related to permitted uses, the provision of a cultural/museum use within the SUD, floor area ratio limitations, dwelling unit exposure, height of rooftop equipment, bulk limitations, and curb cut locations; amending the Zoning Map to add the SUD and increase the height of property in the SUD from 400 feet to 480 feet; and making environmental findings and findings of consistency with the General Plan.

Existing Law

The proposed legislation affects three parcels: (1) the entirety of Assessor's Block 3706, Lot 093, which is improved with an existing 10-story, 144-foot-tall building with a 10-foot-tall mechanical penthouse ("Aronson Building"); (2) a portion of Assessor's Block 3706, Lot 277 (the "Mexican Museum Parcel"); and (3) a portion of Assessor's Block 3706, Lot 277 and the entirety of Lot 275, which is improved with the below-grade, 442 parking space Jessie Square Garage (the "Garage Parcel"). The Aronson Building is designated as a Category I Significant Building within the New Montgomery-Mission-Second Street Conservation District. The area is currently zoned C-3-R (Downtown Retail).

Amendments to Current Law

The proposed legislation would allow for the development the 706 Mission Street—The Mexican Museum and Residential Tower Project ("Project"). The Project includes a new 43-story, 480-foot-tall tower (with a 30-foot-tall elevator/mechanical penthouse), with two floors below grade. The new tower would be adjacent to and physically connected to the existing Aronson Building, which would be rehabilitated in compliance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. The new tower would contain up to 39 floors of residential space, and the Mexican Museum would occupy the ground through fourth floors of the tower and the second and third floors and possibly some of the ground floor of the Aronson Building. The overall project would contain up to 190 residential units, space for The Mexican Museum, a ground-floor retail/restaurant use, and associated building services.

To do this, the proposed legislation would create a new special use district ("SUD") overlay on top of the existing C-3-R (Downtown Retail) zoning. This means that the SUD would be an additional set of zoning controls on top of and taking precedence over the C-3-R zoning. The proposed legislation would also reclassify the property from a 400-I Height and Bulk District to a 480-I Height and Bulk District.
Agenda Item 1B
Recreation and Park Commission
Resolution 1305-014

HEARING DATE: May 23, 2013

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE SECTION 295 IMPLEMENTATION MEMO ADOPTED IN 1989 TO RAISE THE ABSOLUTE CUMULATIVE SHADOW LIMIT FOR UNION SQUARE TO ACCOMMODATE NEW SHADOW CAST BY THE PROPOSED PROJECT AT 706 MISSION STREET, AND ADOPTING FINDINGS UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT.

PREAMBLE

The people of the City and County of San Francisco, in June 1984, adopted an initiative ordinance, commonly known as Proposition K, codified as Section 295 of the Planning Code.

Section 295 requires that the Planning Commission disapprove any building permit application to construct a structure that will cast shadow on property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department, unless it is determined that the shadow would not be significant or adverse. The Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission must adopt criteria for the implementation of that ordinance.

Section 295 is implemented by analyzing park properties that could be shadowed by new construction, including the current patterns of use of such properties, how such properties might be used in the future, and assessing the amount of shadowing, its duration, times of day, and times of year of occurrence. The Commissions may also consider the overriding social or public benefits of a project casting shadow.

Pursuant to Planning Code Section 295, the Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission, on February 7, 1989, jointly adopted standards for allowing additional shadows on the greater downtown parks (Resolution No. 11595).

Union Square (“Park”), which is 0.25 miles northwest of 706 Mission Street (“Project Site”), is a public open space that is under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission. Union Square is an approximately 2.58-acre park that occupies the entire block bounded by Post Street on the north, Stockton Street on the east, Geary Street on the south, and Powell Street on the west. The plaza is primarily hardscaped and oriented to passive recreational uses, large civic gatherings, and ancillary retail. There are no recreational facilities and some grassy areas exist along its southern perimeter. There are pedestrian walkways and seating areas throughout the park, several retail kiosks, one café on the east side of the park and one café on the west side of the park. The park includes portable tables and chairs that can be moved to different locations. A 97-foot-tall monument commemorating the Battle of Manila Bay from the Spanish American War occupies the center of the park. Residents, shoppers, tourists, and workers use the park as an outdoor lunch destination and a mid-block pedestrian crossing. Throughout the year, the park
is sunny during the middle of the day; it is shadowed by existing buildings to the east, south, and west during the early morning, late afternoon, and early evening. During the spring and autumn, Union Square is sunny from approximately 9:00 AM until 3:00 PM; it is shadowed by existing buildings during the early morning, late afternoon, and early evening. During the summer, Union Square is sunny from approximately 10:00 AM until 4:00 PM; it is shadowed by existing buildings during the early morning, late afternoon, and early evening. During the winter, Union Square is mostly sunny from approximately noon until 2:00 PM; it is shadowed by existing buildings during the rest of the day.

Union Square receives about 392,663,521 square-foot-hours ("sfh") of Theoretically Available Annual Sunlight ("TAAS"). Currently, there are about 150,265,376 sfh of existing annual shadow on the Park. The Absolute Cumulative Limit ("ACL") that was established for Union Square in 1989 is additional shadow that was equal to 0.1 percent of the TAAS on Union Square, which is approximately 392,663.5 sfh. Prior to October of 2012, Union Square had a remaining shadow allocation, or shadow budget, of approximately 323,123.5 sfh. Since the quantitative standard for Union Square was established in 1989, two completed development projects have affected the shadow conditions on Union Square. In 1996, a project to expand Macy’s department store altered the massing of the structure and resulted in a net reduction of 194,293 sfh of existing shadow (with a corresponding increase in the amount of sunlight on the park), and in 2003, a project at 690 Market Street added 69,540 sfh of net new shadow on Union Square. Although the Macy’s expansion project reduced the amount of existing shadow and increased the amount of available sunlight on Union Square, this amount has not been added back to the shadow budget for Union Square by the Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission to account for these conditions.

Additionally, on October 11, 2012, the Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission held a duly noticed joint public hearing and adopted Planning Commission Resolution No. 18717 and Recreation and Park Commission Resolution No. 1201-001 amending the 1989 Memo and raising the absolute cumulative shadow limits for seven open spaces under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department that could be shadowed by likely cumulative development sites in the Transit Center District Plan ("Plan") Area, including Union Square. In revising these ACLs, the Commissions also adopted qualitative criteria for each park related to the characteristics of shading within these ACLs by development sites within the Plan Area that would not be considered adverse, including the duration, time of day, time of year, and location of shadows on the particular parks. Under these amendments to the 1989 Memo, any consideration of allocation of “shadow” within these newly increased ACLs for projects within the Plan Area must be consistent with these characteristics. The Commissions also found that the “public benefit” of any proposed project in the Plan Area should be considered in the context of the public benefits of the Transit Center District Plan as a whole. The ACL for Union Square was increased from the original limit of 0.1 percent of the TAAS (approximately 392,663.5 sfh) to 0.19 percent of the TAAS (approximately 746,060.7 sfh), but all of the available ACL was reserved for development sites within the Plan Area.

On October 11, 2012, following the joint hearing regarding the TCDP, the Recreation and Park Commission reviewed the shadow impacts of the proposed Transbay Tower at 101 First Street and made a formal recommendation to the Planning Commission to allocate a portion of the newly adopted ACL for Union Square to the Transbay Tower. On October 18, 2012, the Planning Commission allocated a portion of the newly adopted ACL to the Transbay Tower (Motion No. 18724, Case No. 2008.0789K).
On November 15, 2012, the Recreation and Park Commission made a formal recommendation to the Planning Commission to allocate a portion of the newly adopted ACL for Union Square to a proposed project at 181 Fremont Street. On December 6, 2012, the Planning Commission allocated a portion of the newly adopted ACL to 181 Fremont Street. As a result of these actions, the remaining ACL for Union Square is 0.1785 percent of the TAAS, which means that approximately 700,904.4 sf of net new shadow could be cast on Union Square by other development proposed under the TCDP (Motion No. 18763, Case No. 2007.0456K).

On September 25, 2008, Margo Bradish, Esq., of Cox, Castle & Nicholson LLP on behalf of 706 Mission Street, LLC ("Project Sponsor") submitted a request for review of a development exceeding 40 feet in height, pursuant to Section 295, analyzing the potential shadow impacts of the Project to properties under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Parks Department (Case No. 2008.1084K). Department staff prepared a shadow fan depicting the potential shadow cast by the development and concluded that the Project could have a potential impact to properties subject to Section 295.

On October 24, 2012, the Project Sponsor filed an application with the Planning Department ("Department") for a Determination of Compliance pursuant to Planning Code Section ("Section") 309 with requested Exceptions from Planning Code ("Code") requirements for "Reduction of Ground-Level Wind Currents in C-3 Districts", "Off-Street Parking Quantity", "Rear Yard, and "General Standards for Off-Street Parking and Loading" to allow curb cuts on Third and Mission Streets, for a project to rehabilitate an existing 10-story, 144-foot tall building (the Aronson Building), and construct a new, adjacent 47-story tower, reaching a roof height of 520 feet with a 30-foot tall mechanical penthouse. The two buildings would be connected and would contain up to 215 dwelling units, a “core-and-shell” museum space measuring approximately 52,000 square feet, and approximately 4,800 square feet of retail space. The project would reconfigure portions of the existing Jessie Square Garage to increase the number of parking spaces from 442 spaces to 470 spaces, add loading and service vehicle spaces, and would allocate up to 215 parking spaces within the garage to serve the proposed residential uses. The Project Sponsor has proposed a "flex option" that would retain approximately 61,000 square feet of office uses within the existing Aronson Building, and would reduce the residential component of the project to 191 dwelling units. On May 20, 2013, the Project Sponsor reduced the height of the proposed tower from 520 feet (with a 30-foot-tall elevator/mechanical penthouse) to 480 feet (with a 30-foot-tall elevator/mechanical penthouse). As a result, the number of dwelling units in the Project was reduced from a maximum of 215 dwelling units to a maximum of 190 dwelling units, the number of residential parking spaces was reduced from a maximum of 215 spaces to a maximum of 190 spaces, and the "flex option" of retaining office space within the project was deleted. The project is located at 706 Mission Street, Lots 093, 276, and portions of Lot 277 within Assessor's Block 3706 ("Project Site"), within the C-3-R District and the 400-I Height and Bulk District (collectively, "Project", Case No. 2008.1084X).

On October 24, 2012, the Project Sponsor submitted a request for a General Plan Referral Case No. 2008.1084R, regarding the changes in use, disposition, and conveyance of publicly-owned land, reconfiguration of the public sidewalk along Mission Street, and subdivision of the property. On May 23, 2013, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting and adopted Motion No. 18878 determining that these actions are consistent with the objectives and policies of the General Plan and the Priority Policies of Section 101.1.
On October 24, 2012, the Project Sponsor submitted a request to amend Height Map HT01 of the Zoning Maps of the San Francisco Planning Code to reclassify the Project Site from the 400-I Height and Bulk District to the 520-I Height and Bulk District. (Case No. 2008.1084Z). On May 20, 2013, in association with the reduced height of the Project, the Project Sponsor revised the request for a Height Reclassification to reclassify a portion of the Project Site from the 400-I Height and Bulk District to the 480-I Height and Bulk District. On May 23, 2013, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting and adopted Resolution No. 18879, recommending that the Board of Supervisors approve the requested Height Reclassification.

On October 24, 2012, the submitted a request to amend Zoning Map SU01 and the text of the Planning Code to establish the "Yerba Buena Center Mixed-Use Special Use District" (SUD) on the property. The proposed SUD would modify specific Planning Code regulations related to permitted uses, the provision of a cultural/museum use within the SUD, floor area ratio limitations, dwelling unit exposure, height of rooftop equipment, bulk limitations, and curb cut locations (Case No. 2008.1084T). On May 23 2013, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting and adopted Resolution No. 18879, recommending that the Board of Supervisors approve the requested Planning Code Text Amendment.

A technical memorandum, prepared by Turnstone Consulting, was submitted on June 9, 2011, analyzing the potential shadow impacts of the Project (at its originally proposed 520-foot roof height) to properties under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Parks Department (Case No. 2008.1084K). The memorandum concluded that the Project would cast 337,744 sfh of net new shadow on Union Square on a yearly basis, which would be an increase of about 0.09 percent of the TAAS on Union Square for projects outside of the TCDP. On May 21, 2013, a technical memorandum prepared by Turnstone Consulting was submitted analyzing the shadow impacts of the Project on Union Square, based on the reduced 480-foot roof height. The memorandum concluded that the Project would cast 238,788 sfh of net new shadow on Union Square on a yearly basis, which would be an increase of about 0.06% of the TAAS on Union Square.

As part of their actions on October 11, 2012 to increase the ACLs for seven downtown parks, the Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission designated the ACLs exclusively for projects that meet the criteria set forth in the TCDP. Projects that do not meet the criteria set forth in the TCDP may not utilize any portion of the amended ACLs if they cast net new shadow on any of the seven downtown parks for which the ACLs were amended. Such projects would be required to seek their own amendments to the ACLs for these seven downtown parks. The Project is located outside the Plan area and is not eligible to utilize newly adopted ACL on the Park.

On March 21, 2013, 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 complied with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.) ("CEQA"), 14 California Code of Regulations Sections 15000 et seq. ("the CEQA Guidelines"), and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code ("Chapter 31").

The Planning Commission found the Final EIR was adequate, accurate and objective, reflected the independent analysis and judgment of the Planning Department and the Planning Commission, and that the summary of comments and responses contained no significant revisions to the draft EIR, and certified the Final EIR for the Project in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31.
The EIR concludes that the Project would not result in a project-specific significant shadow impact to recreation facilities or other public areas. With respect to Union Square, the EIR indicates that the net new shadow would be of limited duration and the new shadowing would occur at times when the use of Union Square is limited. The EIR concludes that the Project would, however, make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative shadow impact on public open spaces when taking into account other reasonably foreseeable future projects, such as the Transit Tower and the Palace Hotel Project, that would also result in new shadowing of public areas, including Union Square.

Three separate appeals of the Planning Commission’s certification of the EIR to the Board of Supervisors were filed before the April 10, 2013 deadline. The Board of Supervisors considered these appeals at a duly noticed public hearing on May 7, 2013, and unanimously voted to affirm the Planning Commission’s certification of the Final EIR. The Board of Supervisors 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 complied with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31. The Board of Supervisors found the Final EIR was adequate, accurate and objective, reflected the independent analysis and judgment of the Board of Supervisors, and that the summary of comments and responses contained no significant revisions to the draft EIR, and approved the Final EIR in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31.

On May 23, 2013, the Planning Commission adopted Motion No. 18875, adopting CEQA findings, including a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and adopting the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (“MMRP”), as adopted by Historic Preservation Commission Motion No. 0197, which findings and adoption of the MMRP are hereby incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein. The Planning Commission found that the reduction in the height of the Project has resulted in no substantial changes that would require major revisions to the Final EIR or result in new or substantially more severe significant environmental impacts that were not evaluated in the Final EIR, no new information has become available that was not known and could not have been known at the time the Final EIR was certified as complete and that would result in new substantially more severe significant environmental impacts not evaluated in the Final EIR, and no mitigation measures or alternatives previously found infeasible would be feasible or mitigation measures or alternatives considerably different than those analyzed in the Final EIR would substantially reduce significant environmental impacts, but the project proponent declines to adopt them.

For the Recreation and Parks Department Commission Secretary, Margaret McArthur, is the custodian of records for this action, and such records are located at 501 Stanyan Street, San Francisco, CA.

For the Planning Department, Jonas Ionin, is the custodian of records for this action, and such records are located at 1650 Mission Street, Fourth Floor, San Francisco, California.

The Project Sponsor has requested that, as part of the requested increase in the ACL for Union Square, the Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission formally add to the ACL the additional sunlight that resulted from the Macy’s expansion project in 1996, which consisted of 194,293 sfh (equal to approximately 0.05% of the TAAS for Union Square). The Project at 706 Mission would cast 44,495 sfh of net new shadow (equal to approximately 0.01% of the TAAS for Union Square) beyond the additional
sunlight from the Macy's expansion project, for a total of 238,788 sfh of net new shadow (equal to
approximately 0.06% of the TAAS for Union Square).

The Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission held a duly advertised joint public
hearing on May 23, 2013 to consider whether to increase the ACL for Union Square by 0.05 percent of the
TAAS for Union Square to account for the additional sunlight that resulted from the Macy's expansion
project, and to increase the ACL an additional 0.01 percent, for a total increase of 0.06 percent of the
TAAS for Union Square.

The Recreation and Park Commission and the Planning Commission have reviewed and considered
reports, studies, plans and other documents pertaining to the Project.

The Recreation and Park Commission and the Planning Commission have heard and considered the
testimony presented at the public hearing and has further considered the written materials and oral
testimony presented on behalf of the Project Sponsor, Department staff, and other interested parties.

Therefore, the Recreation and Park Commission and the Planning Commission hereby resolve:

FINDINGS

Having reviewed the materials identified in the recitals above, and having heard all testimony and
arguments, the Commissions finds, concludes, and determines as follows:

1. The foregoing recitals are accurate, and also constitute findings of this Commission.

2. The staffs of both the Planning Department and the Recreation and Park Department have
recommended increasing the ACL for Union Square by 0.05 percent of the TAAS for Union
Square to account for the additional sunlight that resulted from the Macy's expansion project,
and to increase the ACL an additional 0.01 percent, for a total increase of 0.06 percent of the
TAAS for Union Square, equal to approximately 238,788 square-foot-hours of net new shadow.

3. The additional shadow cast by the Project on Union Square, while numerically significant, would
not be adverse to the use of Union Square, and is not expected to interfere with the use of the
Park, for the following reasons: (1) the new shadow would not occur after 9:15 a.m. any day of
the year (maximum new shadow range would be 8:30 a.m. to 9:15 a.m. during daylight savings
time, or 7:30 a.m. to 8:15 a.m. during standard time) and would be consistent with the 1989
Memo qualitative standards for Union Square in that the new net shadow would not occur
during mid-day hours; (2) the new shadow would generally occur in the morning hours during
periods of relatively low park usage; (3) the new shadow would occur for a limited amount of
time from October 11th to November 8th and from February 2nd to March 2nd for less than one hour
on any given day during the hours subject to Section 295; and (4) the new shadow does not affect
the manner in which Union Square is used, which is mainly for passive recreational
opportunities.

4. A determination by the Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission to raise
the absolute cumulative shadow limit for the park in an amount that would accommodate the
additional shadow that would be cast by the Project does not constitute an approval of the Project.

5. The reduction in the height of the Project has resulted in no substantial changes that would require major revisions to the Final EIR or result in new or substantially more severe significant environmental impacts that were not evaluated in the Final EIR, no new information has become available that was not known and could not have been known at the time the Final EIR was certified as complete and that would result in new substantially more severe significant environmental impacts not evaluated in the Final EIR, and no mitigation measures or alternatives previously found infeasible would be feasible or mitigation measures or alternatives considerably different than those analyzed in the Final EIR would substantially reduce significant environmental impacts, but the project proponent declines to adopt them.

DECISION

Based upon the Record, the submissions by the Project Sponsor and by the staff of the Recreation and Park Department and Planning Department, the oral testimony presented to the Planning Commission under Shadow Analysis Application No. 2008.1084K, the Recreation and Park Commission hereby ADOPTS an amendment of the absolute cumulative limit ("ACL") for Union Square to (a) include the approximately 194,293 sfh of shadow (equal to 0.05% of the TAAS) that resulted from a 1996 project modifying the Macy’s department store that reduced shadow on Union Square (the "Macy’s Adjustment") that had not been previously added back to the ACL for Union Square and (b) increase the ACL by an additional 44,495 sfh of net new shadow (equal to 0.01% of the TAAS). Should the building envelope of the Project be reduced, the increase in the cumulative shadow limit authorized by this action shall be reduced to the amount of shadow that would be cast by the revised Project.

The Recreation and Park Commission, for purposes of this action, hereby adopts the findings under the California Environmental Quality Act and the Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program for the Project, as adopted by Planning Commission Motion No. 18875, which are incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein. I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED by the Recreation and Park Commission at the meeting on May 23, 2013.

Margaret McArthur
Recreation and Park Commission Secretary

AYES 5
NOES 1
ABSENT 1

ADOPTED: May 23, 2013
Exhibit 1

706 MISSION STREET – THE MEXICAN MUSEUM AND RESIDENTIAL TOWER PROJECT
CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT FINDINGS:
FINDINGS OF FACT, EVALUATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES AND
ALTERNATIVES, AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS
SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION

In determining to approve a the 706 Mission Street – The Mexican Museum and Residential Tower Project located at 706 Mission Street (Assessor's Block 3706, Lots 093, 275, and 277 (portion)), described in Section I, Project Description below, ("Project"), the San Francisco Planning Commission ("Commission") makes and adopts the following findings of fact regarding the Project and mitigation measures and alternatives, and adopts the statement of overriding considerations and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, 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. ("Guidelines"), particularly Section 15091 through 15093 and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

This document is organized as follows:

Section I provides a description of the Project, the Project Objectives, the environmental review process for the Project, the approval actions to be taken, and the location of records;

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

Section III identifies potentially significant impacts that are avoided or reduced to less-than-significant levels through mitigation and describes the disposition of the mitigation measures;

Section IV identifies significant, unavoidable wind and shadow impacts (specifically cumulative shadow impacts), of the Project that cannot be avoided or reduced to less-than-significant levels through Mitigation Measures;

Section V evaluates the different project alternatives and the economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations that support approval of the Project as proposed and the rejection of these alternatives; and

Section VI makes a Statement of Overriding Considerations setting forth the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the Project that outweigh the significant and unavoidable adverse environmental effects and support the rejection of the project alternatives.

The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") for the mitigation measures that have been proposed for adoption is attached with these findings as Exhibit 2. The MMRP is required by CEQA Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091. The MMRP provides a table setting forth each
mitigation measure listed in the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Project ("Final EIR") that is required to reduce or avoid a significant adverse impact. The MMRP also specifies the agency responsible for implementation of each measure and establishes monitoring actions and a monitoring schedule. The full text of the mitigation measures is set forth in the MMRP.

These findings are based upon substantial evidence in the entire record before the Commission. The references set forth in these findings to certain pages or sections of the Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR" or "DEIR") or the Responses to Comments ("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.

MOVED, that the Commission has reviewed and considered the Final EIR and the record associated therewith, including the comments and submissions made to this Commission, and based thereon hereby adopts these findings under the California Environmental Quality Act, including rejecting alternatives as infeasible and adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and adopts the MMRP attached as Exhibit 2 to Motion No. 18875 based on the following findings:

I. Project Description

A. 706 Mission Street – The Mexican Museum and Residential Tower Project

The project site is on the northwest corner of Third and Mission Streets, at 706 Mission Street. It consists of three lots: the entirety of Assessor's Block 3706, Lots 093 and 275, and portions of Assessor's Block 3706, Lot 277. Together, these lots cover an area of approximately 63,468 square feet or approximately 1.45 acres. The area of the project site includes the below-grade publically-owned Jessie Square Garage, which would become private by conveyance to the project sponsor.

Lot 093, an approximately 15,460 square foot, rectangular parcel is currently developed with the 10-story, 154-foot-tall Aronson Building (a 144-foot-tall building with a 10-foot-tall mechanical penthouse). The building was originally constructed in 1903, and two annexes were added in 1978. The Aronson Building is rated "A" (highest importance) by the Foundation for San Francisco's Architectural Heritage, and it is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places and the California Register of Historical Resources. The Aronson Building is also designated as a Category I Significant Building within the New Montgomery-Mission-Second Street Conservation District. Including the annexes, the Aronson Building contains a total of approximately 120,340 gross square feet (gsf), with approximately 13,700 gsf of storage and utility space in the basement, an approximately 10,660-gsf retail space on the ground floor, which is currently occupied by a Rochester Big & Tall retail clothing store, and approximately 95,980 gsf of office space on the second through tenth floors. Including the annexes, the Aronson Building covers approximately 74 percent of Lot 093.

Lot 275 is occupied by the existing ramp that provides vehicular access from Stevenson Street to the subsurface Jessie Square Garage. This lot has an area of approximately 1,635 square feet.

A currently vacant approximately 9,780 square foot portion of Lot 277 is the future permanent home of The Mexican Museum (Mexican Museum parcel). The subsurface Jessie Square Garage is the other
portion of Lot 277 that makes up the project site. The Jessie Square Garage contains 442 parking spaces within a footprint of approximately 45,310 square feet. Currently, vehicles enter the Jessie Square Garage from Stevenson Street and exit onto either Stevenson or Mission Streets.

Prior to project approval, the Project Sponsor proposed modifications to the project to reduce the height of the proposed tower from 520 feet (with a 30-foot-tall elevator/mechanical penthouse) to 480 feet (with a 30-foot-tall elevator/mechanical penthouse). The project described here includes these, and other conforming, modifications. Thus, the proposed project would include a 43-story, 480-foot-tall tower (with a 30-foot-tall elevator/mechanical penthouse), with two floors below grade on The Mexican Museum parcel and the western portion of the Aronson Building parcel. The new tower would be west of, adjacent to, and physically connected to the existing Aronson Building. The overall project would contain space for The Mexican Museum, a ground-floor retail/restaurant use, up to 190 residential units, and associated building services.

In the proposed tower, there would be up to 39 floors of residential space, including mechanical areas, and four floors of museum space. The Mexican Museum would occupy the ground through fourth floors, and residential uses would occupy the fifth through thirty-ninth floors. The fifth floor of the tower would be occupied by residential or residential amenity space, unless the residential amenity space is on the tenth floor of the Aronson Building as discussed below. Approximately 2,100 gsf on Basement Level B2 would be allocated to The Mexican Museum for storage. About 15,900 gsf on Basement Levels B1 and B2 would be occupied by the elevator core and building services.

As part of the proposed project, the historically important Aronson Building would be restored and rehabilitated, and the existing mechanical penthouse on the roof of the Aronson Building would be removed. The Aronson Building currently contains approximately 10,660 gsf of retail space on the ground floor and approximately 95,980 gsf of office space on the second through tenth floors. With the proposed project, the Aronson Building would have lobby space and retail/restaurant space on the ground floor. The Mexican Museum would occupy the second and third floors and possibly some or all of the ground floor of the Aronson Building. The fourth through tenth floors of the Aronson Building would be residential. A proposed “office flex option” that would have allowed these floors of the Aronson Building to be used as office space was eliminated as part of the Project Sponsor’s proposed project changes. Building services would occupy a small portion of each floor.

The Jessie Square Garage would be reconfigured to include 470 spaces, of which up to 280 would be made available to the general public. Under the proposed project, all non-project vehicles would continue to enter the Jessie Square Garage from Stevenson Street. Project residents would have the option of parking their own vehicles or using a valet service. Project residents who choose to park their own vehicles would be required to enter the garage from Stevenson Street; they would not be allowed to access the project site from Third Street using the car elevators to enter the garage. Project residents who choose to use the valet service would drive onto the project site from Third Street using the existing curb cut and driveway. As under current conditions, all loading trucks would exit the Jessie Square Garage onto Stevenson Street only, but delivery vans, service vehicles, and all other vehicles would have the option of exiting the garage onto either Stevenson or Mission Streets.
While several vehicular access variants to the proposed project were analyzed in the EIR, none of them are being approved by this Commission or any other City decision-maker. Because of this, these findings do not address the significant and unavoidable impacts that the Final EIR identified would result if the vehicular access variants were to be approved.

B. Successor Agency Project Objectives

The objectives of the Successor Agency are as follows:

- To complete the redevelopment of the Yerba Buena Center (YBC) Redevelopment Project Area envisioned under the Yerba Buena Center Redevelopment Plan.

- To stimulate and attract private investment and generate sales taxes and other General Fund revenues from new uses on the project site, thereby improving the City’s overall economic health, employment opportunities, tax base, and community economic development opportunities.

- To provide for the development of a museum facility and an endowment for The Mexican Museum on Successor Agency-owned property located adjacent to Jessie Square, at the heart of San Francisco’s cultural district location, in a manner that is consistent with General Plan Policy VI-1.9, to “create opportunities for private developers to include arts spaces in private developments city-wide.”

- To ensure construction of a preeminent building with a superior level of design for this important site across from Yerba Buena Gardens and adjacent to Jessie Square in a manner that complements the landscaping and design of Jessie Square.

- To provide housing in an urban infill location to help alleviate the effects of suburban sprawl.

- To provide temporary and permanent employment and contracting opportunities for minorities, women, qualified economically disadvantaged individuals, and other residents both in the South of Market area and in the City generally, in a manner consistent with the City’s current and future equal opportunity programs.

- To create a development that is financially feasible and that can fund the project’s capital costs and ongoing operation and maintenance costs related to the redevelopment and long-term operation of the Mexican Museum parcel without reliance on public funds.

- To maximize the quality of the pedestrian experience along Mission Street and Third Street, while maintaining accessibility to the project site for automobiles and loading.

- To transfer ownership of the Jessie Square Garage to a private entity, while providing adequate parking in the Jessie Square Garage for the Contemporary Jewish Museum, St. Patrick’s Church, The Mexican Museum, and the public.

- To provide for rehabilitation of the historically important Aronson Building.
• To secure funding for new and affordable below-market rate units beyond the amount currently required by City ordinances.

• To secure additional funding for operations, management, and security of Yerba Buena Gardens.

C. Project Sponsor Objectives

The objectives of the project sponsor, 706 Mission Street Co., LLC, are as follows:

• To construct a residential building of superior quality and design that complements and is generally consistent with the downtown area, furthering the objectives of the General Plan’s Urban Design Element and the Yerba Buena Center Redevelopment Plan.

• To redevelop the project site with a high-quality residential development that includes a ground-floor retail or restaurant use.

• To provide housing in downtown San Francisco that is accessible to local and regional transit, as well as cultural amenities and attractions, such as performing art centers, and art museums and exhibitions.

• To rehabilitate the historically important Aronson Building.

• To design and construct the project to a minimum of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Silver standards (or such higher and additional requirements as adopted by the City and County of San Francisco), thereby reducing the project’s carbon footprint and maximizing the energy efficiency of the building.

• To develop a project that is financially feasible and financeable, and to create a level of development sufficient to support the costs of providing the public benefits delivered by the project, including space and funding for The Mexican Museum; rehabilitation of the historically important Aronson Building; funding of affordable, below-market-rate housing; and funding for the maintenance of Yerba Buena Gardens, and that can fund project costs.

• To provide adequate parking and vehicular access to serve the needs of project residents and their visitors.

D. Planning and Environmental Review Process

The Project Sponsor submitted an Environmental Evaluation application for the project on June 30, 2008. The Environmental Evaluation application was revised on December 7, 2009, and again on March 5, 2012, to reflect design changes to the proposed project. The San Francisco Planning Department (the “Department”) determined that an Environmental Impact Report was required and published and distributed a Notice of Preparation of an EIR (“NOP”) on April 13, 2011. The NOP is Appendix A to the Draft EIR. The public review period on the NOP began on April 14, 2011, and ended on May 13, 2011.
The Department published a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) on June 27, 2012. The Commission held a public hearing to solicit testimony on the DEIR on July 27, 2013. The Department received written comments on the DEIR from June 28, 2012, to August 13, 2012. The Department published the Responses to Comments on March 7, 2013. The DEIR, together with the Responses to Comments constitute the Final EIR. The FEIR was certified by Planning Commission on March 21, 2013, by Motion No. 18829. Certification of the FEIR was appealed to the Board of Supervisors. On May 7, 2013, the Board of Supervisors rejected the appeal and affirmed the certification of the FEIR.

E. Approval Actions

1. Actions by the Planning Commission

   • Certification of the Final EIR on March 21, 2013, by Planning Commission Motion No. 18829;

   • General Plan referral to determine project consistency with the General Plan and the Priority Policies.

   • Recommend approval to the Board of Supervisors of a Zoning Map amendment to reclassify the existing 400-foot height limit for the project site, shown on Zoning Map Sheet HT01, and to amend Zoning Map Sheet SU01 to show the Special Use District.

   • Recommend approval to the Board of Supervisors of a Special Use District to address Floor Area Ratio, height, and other land use controls for the project site, which may include additional provisions regarding permitted uses, the provision of cultural/museum use within the SUD, floor area ratio limitations, dwelling unit exposure, height of rooftop equipment, bulk limitations, and curb cut locations.

   • Approval of a Section 309 Determination of Compliance and Request for Exceptions for the construction of a new building in a C-3 District.

   • Approval of amendment of the quantitative shadow standard for Union Square that was established on February 7, 1989, pursuant to Planning Commission Resolution No. 11595; and Section 295 shadow significance determination and allocation to project.

2. Action by this Historic Preservation Commission

   • Approval of a Major Permit to Alter pursuant to Article 11 of the Planning Code.

3. Actions by the Board of Supervisors

   • The Planning Commission's certification of the Final EIR was appealed to the Board of Supervisors, and on May 7, 2013, the Board of Supervisors upheld the certification of the Final EIR.
• Adoption of a Zoning Map amendment to reclassify the existing 400-foot height limit for the project site, shown on Zoning Map Sheet HT01, and to amend Zoning Map Sheet SU01 to show the Special Use District.

• Adoption of a Special Use District to address Floor Area Ratio, height, and other land use controls for the project site, which may include additional provisions regarding permitted uses, the provision of cultural/museum use within the SUD, floor area ratio limitations, dwelling unit exposure, height of rooftop equipment, bulk limitations, and curb cut locations.

4. Actions by the Recreation and Park Commission

• Approval of amendment of the quantitative shadow standard for Union Square that was established on February 7, 1989, pursuant to Planning Commission Resolution No. 11595;

• Recommendation to the Planning Commission regarding the Section 295 shadow significance determination and allocation to project.

5. Actions by the Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency, and the Oversight Board of the Successor Agency

• Approval of the Agreement of Purchase and Sale for the Mexican Museum parcel and the Jessie Square Garage.

• Approval of parking structure bond purchase/ defeasance documents.

6. Actions by the Department of Public Works

• Approval of the tentative map

7. Actions by the Department of Public Works and the SFMTA Board of Directors

• Approval of a street improvement permit and/or encroachment permit to (1) extend the existing Jessie Square passenger loading/unloading zone on Mission Street by approximately 83 feet, 6 inches to the east, resulting in a 154-foot-long passenger loading/unloading zone; and (2) designate the curb along Third Street in front of the project site as a white zone for passenger loading/unloading.

8. Actions by the Department of Building Inspection

• Approval of the site permit

• Approval of demolition, grading, and building permits

9. Actions by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
• Approval of compliance with requirements of the Stormwater Management Ordinance for projects with over 5,000 square feet of disturbed ground area.

F. Location and Custodian of Records

The public hearing transcript, a copy of the letters regarding the Draft EIR received during the public review period, the administrative record, and background documentation for the FEIR are located at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, San Francisco. The Commission Secretary is the custodian of records for the Planning Department and the Commission.

These findings are based upon substantial evidence in the entire record before the Commission.

G. Findings Regarding Project Modifications

As noted above, prior to project approval, the Project Sponsor proposed modifications to the project to reduce the height of the proposed tower from 520 feet (with a 30-foot-tall elevator/mechanical penthouse) to 480 feet (with a 30-foot-tall elevator/mechanical penthouse). The project described here includes these, and other conforming, modifications. Thus, the proposed project would include a 43-story, 480-foot-tall tower (with a 30-foot-tall elevator/mechanical penthouse), with two floors below grade on The Mexican Museum parcel and the western portion of the Aronson Building parcel. The overall project would contain space for The Mexican Museum, a ground-floor retail/restaurant use, up to 190 residential units, and associated building services.

The Commission finds that the Project as currently proposed with a height reduction to 480 feet, with a 30-foot-tall elevator/mechanical penthouse, and conforming reductions in unit count, among other conforming changes, is within the scope of the project analyzed in the Final EIR. The Commission finds that the reduction in the height of the Project has resulted in no substantial changes that would require major revisions to the Final EIR or result in new or substantially more severe significant environmental impacts that were not evaluated in the Final EIR, no new information has become available that was not known and could not have been known at the time the Final EIR was certified as complete and that would result in new substantially more severe significant environmental impacts not evaluated in the Final EIR, and no mitigation measures or alternatives previously found infeasible or mitigation measures or alternatives considerably different than those analyzed in the Final EIR would substantially reduce significant environmental impacts, but the project proponent declines to adopt them. The Commission finds that no supplemental or subsequent EIR is needed and no addendum to the EIR is needed to augment the analysis presented in the Final EIR for the Proposed Project.

II. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant And Thus Do Not Require Mitigation

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant (Pub. Res. Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091). As more fully described in the Final EIR and based on substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding, the Commission hereby finds that implementation of the Project would not result in any significant impacts in the following areas and that these impact areas therefore do not require mitigation.
A. **Land Use and Land Use Planning**

- **Impact LU-1**: The proposed project would not physically divide an established community.
- **Impact LU-2**: The proposed project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.
- **Impact LU-3**: The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse impact on the character of the vicinity.
- **Impact C-LU-1**: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant adverse cumulative land use impacts related to a physical division of an established community; to conflicts with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; and to the existing character of the vicinity.

B. **Aesthetics**

- **Impact AE-1**: The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.
- **Impact AE-2**: The proposed project tower would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource.
- **Impact AE-3**: The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.
- **Impact AE-4**: The proposed project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area or which would substantially impact other people or properties.
- **Impact C-AE-1**: The proposed project, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity, would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant impact related to aesthetics.

C. **Population and Housing**

- **Impact PH-1**: The proposed project would not induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly.
- **Impact PH-2**: The proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or create demand for additional housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.
- **Impact PH-3**: The proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.
- **Impact C-PH-1**: The proposed project, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant adverse cumulative impacts related to population growth, housing, and employment, either directly or indirectly.
D. Cultural and Paleontological Resources

- **Impact CP-5**: The proposed rehabilitation, repair and reuse of the Aronson Building under the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the Aronson Building as a historical resource under CEQA.
- **Impact CP-6**: The proposed project tower would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the Aronson Building historical resource.
- **Impact CP-7**: The proposed project tower would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of nearby historical resources.
- **Impact C-CP-2**: The proposed project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity, would not have a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant impact on historic architectural resources.

E. Transportation and Circulation

- **Impact TR-1**: The proposed project would not cause a substantial increase in traffic that would cause the level of service to decline from LOS D or better to LOS E or F, or from LOS E to F at seven intersections studied in the project vicinity.
- **Impact TR-2**: The proposed project would not cause a substantial increase in transit demand that could not be accommodated by adjacent transit capacity; nor would it cause a substantial increase in delays or costs such that significant adverse impacts in transit service levels could occur.
- **Impact TR-3**: The proposed project would not result in substantial overcrowding on public sidewalks, nor create potentially hazardous conditions for pedestrians, or otherwise interfere with pedestrian accessibility to the site and adjoining areas.
- **Impact TR-4**: The proposed project would not create potentially hazardous conditions for bicyclists, or otherwise substantially interfere with bicycle accessibility to the site and adjoining areas.
- **Impact TR-5**: The loading demand of the proposed project during the peak hour of loading activities would be accommodated within the proposed on-site loading facilities or within convenient on-street loading zones, and would not create potentially hazardous traffic conditions or significant delays involving traffic, transit, bicycles, or pedestrians.
- **Impact TR-6**: Construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access.
- **Impact TR-7**: Construction-related impacts of the proposed project would not be considered significant due to their temporary and limited duration.
- **Impact C-TR-1**: The proposed project would not contribute considerably to future cumulative traffic increases that would cause levels of service to deteriorate to unacceptable levels at seven intersections.
- **Impact C-TR-2**: The proposed project would not contribute considerably to cumulative increases in transit ridership that would cause the levels of service to deteriorate to unacceptable levels.
- **Impact C-TR-3**: The construction impacts of the proposed project would not result in a considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact when combined with other nearby proposed projects due to the temporary and limited duration of the construction of the proposed project and nearby projects.
F. Noise

- **Impact NO-4**: The proposed project's new residences and cultural uses would not be substantially affected by existing noise levels.
- **Impact C-NO-1**: Construction of the proposed project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the proposed project.
- **Impact C-NO-3**: Operation of the proposed project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.
- **Impact C-NO-4**: Noise from traffic increases generated by the proposed project, when combined with noise from reasonably foreseeable traffic growth forecast to the year 2030, would not contribute considerably to significant cumulative traffic noise impacts.

G. Air Quality

- **Impact AQ-1**: Construction of the proposed project would not violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; nor would it result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria air pollutants, for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable ambient air quality standard.
- **Impact AQ-2**: Construction of the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations of fugitive dust.
- **Impact AQ-4**: Operation of the proposed project would not violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; nor would it result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria air pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable ambient air quality standard.
- **Impact AQ-5**: Operation of the proposed project would not generate emissions of PM2.5 and toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, at levels that would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
- **Impact AQ-6**: Operation of the proposed project would not expose new on-site sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
- **Impact AQ-7**: Construction and operation of the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan (CAP), the applicable air quality plan.
- **Impact AQ-8**: Construction and operation of the proposed project would not expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors.
- **Impact C-AQ-1**: Construction and operation of the proposed project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to exposure of sensitive receptors to significant cumulative substantial pollutant concentrations.

H. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- **Impact C-GG-1**: The proposed project would be consistent with the City's CHG Reduction Plan and the AB 32 Scoping Plan, and would, therefore, not result in a cumulatively considerable
contribution to significant cumulative GHG emissions or conflict with any policy, plan, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.

L. **Wind and Shadow**
   - **Impact WS-1:** The proposed project would not alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas.
   - **Impact C-WS-1:** The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity, would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative wind impact.
   - **Impact WS-2:** The proposed project would not create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities and other public areas.

J. **Recreation**
   - **Impact RE-1:** The proposed project would not increase the use of existing park and recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of facilities would occur or be accelerated.
   - **Impact RE-2:** The proposed project would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.
   - **Impact RE-3:** The proposed project would not physically degrade existing recreational resources.
   - **Impact C-RE-1:** Construction of the proposed project, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant adverse cumulative impacts on recreational facilities.

K. **Utilities and Service Systems**
   - **Impact UT-1:** The proposed project would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.
   - **Impact UT-2:** The proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new or the expansion of existing water or wastewater treatment facilities, or stormwater drainage facilities, the construction of which could have significant environmental effects.
   - **Impact UT-3:** The proposed project would not result in a determination that there is insufficient capacity in the wastewater treatment system to serve the proposed project's estimated demand in addition to its existing demand.
   - **Impact C-UT-1:** Construction of the proposed project, in combination with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant adverse cumulative impact regarding the treatment of stormwater runoff or capacity of wastewater treatment facilities or stormwater drainage facilities.
   - **Impact UT-4:** The proposed project would be adequately served by existing water entitlements and water supply resources, and would not require new or expanded water supply resources or entitlements.
   - **Impact C-UT-2:** Construction of the proposed project, in combination with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant adverse cumulative impact on water supply.
   - **Impact UT-5:** The proposed project would increase the amount of solid waste generated on the project site, but would be adequately served by the City's landfill and would comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.
• **Impact C-UT-3**: Construction of the proposed project, in combination with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant adverse cumulative impact on solid waste disposal facilities.

**Public Services**

• **Impact PS-1**: The proposed project would not increase demand for public services to the extent that new facilities would have to be constructed or existing facilities altered in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any public services such as police protection, fire protection and emergency services, schools, or libraries.

• **Impact C-PS-1**: The proposed project, in combination with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant adverse cumulative impacts that would result in a need for construction of new or physically altered facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any public services, including police protection, fire protection and emergency services, schools, and libraries.

**Biological Resources**

• **Impact BI-1**: The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS.

• **Impact BI-2**: The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on the movement of native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, nor would it impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

• **Impact BI-3**: The proposed project would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

• **Impact C-BI-1**: The proposed project, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity, would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant adverse cumulative impact on biological resources.

**Geology and Soils**

• **Impact GE-1**: The proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture, ground-shaking, liquefaction, or landslides.

• **Impact GE-2**: The proposed project would not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil.

• **Impact GE-3**: The proposed project would not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.

• **Impact GE-4**: The proposed project would not be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property.

• **Impact C-GE-1**: The proposed project, in combination with other past, present and other reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant adverse cumulative impacts with respect to geology, soils, or seismicity.
O. **Hydrology and Water Quality**
- Impact HY-1: The proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.
- Impact HY-2: The proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge.
- Impact HY-3: The proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on or off site.
- Impact HY-4: Construction of the proposed project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.
- Impact HY-5: Operation of the proposed project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.
- Impact C-HY-1: The proposed project, in combination with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant adverse cumulative impact on hydrology and water quality.

P. **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**
- Impact HZ-1: The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.
- Impact HZ-3: The proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.
- Impact HZ-4: The proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- Impact HZ-5: The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a risk of loss, injury or death involving fires.
- Impact C-HZ-1: The proposed project, when combined with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant adverse cumulative impact on hazards and hazardous materials.

Q. **Mineral and Energy Resources**
- Impact ME-1: The proposed project would not have a significant adverse impact on the availability of a known mineral resource and/or a locally important mineral resource recovery site.
- Impact ME-2: The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on the use of fuel, water, or energy consumption, and would not encourage activities that could result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use these in a wasteful manner.
- Impact C-ME-1: The proposed project, in combination with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant adverse cumulative impact on mineral and energy resources.
R. Agricultural and Forest Resources

- **Impact AG-1:** The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on the conversion of farmland, would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or with a Williamson Act contract, nor involve other changes that would result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.
- **Impact AG-2:** The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land or timberland, nor would it result in the loss of forest land or the conversion of forest land to non-forest use.
- **Impact C-AG-1:** The proposed project, in combination with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant adverse cumulative impact on agricultural resources or forest land or timberland.

III. Potentially Significant Impacts That Are Avoided Or Reduced To A Less-Than-Significant Level And Findings Regarding Mitigation Measures

The following Sections III and IV set forth the 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 Commission regarding the environmental impacts of the Project and the mitigation measures included as part of the Final EIR and adopted by the Commission and other City decision makers as part of the Project. To avoid duplication and redundancy, and because the Commission agrees with, and hereby adopts, the conclusions in the Final EIR, these findings will not repeat the complete analysis and conclusions in the Final EIR, but instead summarizes and incorporates them by reference herein and relies rely upon them as substantial evidence supporting these findings.

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

As set forth below, the Commission adopts and incorporates all of the mitigation measures within its jurisdiction set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP to substantially lessen or avoid the potentially significant and significant impacts of the Project. The Commission and other City decision makers intend to adopt each of the mitigation measures proposed in the Final EIR. 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.
The potentially significant impacts of the Project that will be mitigated through implementation of mitigation measures are identified and summarized below along with the corresponding mitigation measures.

A. Cultural and Paleontological Resources

- **Impact CP-1**: Construction activities for the proposed project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resources, if such resources are present within the project site.
  - Ground-disturbing construction activity within the project site, particularly within previously undisturbed soils, could adversely affect the significance of archaeological resources by impairing the ability of such resources to convey important scientific and historical information. This effect would be considered a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource and would therefore be a potentially significant impact under CEQA.
  - The following mitigation measures, as more fully described in the Final EIR, are hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided herein, to mitigate the potentially significant impact of Impact CP-1.
    - **Mitigation Measure M-CP-1a**: Archaeological Test, Monitoring, Data Recovery and Reporting
    - **Mitigation Measure M-CP-1b**: Interpretation
  - Based on the final EIR and the entire administrative record, it is hereby found and determined that implementing Mitigation Measures M-CP-1a and M-CP-1b would reduce Impact CP-1 to a less-than-significant level because Mitigation Measure M-CP-1a would ensure that any potentially affected archaeological deposits would be identified, evaluated, and, as appropriate, subject to data recovery and reporting by a qualified archaeologist under the oversight of the Environmental Review Officer, and Mitigation Measure M-CP-1b would ensure that a plan for the post-recovery interpretation of buried or submerged archaeological resources is developed and implemented with the assistance of qualified archaeologist and under the oversight of the Environmental Review Officer.

- **Impact CP-2**: Construction activities for the proposed project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of human remains, if such resources are present within the project site.
  - Ground-disturbing construction activity within the project site, particularly within previously undisturbed soils, could adversely affect the significance of human remains, which would be a potentially significant impact under CEQA.
  - The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided herein, to mitigate the potentially significant impact of Impact CP-2.
• **Mitigation Measure M-CP-1a:** Archaeological Test, Monitoring, Data Recovery and Reporting
  - Based on the final EIR and the entire administrative record, it is hereby found and determined that implementing Mitigation Measure M-CP-1a would reduce Impact CP-2 to a less-than significant level because the mitigation measure would ensure that the treatment of any human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during soil disturbing activities complies with applicable state and federal laws, including immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and, in the event of the Coroner’s determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the NAHC, who would appoint an MLD.

• **Impact CP-3:** Construction activities for the proposed project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of paleontological resources, if such resources are present within the project site.
  - Paleontological resources could exist in the Franciscan, and possibly the Colma, Formations that underlie the project site. Project construction activities could disturb and impair the significance of such paleontological resources, which would be a potentially significant impact under CEQA.
  - The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided herein, to mitigate the potentially significant impact of Impact CP-3.
    - **Mitigation Measure M-CP-3:** Paleontological Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Program
      - Based on the final EIR and the entire administrative record, it is hereby found and determined that implementing Mitigation Measure M-CP-3 would reduce Impact CP-3 to a less-than significant level because the mitigation measure would ensure that a plan for monitoring, recovery, identification, and curation of paleontologic resources would be developed and implemented by a qualified paleontologist under the oversight of the Environmental Review Officer in the event that paleontological resources are present within the project site.

• **Impact CP-4:** Construction activities for the proposed project would disturb unknown resources if any are present within the project site.
  - Construction activities could disturb or remove unknown human remains within the project site, which could materially impair the physical characteristics of the unknown resource, resulting in a potentially significant impact under CEQA.
  - The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided herein, to mitigate the potentially significant impact of Impact CP-4.
    - **Mitigation Measure M-CP-4:** Accidental Discovery
      - Based on the final EIR and the entire administrative record, it is hereby found and determined that implementing Mitigation Measure M-CP-4 would reduce Impact CP-4 to
a less than significant level because the mitigation measure ensures that all field and construction personnel will be informed of the potential presence of archaeological resources within the project site and the procedures that are to be followed in the event such resources are encountered during construction activities.

- **Impact C-CP-1:** Disturbance of archaeological and paleontological resources, if encountered during construction of the proposed project, in combination with other past, present, and future reasonably foreseeable projects, would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact on archaeological resources.
  - When considered with other past and proposed development projects within San Francisco and the Bay Area region, the potential disturbance of archaeological and paleontological resources within the project site could make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a loss of significant historic and scientific information about California, Bay Area, and San Francisco history and prehistory, which would be a potentially significant impact under CEQA.
  - The following mitigation measures, as more fully described in the Final EIR, are hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided herein, to mitigate the potentially significant impact of Impact C-CP-1.
    - **Mitigation Measure M-CP-1a:** Archaeological Test, Monitoring, Data Recovery and Reporting
    - **Mitigation Measure M-CP-1b:** Interpretation
    - **Mitigation Measure M-CP-3:** Paleontological Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Program
    - **Mitigation Measure M-CP-4:** Accidental Discovery
  - Based on the final EIR and the entire administrative record, it is hereby found and determined that implementing Mitigation Measures M-CP-1a, M-CP-1b, M-CP-3, and M-CP-4 would reduce the project's contribution to Impact C-CP-1 to a less than cumulatively considerable level because these mitigation measures would ensure that plans for testing, monitoring, data recovery, documentation and interpretation are approved and implemented to preserve and realize the information potential of archaeological and paleontological resources that may be encountered on the project site.

B. **Noise**

- **Impact NO-1:** Construction of the proposed project would generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the San Francisco General Plan or noise ordinance and would result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.
  - The project's demolition, excavation, and building construction activities would temporarily and intermittently increase noise in the project vicinity to levels that could be considered an annoyance by occupants of nearby properties, which would be a potentially significant impact under CEQA. The loudest construction activities, such as installing piles, grading, and excavation, would occur over the first two year of the
construction period, and once the activity is completed, the associated high noise levels would no longer be experienced by the affected sensitive receptors.

- The following mitigation measures, as more fully described in the Final EIR, are hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided herein, to mitigate the potentially significant impact of Impact NO-1.
  - **Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a**: Reduce Noise Levels During Construction
  - **Mitigation Measure M-NO-1b**: Noise-Reducing Techniques and Muffling Devices for Pile Installation

- Based on the final EIR and the entire administrative record, it is hereby found and determined that implementing Mitigation Measures M-NO-1a and M-NO-1b would reduce Impact NO-1 to a less than significant level because Mitigation Measure M-NO-1 would require the project contractor to use equipment with lower noise emissions and sound controls or barriers where feasible, locate stationary equipment as far as possible from sensitive receptors, and designate a noise coordinator, and Mitigation Measure M-NO-1b would require the use of feasible noise-reducing techniques for installing piles. The combination of these measures would decrease construction noise levels and minimize the significant effects.

- **Impact NO-2**: Construction of the proposed project would result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.
  - Proposed project demolition, excavation, and building construction activities would temporarily generate groundborne vibration in the project vicinity that could be considered an annoyance by occupants of adjacent properties, especially residential and cultural uses adjacent to the site, and could also damage nearby structures, with the highest levels of groundborne vibration expected during demolition and the installation of piles for structural support. This would be a potentially significant impact under CEQA.
  - The following mitigation measures, as more fully described in the Final EIR, are hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided herein, to mitigate the potentially significant impact of Impact NO-2.
    - **Mitigation Measure M-NO-2a**: Minimize Vibration Levels During Construction
    - **Mitigation Measure M-NO-2b**: Pre-Construction Assessment to Protect Structures from Ground Vibration Associated with Pile Installation
    - **Mitigation Measure M-NO-2c**: Vibration Monitoring and Management Plan

- Based on the final EIR and the entire administrative record, it is hereby found and determined that implementing Mitigation Measures M-NO-2a, M-NO-2b, and M-NO-2c would reduce Impact NO-2 to a less than significant level because Mitigation Measure M-NO-2a would provide for a community liaison to respond to and address complaints and require protective construction techniques, Mitigation Measure M-NO-2b would implement a pre-construction assessment and, if needed, monitoring during vibration causing activities to detect ground settlement or lateral movement of structures, and Mitigation Measure M-NO-2c would implement a vibration monitoring and management
plan to avoid any adverse vibration-related impact to historic structures. With implementation of Mitigation Measures M-NO-2a and M-NO-2b, potential vibration impacts in the project vicinity would be reduced to levels that would be less than significant. With implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-2c, there would be no significant vibration-related impacts to the Aronson Building.

- **Impact NO-3**: Operation of the proposed project would generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the San Francisco General Plan or noise ordinance and would result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.
  - Operation of the proposed project would introduce additional noise sources to the area, including additional motor vehicle traffic and new mechanical systems, such as ventilation equipment. Although specific information regarding the proposed stationary noise sources is currently not available, building mechanical systems would be capable of generating noise levels in excess of applicable General Plan noise-land use compatibility thresholds on adjacent sensitive receptors, which could result in potentially significant impacts on both the on-site and adjacent noise-sensitive residential and cultural uses.
  - The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided herein, to mitigate the potentially significant impact of Impact NO-3.
    - **Mitigation Measure M-NO-3**: Stationary Operational Noise Sources
      - Based on the final EIR and the entire administrative record, it is hereby found and determined that implementing Mitigation Measures M-NO-3 would reduce Impact NO-3 to a less than significant level because this mitigation measure would require the screening, shielding, or setting back of stationary noise sources from noise-sensitive receptors, and would require that a qualified acoustical consultant measure the noise levels of operating exterior equipment within three months after its installation.

- **Impact C-NO-2**: Construction of the proposed project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity, would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.
  - The project along with other nearby projects such as the SFMOMA Expansion (151 Third Street), the Palace Hotel (2 New Montgomery Street), and the Central Subway project have the potential for cumulatively significant groundborne vibration and noise level impacts, particularly during initial phases of proposed project construction. However, the periods when construction vibration impacts would overlap would be brief and limited, and the overall cumulative construction vibration impacts would not be cumulatively significant.
  - The following mitigation measures, as more fully described in the Final EIR, are hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided herein, to mitigate the potentially significant impact of Impact C-NO-2.
- Mitigation Measure M-NO-2a: Minimize Vibration Levels During Construction
- Mitigation Measure M-NO-2b: Pre-Construction Assessment to Protect Structures from Ground Vibration Associated with Pile Installation
- Mitigation Measure M-NO-2c: Vibration Monitoring and Management Plan

- Based on the final EIR and the entire administrative record, it is hereby found and determined that with implementation of Mitigation Measures M-NO-2a, M-NO-2b, and M-NO-2c, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts associated with groundborne vibration for the reasons discussed under Impact NO-2 above and as more fully set forth in the final EIR.

C. Air Quality

- Impact AQ-3: Construction of the proposed project would generate emissions of PM2.5 and toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, at levels that would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
  - The Air Quality Technical Report that was prepared for the project found that constructions emissions would exceed the threshold of significance for excess cancer risk at the project MEI if the emissions were not mitigated.
  - The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided herein, to mitigate the potentially significant impact of Impact AQ-3.
    - Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3: Construction Emissions Mitigation
  - Based on the final EIR and the entire administrative record, it is hereby found and determined that implementing Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3 would reduce Impact AQ-3 to a less than significant level because this mitigation measure would require a Construction Emissions Mitigation Plan designed to reduce construction-related diesel particulate matter emissions from off-road construction equipment used at the site by at least 65 percent as compared to the construction equipment list, schedule, and inventory provided by the sponsor on May 27, 2011, which would bring emissions below the threshold of significance for excess cancer risk.

D. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- Impact HZ-2: The proposed project would have a substantial adverse effect on the public or the environment through the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment.
  - In order to construct the proposed tower, excavation to a depth of approximately 41 feet below the surface on the west side of the Aronson Building would be required, which could have the potential to expose the public and environment to contaminants in the soil.
  - The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided herein, to mitigate the potentially significant impact of Impact HZ-2.
  - Based on the final EIR and the entire administrative record, it is hereby found and determined that implementing Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2 would reduce Impact HZ-2 to a less than significant level because this mitigation measure would require soil testing for contaminants of concern, preparation of a Soil Mitigation Plan for managing contaminated soils on the site, and protocols for the handling, hauling, and disposal of contaminated soils, which would reduce the potential for exposure of the public and the environment to a less than significant level.

The Project Sponsor has agreed to implement all mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR for the project. The required mitigation measures are fully enforceable and will be included as conditions of approval by and the Commission and other City decision makers. Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081.6, adopted mitigation measures will be implemented and monitored as described in the MMRP, which is incorporated herein by reference.

With the required mitigation measures, all potential project impacts, with the exception of impacts described in Section IV below, would be avoided or reduced to a less-than-significant level.

As authorized by CEQA Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, 15092, and 15093, based on substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding, the City finds that, unless otherwise stated, all of the changes or alterations to the Project identified in the mitigation measures have been or will be required in, or incorporated into, the Project to mitigate or avoid the significant or potentially significant environmental impacts listed herein, as identified in the Final EIR, that these mitigation measures will be effective to reduce or avoid the potentially significant impacts as described in the EIR, and these mitigation measures are feasible to implement and are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City and County of San Francisco to implement or enforce.

IV. Significant Impacts That Cannot Be Avoided Or Reduced To A Less-Than-Significant Level

Based on substantial evidence in the whole record of these proceedings, the Commission finds that, where feasible, changes or alterations have been required, or incorporated into, the Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental impacts. The Commission finds that changes have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21002 and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, may substantially lessen, but do not avoid (i.e., reduce to less than significant levels), the potentially significant environmental effect associated with implementation of the Project. The Commission adopts all of the mitigation measures proposed in the Final EIR and set forth in the MMRP. The Commission further finds, however, for the impact listed below, despite the implementation of mitigation measures, the effects remain significant and unavoidable.

The Commission determines that the following significant impact on the environment, as reflected in the Final EIR, is unavoidable, but under Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(3) and (b), and CEQA Guidelines 15091(a)(3), 15092(b)(2)(B), and 15093, the Commission determines that the impacts are acceptable due to the overriding considerations described in Section VI below. This finding is supported by substantial evidence in the record of this proceeding.
A. Significant and Unavoidable Impacts – Cumulative Shadow

- **Impact C-WS-2:** The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity, would create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas, resulting in a significant cumulative shadow impact. The proposed project would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to this significant cumulative shadow impact.

  - There are several proposed projects in the project vicinity that have the potential to shadow outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas, including some of the same open spaces that the proposed project would shadow. Reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity of the project site include 151 Third Street (the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art Expansion Project), 2 New Montgomery Street (the Palace Hotel Project), and the Transit Tower, and the other projects contemplated by the Transit Center District Plan. The proposed project in combination with other proposed projects in the vicinity would add new shadow on various open spaces and public areas. By contributing shadow to open spaces and public areas, the proposed project would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to the significant and unavoidable cumulative shadow impacts.

  - There is no feasible mitigation for the proposed project’s contribution to cumulative shadow impacts, because any theoretical mitigation that would address the cumulatively considerable contribution to shadow impacts on outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas within the project vicinity would fundamentally alter the project’s basic design and programming parameters. Thus, rather than treat a substantial reduction in height as a mitigation measure, the EIR analyzed a reduction in height in two separate alternatives. With regard to the project’s shadow impacts on Union Square, other than a reduction in the height of the tower to approximately 351 feet or less, no further modification of the tower could eliminate the tower’s net new shadow on Union Square. The project has already undergone design revisions to sculpt the top of the tower in order to reduce shadow on Union Square. The original project proposed by the project sponsor included an elliptical tower design that was approximately 630 feet tall and 170 feet wide at the highest level. That proposal was modified to reflect a shorter and more slender rectangular tower design that was shifted to the west on the project site to reduce shadow impacts on Union Square. The rectangular design ultimately chosen for the project would break up the tower massing and top into smaller volumes at different or staggered heights, particularly along the eastern edge of the site and tower, to further reduce shadow. In addition, the tower massing and the tower core were moved 15 feet to the west on the project site, and the tower cantilever over the Aronson Building was reduced from 106 feet to 8 feet to further reduce shadow impacts on Union Square.

  - On May 21, 2013, a technical memorandum prepared by Turnstone Consulting was submitted analyzing the shadow impacts of the Project on Union Square, based on the
reduced 480-foot roof height. The memorandum concluded that the Project would cast 238,788 sf of net new shadow on Union Square on a yearly basis, which would be an increase of about 0.06% of the Theoretically Available Annual Sunlight (TAAS) on Union Square. The reduction in the height of the tower results in a reduction of approximately 29% of net new shadow compared with the Project’s 520-foot tower design.

- Even if the project’s shadow impacts to Union Square were eliminated, the project would still shadow other downtown open spaces and public areas such as sidewalks. A further reduction of the building height beyond that already included would substantially reduce the development program of the proposed project. Thus, the project’s cumulatively considerable contribution to the significant and unavoidable impact would remain and there is no feasible mitigation to reduce the project’s contribution to this significant cumulative impact to a less-than-cumulatively considerable level. Because a significant decrease in the tower height affects the Project significantly, these height reductions were discussed as alternatives. See also the discussion of the Existing Zoning Alternative and the Reduced Shadow Alternative, below.

- Therefore, the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity would create new cumulative shadow in a manner that would substantially affect parks, outdoor recreation facilities, or other public areas. This cumulative shadow impact would be significant and unavoidable, and the proposed project would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to this significant cumulative shadow impact.

V. Alternatives Rejected and the Reasons for Rejecting Them as Infeasible

The Commission rejects the Alternatives set forth in the Final EIR and listed below because the Commission finds that there is substantial evidence, including evidence of economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations described in this Section, in addition to those described in Section VI below, under CEQA Guidelines 15091(a)(3), that make infeasible such Alternatives. In making these determinations, the 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 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 Commission adopts the EIR’s analysis and conclusions regarding alternatives eliminated from further consideration, both during the scoping process and in response to comments. The Commission certifies that it has independently reviewed and considered the information on the alternatives provided in the Final EIR and in the record. The Project Sponsor engaged Economic & Planning Systems, Inc. to prepare an economic analysis of the financial feasibility of the project alternatives described in the EIR. (Report on the Financial Feasibility of 706 Mission Street: The Mexican Museum and Residential Tower Project and Alternatives, dated May 2013 (the "EPS Report"). The Successor Agency retained an independent
economic consultant Keyser Marston Associates, Inc., to peer review the EPS Report and Keyser Marston Associates prepared the "Peer Review of Financial Feasibility Report for 706 Mission Street" ("Peer Review"). The Peer Review, independently reviewed and evaluated by the Successor Agency, concurs with the results of the EPS Report. Planning Department staff and the Commission have independently reviewed and concur with the results of the EPS Report and the Peer Review. The Final EIR reflects the Commission's and the City's independent judgment as to the alternatives.

The Commission finds that the Project provides the best balance between satisfaction of the project objectives and mitigation of environmental impacts to the extent feasible, as described and analyzed in the EIR, and adopts a statement of overriding considerations as set forth in Section VI below.

While the Commission makes these findings regarding the environmental impacts and feasibility of each of the alternatives analyzed in the final EIR, if feasible mitigation measures substantially lessen or avoid the significant adverse environmental effects of a project, the project may be approved without an evaluation of the feasibility of project alternatives. *Laurel Hills Homeowners Association v. City Council of Los Angeles*, 83 Cal.App.3d 515, 521 (1978). With respect to the project, all significant impacts can be reduced to a less than significant level with feasible mitigation measures, except for the project’s cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative shadow impacts. Thus, although the Commission makes these findings regarding the environmental impacts of each of the alternatives, CEQA only requires that the Commission make findings regarding the alternatives that would substantially lessen or avoid the project’s cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative shadow impacts. Findings for the Separate Buildings Alternative and Increased Residential Density Alternative are therefore not required by CEQA, although the Commission nevertheless makes findings for those alternatives below.

The FEIR analyzed five alternatives to the Project: No Project Alternative, Existing Zoning Alternative, Separate Buildings Alternative, Increased Residential Density Alternative, and Reduced Shadow Alternative. These alternatives and the reasons for rejecting them are described below.

1. **No Project Alternative**

Under the No Project Alternative, the site would remain in its existing condition. Assuming that the existing physical conditions at the project site would remain into the foreseeable future, none of the impacts associated with the proposed project would occur.

The No Project Alternative would not create net new shadow on Union Square, or any other public open spaces, privately owned publicly accessible open spaces, or public sidewalks, and therefore would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the significant unavoidable cumulative shadow impact. Because existing conditions on the project site would not change under this alternative, there would be no impacts related to land use and land use planning, aesthetics, population and housing, cultural and paleontological resources, transportation and circulation, noise, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, wind, recreation, utilities and service systems, public services, biological resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, hazards and hazardous materials, mineral and energy resources or agricultural and forest resources. Under the proposed project, the impacts with respect to these environmental topics would be either less than significant or less than significant with mitigation, except
for agricultural and forest resources. Both the No Project Alternative and the proposed project would have no impact on agricultural and forest resources.

The No Project Alternative would not be desirable or meet either the Successor Agency or the Project Sponsor’s objectives, as more particularly described below. The No Project Alternative is rejected in favor of the project and is found infeasible for the following environmental, economic, legal, social, technological, and/or other reasons:

- The No Project Alternative would not meet any of the Successor Agency or the Project Sponsor’s objectives.

- The No Project Alternative would not complete the redevelopment of the YBC Redevelopment Project Area envisioned under the former Yerba Buena Center Redevelopment Plan.

- The No Project Alternative would not stimulate and attract private investment and generate sales taxes and other General Fund revenues from new uses on the project site, thereby improving the City’s overall economic health, employment opportunities, tax base, and community economic development opportunities.

- The No Project Alternative would not provide for the development of a museum facility and an endowment for The Mexican Museum on Successor Agency-owned property located adjacent to Jessie Square, at the heart of San Francisco’s cultural district location, in a manner that is consistent with General Plan Policy VI-1.9, to “create opportunities for private developers to include arts spaces in private developments city-wide.”

- The No Project Alternative would not result in construction of a preeminent building with a superior level of design for this important site across from Yerba Buena Gardens and adjacent to Jessie Square in a manner that complements the landscaping and design of Jessie Square.

- The No Project Alternative would not provide housing in an urban infill location to help alleviate the effects of suburban sprawl.

- The No Project Alternative would not provide temporary and permanent employment and contracting opportunities for minorities, women, qualified economically disadvantaged individuals, and other residents both in the South of Market area and in the City generally, in a manner consistent with the City’s current and future equal opportunity programs.

- The No Project Alternative would not maximize the quality of the pedestrian experience along Mission Street and Third Street, while maintaining accessibility to the project site for automobiles and loading.

- The No Project Alternative would not provide for rehabilitation of the historically important Aronson Building.
• The No Project Alternative would not secure funding for new and affordable below-market-rate units.

• The No Project Alternative would not secure additional funding for operations, management, and security of Yerba Buena Gardens.

• The No Project Alternative would not result in the construction of a residential building of superior quality and design that complements and is generally consistent with the downtown area, furthering the objectives of the General Plan's Urban Design Element and the former Yerba Buena Center Redevelopment Plan.

• The No Project Alternative would not redevelop the project site with a high-quality residential development that includes a ground-floor retail or restaurant use.

• The No Project Alternative would not provide housing in downtown San Francisco that is accessible to local and regional transit, as well as cultural amenities and attractions, such as performing art centers, and art museums and exhibitions.

The Commission finds each of these reasons provide sufficient independent grounds for rejecting the No Project Alternative.

2. **Existing Zoning Alternative**

The intent of the Existing Zoning Alternative is to provide an alternative that meets all applicable provisions of the Planning Code and existing zoning for the project site. In addition, this alternative would reduce the significant and unavoidable cumulative shadow impacts compared to the proposed project, but not to a less than significant level. Under this alternative, a new 13-story, approximately 196-foot-tall building with a 9.0 to 1 FAR would be constructed adjacent to and west of the Aronson Building. As with the proposed project, the Aronson Building would be restored and rehabilitated, and the new building would be connected to it. This alternative would provide an approximately 45,000-gsf cultural space for The Mexican Museum, compared to the approximately 52,285-gsf of cultural space provided for the museum under the proposed project. Vehicular access into and out of the existing subsurface Jessie Square Garage would not change from existing conditions. Unlike the proposed project, under this alternative, there would not be a driveway on Third Street to serve the residential units. The vehicular access variants analyzed for the proposed project would not apply to this alternative.

The Existing Zoning Alternative would reduce as compared to the proposed project the cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant and unavoidable cumulative shadow impact, but not to a less than cumulatively considerable level. While the reduced building height of the new tower under this alternative would not create net new shadow on Union Square, unlike the proposed project, shadow from the proposed tower could still reach some of the same public open spaces, privately owned publicly accessible open spaces, and public sidewalks that would be shadowed by the proposed project, and therefore may contribute to a cumulatively significant shadow impact. As with the proposed project (but generally to a lesser degree than with the proposed project), there would be less-than-significant impacts
related to land use and land use planning, aesthetics, population and housing, transportation and circulation, greenhouse gas emissions, wind, recreation, utilities and service systems, public services, biological resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, and mineral and energy resources. As with the proposed project (but generally to a lesser degree than with the proposed project), there would be less-than-significant impacts with mitigation related to cultural and paleontological resources, noise, air quality, and hazards and hazardous materials. Both the Existing Zoning Alternative and the proposed project would have no impact on agricultural and forest resources.

The Existing Zoning Alternative would meet some, but not all, of the Successor Agency and Project Sponsor’s objectives. For example, it would attract private investment and generate sales taxes and other General Fund revenues from new uses on the project site, and would provide housing in an urban infill location, near transit and cultural amenities to help alleviate the effects of suburban sprawl, although not as much housing as under the proposed project. The Existing Zoning Alternative would provide temporary and permanent employment and contracting opportunities for minorities, women, qualified economically disadvantaged individuals, and other residents although the scope of these alternatives would be less than with the proposed project due to the reduced size of the Existing Zoning Alternative. The Existing Zoning Alternative would provide for rehabilitation of the historically important Aronson Building. The Existing Zoning Alternative would design and construct the project to a minimum of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Silver standards (or such higher and additional requirements as adopted by the City and County of San Francisco), thereby reducing the project’s carbon footprint and maximizing the energy efficiency of the building.

But, the Existing Zoning Alternative would reduce but not avoid the proposed project’s cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant and unavoidable cumulative shadow impact, although the reduced height of the new tower under this alternative would not create net new shadow on Union Square. Furthermore, the Existing Zoning Alternative would not be desirable or meet many of the Successor Agency and Project Sponsor’s objectives and/or would not advance those objectives to the extent that the proposed project would, as more particularly described below.

The EPS Report indicates that the Existing Zoning Alternative is not financially feasible because project costs plus developer targeted return would exceed project revenues under this alternative. The Existing Zoning Alternative is not financially feasible with or without the purchase of TDRs because under this Alternative, the height of the tower is reduced, which reduces the number of revenue generating units, and per square foot construction costs are highest under this alternative due to a decrease in construction cost efficiency. Additionally, the Jessie Square Garage would not be conveyed to the Project Sponsor under this alternative, which means the Alternative does not include defeasance of the outstanding Jessie Square Garage bonds or repayment of the Successor Agency’s debt to the City. It also does not generate parking-related revenue.

The Existing Zoning Alternative is projected to generate approximately $149 million under the Residential Flex Option. With the purchase of TDRs, projected development costs, including developer return, are approximately $292 million under the Residential Flex Option. The Project Residuals, above the minimum return on investment needed for project feasibility, are estimated at approximately negative $142.6 million under the Residential Flex Option. With the purchase of TDRs, the Project Residuals for
this Alternative are estimated at approximately negative $143.4 million under the Residential Flex Option. The Peer Review concurs with this opinion.

Therefore, the Existing Zoning Alternative is rejected in favor of the project and is found infeasible for the following environmental, economic, legal, social, technological, and/or other reasons:

- The Existing Zoning Alternative would not avoid the proposed project’s cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant and unavoidable cumulative shadow impact.

- The Existing Zoning Alternative would not transfer ownership of the Jessie Square Garage to a private entity and therefore does not include defeasance of the outstanding Jessie Square Garage bonds or repayment of the Successor Agency’s debt to the City.

- The Existing Zoning Alternative would not create a development that meets the Successor Agency’s and Project Sponsor’s objective to be financially feasible with the ability to fund the Project’s capital costs and ongoing operation and maintenance costs related to the redevelopment and long-term operation of the Mexican Museum parcel without reliance on public funds.

- Because the Existing Zoning Alternative would not create a development that is financially feasible, the Existing Zoning Alternative would not be constructed, and none of the benefits associated with the Project, such as the construction of The Mexican Museum core and shell at no cost to the Successor Agency or City, the endowment for The Mexican Museum, funding for new and affordable market rate units, rehabilitation of the historically important Aronson Building, defeasance of the outstanding Jessie Square Garage bonds and repayment of the Successor Agency’s debt to the City, or additional funding for operations, management, and security of Yerba Buena Gardens, would exist under this Alternative. Thus the Existing Zoning Alternative is infeasible because it does not meet the Successor’s Agency’s objectives to: complete the redevelopment of the Yerba Buena Redevelopment Project Area; to stimulate and attract private development on the site; to provide for the development of a museum facility and an endowment for that facility; and others noted in the EIR on pages II.5 to II.6.

- Because the Existing Zoning Alternative substantially reduces the residential density and the number of housing units produced at this site, this Alternative is infeasible because it does not fully satisfy General Plan policies such as Housing Element Policies 1.1 and 1.4, among others noted in the Department’s staff report accompany the Project Approvals on the Determination of Compliance with Section 309, among other approvals. The Project site is well-served by transit, services and shopping and is suited for dense residential development, where residents can commute and satisfy convenience needs without frequent use of a private automobile. The Project Site is located immediately adjacent to employment opportunities within the Downtown Core, and is in an area with abundant local and region-serving transit options, including the future Transit Center. For these reasons, a project with fewer residential units at this site is not compatible with the General Plan and is infeasible.
• The Existing Zoning Alternative is infeasible because it substantially reduces the residential density and the number of housing units produced at this site, and thus does not meet the Successor Agency’s objectives to the extent that the Project does. Among other objectives, the Existing Zoning Alternative would not stimulate and attractive private investment, sales tax and other General Fund revenues to the extent that the Project would; would not provide temporary and permanent jobs to the extent that the Project would; and due to its reduced height, it may not provide a preeminent building of the same stature as the Project.

The Commission finds each of these reasons provide sufficient independent grounds for rejecting the Existing Zoning Alternative.

3. Separate Buildings Alternative

The purpose of the Separate Buildings Alternative is to minimize changes to the Aronson Building, while still meeting most of the Project Sponsor’s objectives and the objectives of the Successor Agency. Under this alternative, a new 47-story, 520-foot-tall building (with 30 foot tall mechanical/elevator penthouse) would be constructed adjacent to and west of the Aronson Building. The Mexican Museum would occupy space on the first through fifth floors of the new building. Unlike the proposed project, the new building would not be connected to the Aronson Building. Unlike the proposed project, the Separate Buildings Alternative would not undertake the full scope of rehabilitation and restoration of the Aronson Building; only repairs and improvements necessary to prevent further deterioration of the Aronson Building or to permit continued occupancy of the Aronson Building would be undertaken. However, the two non-historic annexes would still be demolished under this alternative. This alternative would include a down ramp along the north side of the Aronson Building from Third Street. The existing curb cut on Third Street would be used to provide vehicular ingress to the existing Jessie Square Garage by project residents for below-grade valet access and project-related delivery and service vehicles via a ramp. The vehicular access variants analyzed for the proposed project would not apply to this alternative.

The Separate Buildings Alternative would result in similar project-level and cumulative impacts as identified under the proposed project. Since the building design and configuration of the proposed tower would be the same as under the proposed project, this alternative would result in significant unavoidable cumulative shadow impact due to the creation of net new shadow on public open spaces, privately owned publicly accessible open spaces, and public sidewalks. As with the proposed project, there would be less-than-significant impacts related to land use and land use planning, aesthetics, population and housing, transportation and circulation, greenhouse gas emissions, wind, recreation, utilities and service systems, public services, biological resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, and mineral and energy resources. As with the proposed project, there would be less-than-significant impacts with mitigation related to cultural and paleontological resources, noise, air quality, and hazards and hazardous materials. Both the Separate Buildings Alternative and the proposed project would have no impact on agricultural and forest resources.

The Separate Building Alternative would meet some but not all of the Successor Agency and Project Sponsor’s objectives. It would complete the redevelopment of the YBC Redevelopment Project Area envisioned under the former Yerba Buena Center Redevelopment Plan and stimulate and attract private investment and generate sales taxes and other General Fund revenues from new uses on the project site. The Separate Buildings Alternative would provide for the development of a museum facility for The
Mexican Museum. It would provide housing, near transit and cultural amenities, in an urban infill location to help alleviate the effects of suburban sprawl, although not as many housing units as under the proposed project. The Separate Buildings Alternative would provide temporary and permanent employment and contracting opportunities for minorities, women, qualified economically disadvantaged individuals, and other residents, although not as many opportunities as with the proposed project. The Separate Buildings Alternative would transfer ownership of the Jessie Square Garage to a private entity, while providing adequate parking for other cultural uses. The Separate Buildings Alternative would design and construct the project to a minimum of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Silver standards (or such higher and additional requirements as adopted by the City and County of San Francisco), thereby reducing the project’s carbon footprint.

The Separate Buildings Alternative would result in similar project-level and cumulative impacts as the proposed project, and would not avoid or substantially lessen the proposed project’s cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant and unavoidable cumulative shadow impact. The Separate Buildings Alternative would not be desirable or meet some of the Successor Agency or the Project Sponsor’s objectives, and/or would not advance those objectives to the extent that the proposed project would, as more particularly described below. Therefore, the Separate Buildings Alternative is rejected in favor of the project and is found infeasible for the following environmental, economic, legal, social, technological, and/or other reasons:

- The Separate Buildings Alternative would result in similar project-level and cumulative impacts as the proposed project, and, most significantly, would not avoid or substantially lessen the project’s cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative shadow impact.

- The Separate Buildings Alternative would not undertake the full scope of rehabilitation and restoration of the historically important Aronson Building as would be the case under the proposed project. Instead, only repairs and improvements necessary to prevent further deterioration and/or to permit continued occupancy would be undertaken meaning that the objective of rehabilitating the building would not be met.

The Commission finds each of these reasons provide sufficient independent grounds for rejecting the Separate Buildings Alternative.

4. Increased Residential Density Alternative

The purpose of the Increased Residential Density Alternative is to consider a project that would provide more residential dwelling units within the same amount of floor area as would be provided by the proposed project. Under this alternative, a new 47-story, 520-foot-tall building (with 30 foot tall elevator/mechanical penthouse) would be constructed adjacent to and west of the Aronson Building. As with the proposed project, the Aronson Building would be restored and rehabilitated, and the new building would be connected to the Aronson Building. As with the proposed project, seven floors in the Aronson Building would be designated as flex space for the residential and office flex options. Under the residential flex option, the Aronson Building would include up to 325 residential units (110 more units than under the proposed project) and no office space. Under the office flex option, this building would include up to 283 residential units (92 more units than under the proposed project) and approximately
61,320 gsf of office space. As with the proposed project, the Increased Residential Density Alternative would use the existing curb cut on Third Street to provide vehicular ingress to the existing Jessie Square Garage. This access would be for use by project residents only. As with the proposed project, this alternative would include a residential drop-off area (vehicular access would be the same as under the proposed project). The vehicular access variants analyzed for the proposed project would also apply to this alternative.

The Increased Residential Density Alternative would result in similar project-level and cumulative impacts as identified under the proposed project, although some of the alternative’s impacts, such as traffic and circulation and air quality during project operations, would be slightly greater because of the increased density. The Increased Residential Density Alternative would not avoid or reduce any significant environmental effects of the proposed project. Because the building design and configuration of the proposed tower would be the same as under the proposed project, this alternative would result in significant unavoidable cumulative shadow impact due to the creation of net new shadow on Union Square and other public open spaces, privately owned publicly accessible open spaces, and public sidewalks. As with the proposed project, there would be less-than-significant impacts related to land use and land use planning, aesthetics, population and housing, transportation and circulation, greenhouse gas emissions, wind, recreation, utilities and service systems, public services, biological resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, and mineral and energy resources. As with the proposed project, there would be less-than-significant impacts with mitigation related to cultural and paleontological resources, noise, air quality, and hazards and hazardous materials. Both the Increased Residential Density Alternative and the proposed project would have no impact on agricultural and forest resources.

The Increased Residential Density Alternative would meet some but not all of the Project Sponsor’s objectives. For example, it would stimulate and attract private investment and generate sales taxes and other General Fund revenues from new uses on the project site, and result in the construction of a preeminent building at this important site across from Yerba Buena Gardens and adjacent to Jessie Square. The Increased Residential Density Alternative would provide housing, close to transit and cultural amenities, in an urban infill location to help alleviate the effects of suburban sprawl. It would provide temporary and permanent employment and contracting opportunities for minorities, women, qualified economically disadvantaged individuals, and other residents, and would transfer ownership of the Jessie Square Garage to a private entity, while providing adequate parking for other existing nonprofit organizations and the public in the Jessie Square Garage. The Increased Residential Density Alternative would provide for rehabilitation of the historically important Aronson Building and would design and construct the project to a minimum of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Silver standards (or such higher and additional requirements as adopted by the City and County of San Francisco), thereby reducing the project’s carbon footprint and maximizing the energy efficiency of the building.

But, the Increased Residential Density Alternative would result in similar project-level and cumulative impacts as identified under the proposed project, would slightly increase some impacts, and would not avoid or substantially lessen the proposed project’s cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant and unavoidable cumulative shadow impact.
The Increased Residential Density Alternative would meet most of the Successor Agency and Project Sponsor’s objectives but not all of the Successor Agency or Project Sponsor’s Objectives. In addition, according to the EPS Report, the Increased Residential Density Alternative is not financially feasible because project costs plus developer targeted return would exceed project revenues under this alternative. The Increased Residential Density Alternative is not financially feasible because the direct per square foot construction costs are higher under the Increased Residential Density Alternative than under the Proposed Project. Though there are more units in the Increased Residential Density Alternative than there are in the Proposed Project, the overall square footage is the same. Because residential revenue is based on a per square foot price (rather than a per unit price), the residential revenue is similar to the Proposed Project.

The Increased Residential Density Alternative is projected to generate approximately $585 million under the Residential Flex Option. Projected development costs, including developer return, are approximately $610 million under the Residential Flex Option. The Project Residuals, above the minimum return on investment needed for project feasibility, are estimated at approximately negative $25.6 million under the Residential Flex Option. The Peer Review concurs with this opinion.

The Increased Residential Density Alternative is rejected in favor of the project and is found not to be feasible or desirable for the following environmental, economic, legal, social, technological, and/or other reasons:

- The Increased Residential Density Alternative would result in similar project-level and cumulative impacts as identified under the proposed project, would slightly increase some impacts, and would not avoid or reduce any significant environmental effects of the proposed project. Specifically, when compared to the proposed project, this alternative would result in incrementally increased impacts under Transportation and Circulation (additional trips on already impacted intersections; additional demand on transit service), Air Quality (additional project related operational emissions), Greenhouse Gas (additional project related emissions increasing the project’s carbon footprint), Recreation (additional residents seeking recreation facilities), Public Services (additional residents seeking police or fire protection services), and Utilities and Service Systems (additional residents increasing water usage and generating additional wastewater).

- The Increased Residential Density Alternative would not meet the objective to create a development that is financially feasible and that can fund the Project’s capital costs and ongoing operation and maintenance costs related to the redevelopment and long-term operation of the Mexican Museum parcel without reliance on public funds.

- Because the Increased Residential Density Alternative would not create a development that is financially feasible, the Increased Density Alternative would not be constructed, and none of the benefits associated with the Project, such as the construction of The Mexican Museum core and shell at no cost to the Successor Agency or City, the endowment for The Mexican Museum, funding for new and affordable market rate units, rehabilitation of the historically important
Aronson Building, defeasance of the outstanding Jessie Square Garage bonds and repayment of the Successor Agency's debt to the City, or additional funding for operations, management, and security of Yerba Buena Gardens, would exist under this Alternative. Thus the Increased Residential Density Alternative is infeasible because it does not meet the Successor's Agency's objectives mentioned above including, but not limited to: complete the redevelopment of the Yerba Buena Redevelopment Project Area; to stimulate and attract private development on the site; to provide for the development of a museum facility and an endowment for that facility; and others noted in the EIR on pages II.5 to II.6.

The Commission finds each of these reasons provide sufficient independent grounds for rejecting the Increased Residential Density Alternative.

5. **Reduced Shadow Alternative**

The purpose of the Reduced Shadow Alternative is to reduce the shadow impacts that would be caused by development under the proposed project. Under this alternative, a new 27-story, approximately 351-foot-tall tower, including a mechanical penthouse, would be constructed adjacent to, west of and connected to the Aronson Building, with approximately 45,000 gsf of cultural space for The Mexican Museum as compared to approximately 52,285 square feet under the proposed project. As with the proposed project, the Aronson Building would be restored and rehabilitated. This alternative's residential flex option would include up to 186 residential units (4 fewer residential units than planned under the Proposed Project). This alternative's office flex option would include up to 162 residential units and approximately 52,560 gsf of office space. This alternative would also include approximately 4,800 gsf of retail/restaurant space. As under the proposed project, the Jessie Square Garage would be converted from a public garage to a private garage. Unlike the proposed project, the Reduced Shadow Alternative would not include a driveway from Third Street to serve the residential units. Vehicular access into and out of the existing subsurface Jessie Square Garage would not change from under existing conditions. The vehicular access variants analyzed for the proposed project would not apply to this alternative. The Reduced Shadow Alternative, like the proposed project, would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant and unavoidable cumulative shadow impact. Although the reduced building height of the new tower under this alternative would substantially reduce shadow impacts and would not create net new shadow on Union Square, unlike the proposed project, shadow from the proposed tower could still reach some of the same public open spaces, privately owned publicly accessible open spaces, and public sidewalks that would be shadowed by the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative may contribute to a cumulatively significant shadow impact. As with the proposed project (but generally to a lesser degree than with the proposed project), there would be less-than-significant impacts related to land use and land use planning, aesthetics, population and housing, transportation and circulation, greenhouse gas emissions, wind, recreation, utilities and service systems, public services, biological resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, and mineral and energy resources. As with the proposed project (but generally to a lesser degree than with the proposed project), there would be less-than-significant impacts with mitigation related to cultural and paleontological resources, noise, air quality, and hazards and hazardous materials. Both the Reduced Shadow Alternative and the proposed project would have no impact on agricultural and forest resources.
The Reduced Shadow Alternative would meet some, but not all of the Successor Agency and Project Sponsor’s objectives. It would complete redevelopment of the YBC Redevelopment Project Area envisioned under the Yerba Buena Center Redevelopment Plan and attract private investment and generate sales taxes and other General Fund revenues from new uses on the project site, although to a lesser extent than with the proposed project. The Reduced Shadow Alternative would provide housing, close to transit and cultural amenities, in an urban infill location to help alleviate the effects of suburban sprawl, although fewer housing units than with the proposed project. The Reduced Shadow Alternative would provide temporary and permanent employment and contracting opportunities for minorities, women, qualified economically disadvantaged individuals, and other residents, although to a lesser extent than with the proposed project. The Reduced Shadow Alternative would transfer ownership of the Jessie Square Garage to a private entity, while providing adequate parking in the Jessie Square Garage for adjacent nonprofit organizations and the public. The Reduced Shadow Alternative would provide for rehabilitation of the historically important Aronson Building and would design and construct the project to a minimum of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Silver standards (or such higher and additional requirements as adopted by the City and County of San Francisco), thereby reducing the project’s carbon footprint and maximizing the energy efficiency of the building.

The Reduced Shadow Alternative, like the proposed project, would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant and unavoidable cumulative shadow impact, although the reduced building height of the new tower under this alternative would reduce shadow impacts and would not create new shadow on Union Square. The Reduced Shadow Alternative would not be desirable or meet many of the Successor Agency or Project Sponsor’s objectives, and/or would not advance those objectives to the extent that the proposed project would, as more particularly described below.

In addition, according to the EPS Report, the Reduced Shadow Alternative is not financially feasible because project costs plus developer targeted return would exceed project revenues under this alternative. The Reduced Shadow Alternative is not financially feasible with or without the purchase of TDRs. In this Alternative, the height of the tower is reduced from 480 feet in the Proposed Project to 351 feet, which reduces the number of residential units to 186 under the Residential Flex Option and reduces potential revenue from residential sales. There are fewer units to generate revenue, and the number of upper floors of the Project, which command substantial price premiums due to views, are not available under the Reduced Shadow Alternative. At the same time, per square foot development costs are higher under the Reduced Shadow Alternative relative to the Proposed Project due to a decrease in construction cost efficiency. Within certain construction type thresholds, the taller the structure, the lower the cost per square foot due to cost-spreading efficiencies. The combination of these factors results in an alternative that is not financially feasible.

The Reduced Shadow Alternative is projected to generate approximately $313 million under the Residential Flex Option. With the purchase of TDRs, projected development costs, including developer return, are approximately $452 million under the Residential Flex Option. The Project Residuals, above the minimum return on investment needed for project feasibility, are estimated at approximately $137.6 million under the Residential Flex Option. With the purchase of TDRs, the Project Residuals for this Alternative are estimated at approximately $139.5 million under the Residential Flex Option. The Peer Review concurs with this opinion.
The Reduced Shadow Alternative is rejected in favor of the project and is found infeasible for the following environmental, economic, legal, social, technological, and/or other reasons:

- While the Reduced Shadow Alternative would include a reduced height tower of 27-stories as compared to the proposed project’s 43-story tower and would create a no net new shadow on Union Square, its shadow could still reach some of the same public open spaces, privately owned publicly accessible open spaces, and public sidewalks that would be shadowed by the proposed project.

- The Reduced Shadow Alternative would not result in a development that is financially feasible and thus does not meet the Successor Agency’s and Project Sponsor’s objective to create a financially feasible project that can fund the project’s capital costs and ongoing operation and maintenance costs related to the redevelopment and long-term operation of the Mexican Museum parcel without reliance on public funds.

- Because the Reduced Shadow Alternative would not create a development that is financially feasible, the Reduced Shadow Alternative would not be constructed, and none of the benefits associated with the Project, such as the construction of The Mexican Museum core and shell at no cost to the Successor Agency or City, the endowment for The Mexican Museum, funding for new and affordable market rate units, rehabilitation of the historically important Aronson Building, defeasance of the outstanding Jessie Square Garage bonds and repayment of the Successor Agency’s debt to the City, or additional funding for operations, management, and security of Yerba Buena Gardens, would exist under this Alternative. Thus the Reduced Shadow Alternative is infeasible because it does not meet the Successor’s Agency’s objectives to: complete the redevelopment of the Yerba Buena Redevelopment Project Area; to stimulate and attract private development on the site; to provide for the development of a museum facility and an endowment for that facility; and others noted in the EIR on pages II.5 to II.6.

- Because the Reduced Shadow Alternative substantially reduces the residential density and the number of housing units produced at this site, this Alternative is infeasible because it does not fully satisfy General Plan policies such as Housing Element Policies 1.1 and 1.4, among others noted in the Department’s staff report accompany the Project Approvals on the Determination of Compliance with Section 309, among other approvals. The Project site is well-served by transit, services and shopping and is suited for dense residential development, where residents can commute and satisfy convenience needs without frequent use of a private automobile. The Project Site is located immediately adjacent to employment opportunities within the Downtown Core, and is in an area with abundant local and region-serving transit options, including the future Transit Center. For these reasons, a project with fewer residential units at this site is not compatible with the General Plan and is infeasible.

- The Reduced Shadow Alternative is infeasible because it substantially reduces the residential density and the number of housing units produced at this site, and thus does not meet the Successor Agency’s objectives to the extent that the Project does. Among other objectives, the
Existing Zoning Alternative would not stimulate and attractive private investment, sales tax and other General Fund revenues to the extent that the Project would; would not provide temporary and permanent jobs to the extent that the Project would; and due to its reduced height, it may not provide a preeminent building of the same stature as the Project. t

The Commission finds each of these reasons provide sufficient independent grounds for rejecting the Reduced Shadow Alternative.

Alternatives Rejected and Reasons for Rejection

The EIR identifies alternatives that were considered by the Planning Department as lead agency, or the Successor Agency, but were rejected as infeasible during the design development and scoping process, and explains the reasons underlying this determination. Among the factors that were considered include the failure to meet most of the basic objectives of the proposed project and inability to avoid significant environmental impacts. These considered and rejected alternatives are the Off-Site Alternative, a Freestanding Alternative, an Office Use Alternative, and Elliptical Tower Plan Alternative.

1. **Off-Site Alternative.** An Off-Site Alternative that would consist of a project design and programming similar to the proposed project, but in a different, though comparable infill location within the City and County of San Francisco was considered but rejected. An Off-Site Alternative would not meet many of the project objectives, particularly the objective of completing the redevelopment of the Yerba Buena Center Redevelopment Project Area and providing for the development of a museum facility and endowment for The Mexican Museum on the Successor Agency-owned property adjacent to Jessie Square. An Off-Site Alternative was also rejected since it would not include rehabilitation of the Aronson Building. The Commission finds each of these reasons provide sufficient independent grounds for rejecting the Off-Site Alternative.

2. **Freestanding Alternative.** A Freestanding Alternative that would result in a development on the Mexican Museum parcel of a freestanding museum with no development, including rehabilitation of the Aronson Building, on the 706 Mission Street parcel, was considered and rejected. Construction of a freestanding museum for The Mexican Museum by the prior San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (“SFRA”) was considered not financeable because the SFRA did not, and the Successor Agency does not, have sufficient funds to cover the costs of constructing a freestanding museum on that parcel. Also, this alternative would not meet any of the project objectives. Lastly, a Freestanding Alternative was rejected because it would not result in any reduced impacts that are not already being evaluated in other alternatives, such as the Existing Zoning Alternative. The Commission finds each of these reasons provide sufficient independent grounds for rejecting the Freestanding Alternative.

3. **Office Use Alternative.** An Office Use Alternative that would include only office use in both the proposed tower and Aronson Building was considered and rejected. This alternative was rejected because the proposed project already has an office flex option that includes fewer proposed residential units and office-only use in the existing Aronson Building, and because an Office Use Alternative would generate more peak hour trips than would the proposed project. Further, an Office Use Alternative would not result in any reduced impacts, due to increased trip generation related to a project...
containing more office space. In addition, the Office Use Alternative was rejected because it would not meet the Successor Agency's project objective of providing housing in an urban infill location. The Commission finds each of these reasons provide sufficient independent grounds for rejecting the Office Use Alternative.

4. **Elliptical Tower Plan.** The Environmental Evaluation Application, as originally submitted to the Planning Department in 2008, called for partial demolition of the Aronson Building and construction of a 42-story, approximately 630-foot-tall tower to the west of, adjacent to, and partially within, the Aronson Building at its northwest corner. This scheme was disfavored by Planning Department staff both because of its impacts on the physical integrity of the historic Aronson Building, as well as due to staff concerns regarding aesthetics related to its elliptical tower plan design. The Commission finds each of these reasons provide sufficient independent grounds for rejecting the Elliptical Tower Plan.

**Additional Alternatives Proposed by the Public**

Various comments have proposed additional alternatives to the project. To the extent that these comments addressed the adequacy of the EIR analysis, they were described and analyzed in the RTC. As presented in the record, the Final EIR reviewed a reasonable range of alternatives, and CEQA does not require the City or the project sponsor to consider every proposed alternative so long as the CEQA requirements for alternatives analysis have been satisfied. For the foregoing reasons, as well as economic, legal, social, technological and/or other considerations set forth herein, and elsewhere in the record, these alternatives are rejected.

**VI. Statement of Overriding Considerations**

Pursuant to CEQA section 21081 and CEQA Guideline 15093, the 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 as set forth below independently and collectively outweighs the significant and unavoidable impacts of the project and is an overriding consideration warranting approval of the Project. Any one of the reasons for approval cited below is sufficient to justify approval of the Project. Thus, even if a court were to conclude that not every reason is supported by substantial evidence, the Commission will stand by its determination that each individual reason is sufficient. The substantial evidence supporting the various benefits can be found in the Final EIR and in the documents found in the administrative record.

On the basis of the above findings and the substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding, the Commission specifically finds that there are significant benefits of the Project in spite of the unavoidable significant impacts, and therefore makes this Statement of Overriding Considerations. The Commission further finds that, as part of the process of obtaining Project approval, all significant effects on the environment from implementation of the Project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible. All mitigation measures proposed in the Final EIR for the proposed Project are adopted as part of this approval action. Furthermore, the 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. In addition, the Commission finds that the rejected Project Alternatives are also rejected for the following specific economic, social, or other considerations, in addition to the specific reasons discussed in Section V, above.

- The Project will provide a new permanent home for The Mexican Museum, a longtime cultural attraction of the City. The permanent home of The Mexican Museum will contribute to the City’s reputation as home to first class cultural amenities and attractions.

- The Project will provide a $5 million operating endowment for The Mexican Museum to support its ongoing operations.

- The Project will rehabilitate the historic Aronson Building, which is rated “A” (highest importance) by the Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage and is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places and the California Register of Historical Resources, and which was recently designated as a Category I Significant Building in the expanded New Montgomery-Mission-Second Street Conservation District, and which is in need of repair.

- The Project will create up to 190 new housing units, which will increase the City’s and region’s housing supply. These new housing units will be in close proximity to transit, employment opportunities, and neighborhood serving retail uses.

- The Project will pay an affordable housing in-lieu fee in an amount equivalent to a 28% housing production requirement, which is substantially in excess of the 20% requirement under the City’s Planning Code. The Project’s affordable housing in-lieu fee will be used to construct much needed affordable housing in the City.

- The Project will provide additional private funding for operations, management, and security of Yerba Buena Gardens; funding which would not be available without the project.

- The Project will construct a high quality, world-class, mixed-use development, designed by an internationally recognized architecture firm in accordance with sound urban design principles. The Project will create a new mixed-use residential development on an urban infill site in close proximity to transit, the Downtown and SOMA employment centers, the Yerba Buena cultural district, and retail uses.

- The Project’s residential tower will be built to at least Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Silver construction standards consistent with the requirements of the Building Code for the City and County of San Francisco (or such higher and additional requirements as adopted by the City and County of San Francisco). The LEED Silver standard will help reduce the City’s overall contribution to greenhouse gas emissions and global warming as well as reducing the project’s carbon footprint by providing for a highly energy efficient building.
• In redeveloping the project site with a high quality residential development that includes a cultural component and a ground floor retail or restaurant use, the project will further the objectives of the General Plan's Urban Design Element and complete the development of the former Yerba Buena Center Redevelopment Plan.
Agenda Item 1C

Recreation and Park Commission
Resolution 1305-015
HEARING DATE: May 23, 2013

RECOMMENDING TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION THAT THE NET NEW SHADOW CAST BY THE PROPOSED PROJECT AT 706 MISSION STREET WILL NOT HAVE AN ADVERSE IMPACT ON THE USE OF UNION SQUARE PARK, AS REQUIRED BY PLANNING CODE SECTION 295 (THE SUNLIGHT ORDINANCE).

PREAMBLE

Under Planning Code Section 295 (also referred to as Proposition K from 1984), a building permit application for a project exceeding a height of 40 feet cannot be approved if there is any shadow impact on a property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department, unless the Planning Commission, upon recommendation from the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, in consultation with the Recreation and Park Commission, makes a determination that the shadow impact will not be significant or adverse to the use of the property.

On February 7, 1989, the Recreation and Park Commission and the Planning Commission adopted criteria establishing absolute cumulative limits ("ACL") for additional shadows on 14 parks throughout San Francisco (Planning Commission Resolution No. 11595), as set forth in a February 3, 1989 memorandum (the "1989 Memo"). The ACL for each park is expressed as a percentage of the Theoretically Available Annual Sunlight ("TAAS") on the Park (with no adjacent structures present).

Union Square ("Park"), which is 0.25 miles northwest of 706 Mission Street ("Project Site"), is a public open space that is under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission. Union Square is an approximately 2.58-acre park that occupies the entire block bounded by Post Street on the north, Stockton Street on the east, Geary Street on the south, and Powell Street on the west. The plaza is primarily hardscaped and oriented to passive recreational uses, large civic gatherings, and ancillary retail. There are no recreational facilities and some grassy areas exist along its southern perimeter. There are pedestrian walkways and seating areas throughout the park, several retail kiosks, one café on the west side of the park and one café on the east side of the park. The park includes portable tables and chairs that can be moved to different locations. A 97-foot-tall monument commemorating the Battle of Manila Bay from the Spanish American War occupies the center of the park. Residents, shoppers, tourists, and workers use the park as an outdoor lunch destination and a mid-block pedestrian crossing. Throughout the year, the park is sunny during the middle of the day; it is shadowed by existing buildings to the east, south, and west during the early morning, late afternoon, and early evening. During the spring and autumn, Union Square is sunny from approximately 9:00 AM until 3:00 PM; it is shadowed by existing buildings during
the early morning, late afternoon, and early evening. During the summer, Union Square is sunny from approximately 10:00 AM until 4:00 PM; it is shadowed by existing buildings during the early morning, late afternoon, and early evening. During the winter, Union Square is mostly sunny from approximately noon until 2:00 PM; it is shadowed by existing buildings during the rest of the day.

Union Square receives about 392,663,521 square-foot-hours ("sfh") of TAAS. Currently, there are about 150,265,376 sfh of existing annual shadow on the Park. The ACL that was established for Union Square in 1989 is additional shadow that was equal to 0.1 percent of the TAAS on Union Square, which is approximately 392,663.5 sfh. Until October of 2012, Union Square had a remaining shadow allocation, or shadow budget, of approximately 323,123.5 sfh. Since the quantitative standard for Union Square was established in 1989, two completed development projects have affected the shadow conditions on Union Square. In 1996, a project to expand Macy’s department store altered the massing of the structure and resulted in a net reduction of 194,293 sfh of existing shadow (with a corresponding increase in the amount of sunlight on the park), and in 2003, a project at 690 Market Street added 69,540 sfh of net new shadow on Union Square. Although the Macy’s expansion project reduced the amount of existing shadow and increased the amount of available sunlight on Union Square, this amount has not been added back to the shadow budget for Union Square by the Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission to account for these conditions.

Additionally, on October 11, 2012, the Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission held a duly noticed joint public hearing and adopted Planning Commission Resolution No. 18717 and Recreation and Park Commission Resolution No. 1201-001 amending the 1989 Memo and raising the absolute cumulative shadow limits for seven open spaces under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department that could be shadowed by likely cumulative development sites in the Transit Center District Plan ("Plan") Area, including Union Square. In revising these ACLs, the Commissions also adopted qualitative criteria for each park related to the characteristics of shading within these ACLs by development sites in the Plan Area that would not be considered adverse, including the duration, time of day, time of year, and location of shadows on the particular parks. Under these amendments to the 1989 Memo, any consideration of allocation of “shadow” within these newly increased ACLs for projects within the Plan Area must be consistent with these characteristics. The Commissions also found that the “public benefit” of any proposed project in the Plan Area should be considered in the context of the public benefits of the Transit Center District Plan as a whole. During a joint public hearing on October 11, 2012, the Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission increased the ACLs for seven downtown parks, including Union Square, to allow for shadow cast by development proposed under the Transit Center District Plan (TCDP). The ACL for Union Square was increased from the original limit of 0.1 percent of the TAAS (approximately 392,663.5 sfh) to 0.19 percent of the TAAS (approximately 746,060.7 sfh), but all of the available shadow budget within this ACL was reserved for development within the Plan Area.

On October 11, 2012, following the joint hearing regarding the TCDP, the Recreation and Park Commission reviewed the shadow impacts of the proposed Transbay Tower at 101 First Street and made a formal recommendation to the Planning Commission to allocate a portion of the newly adopted ACL for Union Square to the Transbay Tower. On October 18, 2012, the Planning Commission allocated a portion of the newly adopted ACL to the Transbay Tower (Motion No. 18724, Case No. 2008.0789K).
On November 15, 2012, the Recreation and Park Commission made a formal recommendation to the Planning Commission to allocate a portion of the newly adopted ACL for Union Square to a proposed project at 181 Fremont Street. On December 6, 2012, the Planning Commission allocated a portion of the newly adopted ACL to 181 Fremont Street. As a result of these actions, the remaining ACL for Union Square is 0.1785 percent of the TAAS, which means that approximately 700,904.4 sfh of net new shadow could be cast on Union Square by other development proposed under the TCDP (Motion No. 18763, Case No. 2007.0456K).

On September 25, 2008, Sean Jeffries of Millennium Partners, acting on behalf of 706 Mission Street, LLC ("Project Sponsor") submitted a request for review of a development exceeding 40 feet in height, pursuant to Section 295, analyzing the potential shadow impacts of the Project to properties under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Parks Department (Case No. 2008.1084K). Department staff prepared a shadow fan depicting the potential shadow cast by the development and concluded that the Project could have a potential impact to properties subject to Section 295.

On October 24, 2012, the Project Sponsor filed an application with the Planning Department ("Department") for a Determination of Compliance pursuant to Planning Code Section ("Section") 309 with requested Exceptions from Planning Code ("Code") requirements for "Reduction of Ground-Level Wind Currents in C-3 Districts", "Off-Street Parking Quantity", "Rear Yard, and "General Standards for Off-Street Parking and Loading" to allow curb cuts on Third and Mission Streets, for a project to rehabilitate an existing 10-story, 144-foot tall building (the Aronson Building), and construct a new, adjacent 47-story tower, reaching a roof height of 520 feet with a 30-foot tall mechanical penthouse. The two buildings would be connected and would contain up to 215 dwelling units, a "core-and-shell" museum space measuring approximately 52,000 square feet, and approximately 4,800 square feet of retail space. The project would reconfigure portions of the existing Jessie Square Garage to increase the number of parking spaces from 422 spaces to 470 spaces, add loading and service vehicle spaces, and would allocate up to 215 parking spaces within the garage to serve the proposed residential uses. The Project Sponsor has proposed a "flex option" that would retain approximately 61,000 square feet of office uses within the existing Aronson Building, and would reduce the residential component of the project to 191 dwelling units. On May 20, 2013, the Project Sponsor reduced the height of the proposed tower from 520 feet (with a 30-foot-tall elevator/mechanical penthouse) to 480 feet (with a 30-foot-tall elevator/mechanical penthouse). As a result, the number of dwelling units in the Project was reduced from a maximum of 215 dwelling units to a maximum of 190 dwelling units, the number of residential parking spaces was reduced from a maximum of 215 spaces to a maximum of 190 spaces, and the "flex option" of retaining office space within the project was deleted. The project is located at 706 Mission Street, Lots 093, 276, and portions of Lot 277 within Assessor's Block 3706 ("Project Site"), within the C-3-R District and the 400-I Height and Bulk District (collectively, "Project", Case No. 2008.1084X).

On October 24, 2012, the Project Sponsor submitted a request for a General Plan Referral Case No. 2008.1084R, regarding the changes in use, disposition, and conveyance of publicly-owned land, reconfiguration of the public sidewalk along Mission Street, and subdivision of the property. On May 23, 2013, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting and adopted Motion No. 18878 determining that these actions are consistent with the objectives and policies of the General Plan and the Priority Policies of Section 101.1.
On October 24, 2012, the Project Sponsor submitted a request to amend Height Map HT01 of the Zoning Maps of the San Francisco Planning Code to reclassify the Project Site from the 400-I Height and Bulk District to the 520-I Height and Bulk District. (Case No. 2008.1084Z). On May 20, 2013, in association with the reduced height of the Project, the Project Sponsor revised the request for a Height Reclassification to reclassify a portion of the Project Site from the 400-I Height and Bulk District to the 480-I Height and Bulk District. On May 23, 2013, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting and adopted Resolution No. 18879, recommending that the Board of Supervisors approve the requested Height Reclassification.

On October 24, 2012, the submitted a request to amend Zoning Map SU01 and the text of the Planning Code to establish the “Yerba Buena Center Mixed-Use Special Use District” (SUD) on the property. The proposed SUD would modify specific Planning Code regulations related to permitted uses, the provision of a cultural/museum use within the SUD, floor area ratio limitations, dwelling unit exposure, height of rooftop equipment, bulk limitations, and curb cut locations (Case No. 2008.1084T). On April 11, 2013, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting and adopted Resolution No. 18879, recommending that the Board of Supervisors approve the requested Height Reclassification and Planning Code Text Amendment.

A technical memorandum, prepared by Turnstone Consulting, was submitted on June 9, 2011, analyzing the potential shadow impacts of the Project (at its originally proposed 520-foot roof height) to properties under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Parks Department (Case No. 2008.1084K). The memorandum concluded that the Project would cast 337,744 sfh of net new shadow on Union Square on a yearly basis, which would be an increase of about 0.09% of the TAAS on Union Square for projects outside of the TCDP. On May 21, 2013, a technical memorandum prepared by Turnstone Consulting was submitted analyzing the shadow impacts of the Project on Union Square, based on the reduced 480-foot roof height. The memorandum concluded that the Project would cast 238,788 sfh of net new shadow on Union Square on a yearly basis, which would be an increase of about 0.06% of the TAAS on Union Square. The reduction in the height of the tower results in a reduction of approximately 29% of net new shadow compared with the Project’s original design.

On March 21, 2013, 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 complied with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.) ("CEQA"), 14 California Code of Regulations Sections 15000 et seq. ("the CEQA Guidelines"), and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code ("Chapter 31").

The Planning Commission found the Final EIR was adequate, accurate and objective, reflected the independent analysis and judgment of the Department and the Commission, and that the summary of comments and responses contained no significant revisions to the draft EIR, and certified the Final EIR for the Project in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31.

The EIR concludes that the Project would not result in a project-specific significant shadow impact to recreation facilities or other public areas. With respect to Union Square, the EIR indicates that the net new shadow would be of limited duration and the new shadowing would occur at times when the use of Union Square is limited. The EIR concludes that the Project would, however, make a cumulatively
considerable contribution to a significant cumulative shadow impact on public opens spaces when taking into account other reasonably foreseeable future projects, such as the Transit Tower and the Palace Hotel Project, that would also result in new shadowing of public areas, including Union Square.

Three separate appeals of the Commission’s certification of the EIR to the Board of Supervisors were filed before the April 10, 2013 deadline. The Board of Supervisors considered these appeals at a duly noticed public hearing on May 7, 2013, and unanimously voted to affirm the Planning Commission’s certification of the Final EIR. The Board of Supervisors 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 complied with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31. The Board of Supervisors found the Final EIR was adequate, accurate and objective, reflected the independent analysis and judgment of the Board of Supervisors, and that the summary of comments and responses contained no significant revisions to the draft EIR, and approved the Final EIR in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31.

As part of their actions on October 11, 2012 to increase the ACLs for seven downtown parks, the Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission designated the ACLs exclusively for projects that meet the criteria set forth in the TCDP. Projects that do not meet the criteria set forth in the TCDP may not utilize any portion of the amended ACLs if they cast new shadow on any of the seven downtown parks for which the ACLs were amended. Such projects would be required to seek their own amendments to the ACLs for these seven downtown parks. The Project is located outside the Plan area and is not eligible to utilize newly adopted ACL on the Park.

On May 23, 2013, the Planning Commission adopted Motion No. 18875, adopting CEQA findings, including a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and adopting the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (“MMRP”), which findings and adoption of the MMRP are hereby incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein. The Planning Commission found that the reduction in the height of the Project has resulted in no substantial changes that would require major revisions to the Final EIR or result in new or substantially more severe significant environmental impacts that were not evaluated in the Final EIR, no new information has become available that was not known and could not have been known at the time the Final EIR was certified as complete and that would result in new substantially more severe significant environmental impacts not evaluated in the Final EIR, and no mitigation measures or alternatives previously found infeasible would be feasible or mitigation measures or alternatives considerably different than those analyzed in the Final EIR would substantially reduce significant environmental impacts, but the project proponent declines to adopt them.

The Recreation and Parks Department Commission Secretary, Margaret McArthur, is the custodian of records for this action, and such records are located at 501 Stanyan Street, San Francisco, CA.

The Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission held a duly advertised joint public hearing on May 23, 2013 and adopted Recreation and Park Commission Resolution No. 1305-4015 and Planning Commission Resolution No. 18876, increasing the ACL for Union Square by 0.05 percent of the TAAS for Union Square to account for the additional sunlight that resulted from the Macy’s expansion project in 1996, and to increase the ACL an additional 0.01 percent, for a total increase of 0.06 percent of the TAAS for Union Square, for a total of 238,788 sfh of net new shadow (equal to approximately 0.06 percent of the TAAS for Union Square).
The Recreation and Park Commission has reviewed and considered reports, studies, plans and other documents pertaining to the Project.

The Recreation and Park Commission has heard and considered the testimony presented at the public hearing and has further considered the written materials and oral testimony presented on behalf of the Project Sponsor, Department staff, and other interested parties.

**RECREATION AND PARK COMMISSION FINDINGS**

Having reviewed the materials identified in the recitals above, and having heard all testimony and arguments, the Recreation and Park Commission finds, concludes, and determines as follows:

1. The foregoing recitals are accurate, and also constitute findings of this Commission.

2. The additional shadow cast by the proposed Project on Union Square, while numerically significant, would not be adverse to the use of Union Square, and is not expected to interfere with the use of the Park, for the following reasons: (1) the new shadow would not occur after 9:15 a.m. any day of the year (maximum new shadow range would be 8:30 a.m. to 9:15 a.m. during daylight savings time, or 7:30 a.m. to 8:15 a.m. during standard time) and would be consistent with the 1989 Memo qualitative standards for Union Square in that the new net shadow would not occur during mid-day hours; (2) the new shadow would generally occur in the morning hours during periods of relatively low park usage; (3) the new shadow would occur for a limited amount of time from October 11th to November 8th and from February 2nd to March 2nd for less than one hour on any given day during the hours subject to Section 295; and (4) the new shadow does not affect the manner in which Union Square is used, which is mainly for passive recreational opportunities.

3. A determination by the Planning Commission and/or the Recreation and Park Commission to allocate net new shadow to the Project does not constitute an approval of the Project.

4. The reduction in the height of the Project has resulted in no substantial changes that would require major revisions to the Final EIR or result in new or substantially more severe significant environmental impacts that were not evaluated in the Final EIR, no new information has become available that was not known and could not have been known at the time the Final EIR was certified as complete and that would result in new substantially more severe significant environmental impacts not evaluated in the Final EIR, and no mitigation measures or alternatives previously found infeasible would be feasible or mitigation measures or alternatives considerably different than those analyzed in the Final EIR would substantially reduce significant environmental impacts, but the project proponent declines to adopt them.

**DECISION**

Based upon the Record, the submissions by the Project Sponsor and by the staff of the Recreation and Park and Planning Departments, the oral testimony presented to the Commission at the public hearing, and all other written materials submitted by all parties, the Recreation and Park Commission hereby RECOMMENDS that the Planning Commission find, under Shadow Analysis Application No.
2008.1084K, that the net new shadow cast by the Project on Union Square will not have an adverse impact on the use of Union Square Park.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED by the Recreation and Commission at the meeting on May 23, 2013.

Margaret McArthur
Commission Secretary

AYES: 6
NOES: 0
ABSENT: 1

ADOPTED: May 23, 2013
June 3, 2013

Ms. Angela Calvillo, Clerk
Honorable Supervisor Chiu
Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Transmittal of Planning Department Case Number 2008.1084TZ:
706 Mission Street
T Case: Planning Code Text Amendment and Zoning Map Amendment –
Adoption of “Yerba Buena Center Mixed-Use Special Use District”
Z Case: Rezoning (Height Reclassification)
Planning Commission Recommendation: Approval

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

On May 23, 2013, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing to consider proposed amendments to the Zoning Map and the Planning Code, in association with a proposed development located at 706 Mission Street to rehabilitate the existing 10-story, 144-foot tall Aronson Building, and construct a new, adjacent 43-story tower, with a roof height of 480 feet and an additional 30-foot tall mechanical penthouse (for a maximum height of 510 feet). The two buildings would be connected and would contain up to 190 dwelling units, a “core-and-shell” museum space measuring approximately 52,000 square feet that will house the permanent home of the Mexican Museum, and approximately 4,800 square feet of retail space. The project would reconfigure portions of the existing Jessie Square Garage to increase the number of parking spaces from 442 spaces to 470 spaces, add loading and service vehicle spaces, and would allocate up to 190 parking spaces within the garage to serve the proposed residential uses.

It should be noted that, since the publication of the initial Planning Commission staff report (including the attached Executive Summary), the Project Sponsor reduced the height of the proposed tower from a maximum roof height of 520 feet, to a roof height of 480 feet. The roofline profile of the tower would not change, with the top of the mechanical penthouse reaching a height of 510 feet (reduced from a previous height of 550 feet). No other changes to the tower envelope or architectural expression are proposed. The reduction in tower height would also reduce the number of dwelling units from a range of 162 to 215 units in the initial proposal, to a range of 145 to 190 units. As a result of the reduced height, the Project sponsor is no longer seeking approval of the “office flex” option described in the Executive Summary.

www.sfplanning.org
The proposed Ordinance would do the following:

1. **Zoning Map Amendments:** Proposal would amend Zoning Map HT01 to reclassify the subject property from the 400-I Height and Bulk District to the 480-I Height and Bulk District, and would amend Zoning Map SU01 to establish the “Yerba Buena Center Mixed-Use Special Use District” on the subject property.

2. **Planning Code Text Amendment:** Proposal would add the “Yerba Buena Center Mixed-Use Special Use District” to the Planning Code, specify permitted uses and required cultural uses, and modify specific Planning Code regulations including Floor Area Ratio (“FAR”) limitations, dwelling unit exposure, rooftop screening features, bulk limitations, curb cuts on Mission on Third Streets, and dwelling unit density. In addition, the SUD is proposed with a five-year sunset provision.

At the May 23, 2013 Planning Commission hearing, the Commission voted to recommend approval of the proposed Ordinance.

Please find attached documents relating to the action of the Commission. Additional supporting documents will be transmitted under separate cover, prior to any Land Use Committee hearing on these items. If you have any questions or require further information please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

![Signature]

John Rahaim
Director of Planning

cc:
Jon Givner, City Attorney
Susan Cleveland-Knowles, City Attorney
Marlena Byrne, City Attorney
Jason Elliot, Mayor’s Director of Legislative & Government Affairs

**Attachments (two hard copies of the following):**
Planning Commission Resolution
Draft Ordinance
Planning Department Executive Summary
Planning Commission Motion 18875
CEQA Findings

HEARING DATE: MAY 23, 2013

Date: March 28, 2013
Case No.: 2008.1084EHKXRZ
Project Address: 706 Mission Street
Project Site Zoning: C-3-R (Downtown, Retail, Commercial)
400-I Height and Bulk District
Block/Lots: 3706/093, 275, portions of 277 (706 Mission Street)
0308/001 (Union Square)
Project Sponsor: 706 Mission Street, LLC
c/o Sean Jeffries of Millennium Partners
735 Market Street, 4th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94107
Staff Contact: Kevin Guy – (415) 558-6163
Kevin.Guy@sfgov.org

ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT, INCLUDING FINDINGS OF FACT, EVALUATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES AND ALTERNATIVES, AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDE CONSIDERATIONS, RELATED TO APPROVALS FOR A PROJECT TO REHABILITATE AN EXISTING 10-STORY, 144-FOOT TALL BUILDING (THE ARONSON BUILDING), AND CONSTRUCT A NEW, ADJACENT 43-STORY TOWER, REACHING A ROOF HEIGHT OF 480 FEET WITH A 30-FOOT TALL MECHANICAL PENTHOUSE. THE TWO BUILDINGS WOULD BE CONNECTED AND WOULD CONTAIN UP TO 190 DWELLING UNITS, A “CORE-AND-SHELL” MUSEUM SPACE MEASURING APPROXIMATELY 52,000 SQUARE FEET, AND APPROXIMATELY 4,800 SQUARE FEET OF RETAIL SPACE. THE PROJECT WOULD RECONFIGURE PORTIONS OF THE EXISTING JESSIE SQUARE GARAGE TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES FROM 442 SPACES TO 470 SPACES, ADD LOADING AND SERVICE VEHICLE SPACES, AND WOULD ALLOCATE UP TO 190 PARKING SPACES WITHIN THE GARAGE TO SERVE THE PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL USES. THE PROJECT SITE IS LOCATED AT 706 MISSION STREET (ASSESOR’S BLOCK 3706, LOTS 093, 275, AND PORTIONS OF LOT 277), WITHIN THE C-3-R (DOWNTOWN OFFICE) DISTRICT AND THE 400-I HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICT.
In determining to approve a the 706 Mission Street – The Mexican Museum and Residential Tower Project located at 706 Mission Street (Assessor’s Block 3706, Lots 093, 275, and 277 (portion)), described in Section I, Project Description below, ("Project"), the San Francisco Planning Commission ("Commission") makes and adopts the following findings of fact regarding the Project and mitigation measures and alternatives, and adopts the statement of overriding considerations and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, 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. ("Guidelines"), particularly Section 15091 through 15093 and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

This document is organized as follows:

Section I provides a description of the Project, the Project Objectives, the environmental review process for the Project, the approval actions to be taken, and the location of records;

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

Section III identifies potentially significant impacts that are avoided or reduced to less-than-significant levels through mitigation and describes the disposition of the mitigation measures;

Section IV identifies significant, unavoidable wind and shadow impacts (specifically cumulative shadow impacts), of the Project that cannot be avoided or reduced to less-than-significant levels through Mitigation Measures;

Section V evaluates the different project alternatives and the economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations that support approval of the Project as proposed and the rejection of these alternatives; and

Section VI makes a Statement of Overriding Considerations setting forth the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the Project that outweigh the significant and unavoidable adverse environmental effects and support the rejection of the project alternatives.

The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") for the mitigation measures that have been proposed for adoption is attached with these findings as Exhibit A. The MMRP is required by CEQA.

Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091. The MMRP provides a table setting forth each mitigation measure listed in the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Project ("Final EIR") that is required to reduce or avoid a significant adverse impact. The MMRP also specifies the agency responsible for implementation of each measure and establishes monitoring actions and a monitoring schedule. The full text of the mitigation measures is set forth in the MMRP.

These findings are based upon substantial evidence in the entire record before the Commission. The references set forth in these findings to certain pages or sections of the Draft Environmental Impact
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Report ("Draft EIR" or "DEIR") or the Responses to Comments ("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.

MOVED, that the Commission has reviewed and considered the Final EIR and the record associated therewith, including the comments and submissions made to this Commission, and based thereon hereby adopts these findings under the California Environmental Quality Act, including rejecting alternatives as infeasible and adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and adopts the MMRP attached as Exhibit A to Motion No. 18875 based on the following findings:

I. Project Description

A. 706 MISSION STREET – THE MEXICAN MUSEUM AND RESIDENTIAL TOWER PROJECT

The project site is on the northwest corner of Third and Mission Streets, at 706 Mission Street. It consists of three lots: the entirety of Assessor’s Block 3706, Lots 093 and 275, and portions of Assessor’s Block 3706, Lot 277. Together, these lots cover an area of approximately 63,468 square feet or approximately 1.45 acres. The area of the project site includes the below-grade publically-owned Jessie Square Garage, which would become private by conveyance to the project sponsor.

Lot 093, an approximately 15,460 square foot, rectangular parcel is currently developed with the 10-story, 154-foot-tall Aronson Building (a 144-foot-tall building with a 10-foot-tall mechanical penthouse). The building was originally constructed in 1903, and two annexes were added in 1978. The Aronson Building is rated “A” (highest importance) by the Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage, and it is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places and the California Register of Historical Resources. The Aronson Building is also designated as a Category I Significant Building within the New Montgomery-Mission-Second Street Conservation District. Including the annexes, the Aronson Building contains a total of approximately 120,340 gross square feet (gsf), with approximately 13,700 gsf of storage and utility space in the basement, an approximately 10,660-gsf retail space on the ground floor, which is currently occupied by a Rochester Big & Tall retail clothing store, and approximately 95,980 gsf of office space on the second through tenth floors. Including the annexes, the Aronson Building covers approximately 74 percent of Lot 093.

Lot 275 is occupied by the existing ramp that provides vehicular access from Stevenson Street to the subsurface Jessie Square Garage. This lot has an area of approximately 1,635 square feet.

A currently vacant approximately 9,780 square foot portion of Lot 277 is the future permanent home of The Mexican Museum (Mexican Museum parcel). The subsurface Jessie Square Garage is the other portion of Lot 277 that makes up the project site. The Jessie Square Garage contains 442 parking spaces within a footprint of approximately 45,310 square feet. Currently, vehicles enter the Jessie Square Garage from Stevenson Street and exit onto either Stevenson or Mission Streets.

Prior to project approval, the Project Sponsor proposed modifications to the project to reduce the height of the proposed tower from 520 feet (with a 30-foot-tall elevator/mechanical penthouse) to 480 feet (with a
30-foot-tall elevator/mechanical penthouse). The project described here includes these, and other conforming, modifications. Thus, the proposed project would include a 43-story, 480-foot-tall tower (with a 30-foot-tall elevator/mechanical penthouse), with two floors below grade on The Mexican Museum parcel and the western portion of the Aronson Building parcel. The new tower would be west of, adjacent to, and physically connected to the existing Aronson Building. The overall project would contain space for The Mexican Museum, a ground-floor retail/restaurant use, up to 190 residential units, and associated building services.

In the proposed tower, there would be up to 39 floors of residential space, including mechanical areas, and four floors of museum space. The Mexican Museum would occupy the ground through fourth floors, and residential uses would occupy the fifth through thirty-ninth floors. The fifth floor of the tower would be occupied by residential or residential amenity space, unless the residential amenity space is on the tenth floor of the Aronson Building as discussed below. Approximately 2,100 gsf on Basement Level B2 would be allocated to The Mexican Museum for storage. About 15,900 gsf on Basement Levels B1 and B2 would be occupied by the elevator core and building services.

As part of the proposed project, the historically important Aronson Building would be restored and rehabilitated, and the existing mechanical penthouse on the roof of the Aronson Building would be removed. The Aronson Building currently contains approximately 10,660 gsf of retail space on the ground floor and approximately 95,980 gsf of office space on the second through tenth floors. With the proposed project, the Aronson Building would have lobby space and retail/restaurant space on the ground floor. The Mexican Museum would occupy the second and third floors and possibly some or all of the ground floor of the Aronson Building. The fourth through tenth floors of the Aronson Building would be residential. A proposed “office flex option” that would have allowed these floors of the Aronson Building to be used as office space was eliminated as part of the Project Sponsor’s proposed project changes. Building services would occupy a small portion of each floor.

The Jessie Square Garage would be reconfigured to include 470 spaces, of which up to 280 would be made available to the general public. Under the proposed project, all non-project vehicles would continue to enter the Jessie Square Garage from Stevenson Street. Project residents would have the option of parking their own vehicles or using a valet service. Project residents who choose to park their own vehicles would be required to enter the garage from Stevenson Street; they would not be allowed to access the project site from Third Street using the car elevators to enter the garage. Project residents who choose to use the valet service would drive onto the project site from Third Street using the existing curb cut and driveway. As under current conditions, all loading trucks would exit the Jessie Square Garage onto Stevenson Street only, but delivery vans, service vehicles, and all other vehicles would have the option of exiting the garage onto either Stevenson or Mission Streets.

While several vehicular access variants to the proposed project were analyzed in the EIR, none of them are being approved by this Commission or any other City decision-maker. Because of this, these findings do not address the significant and unavoidable impacts that the Final EIR identified would result if the vehicular access variants were to be approved.
B. SUCCESSOR AGENCY PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the Successor Agency are as follows:

- To complete the redevelopment of the Yerba Buena Center (YBC) Redevelopment Project Area envisioned under the Yerba Buena Center Redevelopment Plan.

- To stimulate and attract private investment and generate sales taxes and other General Fund revenues from new uses on the project site, thereby improving the City's overall economic health, employment opportunities, tax base, and community economic development opportunities.

- To provide for the development of a museum facility and an endowment for The Mexican Museum on Successor Agency-owned property located adjacent to Jessie Square, at the heart of San Francisco's cultural district location, in a manner that is consistent with General Plan Policy VI-1.9, to "create opportunities for private developers to include arts spaces in private developments city-wide."

- To ensure construction of a preeminent building with a superior level of design for this important site across from Yerba Buena Gardens and adjacent to Jessie Square in a manner that complements the landscaping and design of Jessie Square.

- To provide housing in an urban infill location to help alleviate the effects of suburban sprawl.

- To provide temporary and permanent employment and contracting opportunities for minorities, women, qualified economically disadvantaged individuals, and other residents both in the South of Market area and in the City generally, in a manner consistent with the City's current and future equal opportunity programs.

- To create a development that is financially feasible and that can fund the project's capital costs and ongoing operation and maintenance costs related to the redevelopment and long-term operation of the Mexican Museum parcel without reliance on public funds.

- To maximize the quality of the pedestrian experience along Mission Street and Third Street, while maintaining accessibility to the project site for automobiles and loading.

- To transfer ownership of the Jessie Square Garage to a private entity, while providing adequate parking in the Jessie Square Garage for the Contemporary Jewish Museum, St. Patrick's Church, The Mexican Museum, and the public.

- To provide for rehabilitation of the historically important Aronson Building.

- To secure funding for new and affordable below-market rate units beyond the amount currently required by City ordinances.

- To secure additional funding for operations, management, and security of Yerba Buena Gardens.
C. PROJECT SPONSOR OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the project sponsor, 706 Mission Street Co., LLC, are as follows:

- To construct a residential building of superior quality and design that complements and is generally consistent with the downtown area, furthering the objectives of the General Plan’s Urban Design Element and the Yerba Buena Center Redevelopment Plan.

- To redevelop the project site with a high-quality residential development that includes a ground-floor retail or restaurant use.

- To provide housing in downtown San Francisco that is accessible to local and regional transit, as well as cultural amenities and attractions, such as performing art centers, and art museums and exhibitions.

- To rehabilitate the historically important Aronson Building.

- To design and construct the project to a minimum of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Silver standards (or such higher and additional requirements as adopted by the City and County of San Francisco), thereby reducing the project’s carbon footprint and maximizing the energy efficiency of the building.

- To develop a project that is financially feasible and financeable, and to create a level of development sufficient to support the costs of providing the public benefits delivered by the project, including space and funding for The Mexican Museum; rehabilitation of the historically important Aronson Building; funding of affordable, below-market-rate housing; and funding for the maintenance of Yerba Buena Gardens, and that can fund project costs.

- To provide adequate parking and vehicular access to serve the needs of project residents and their visitors.

D. PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

The Project Sponsor submitted an Environmental Evaluation application for the project on June 30, 2008. The Environmental Evaluation application was revised on December 7, 2009, and again on March 5, 2012, to reflect design changes to the proposed project. The San Francisco Planning Department (the “Department”) determined that an Environmental Impact Report was required and published and distributed a Notice of Preparation of an EIR (“NOP”) on April 13, 2011. The NOP is Appendix A to the Draft EIR. The public review period on the NOP began on April 14, 2011, and ended on May 13, 2011.

The Department published a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) on June 27, 2012. The Commission held a public hearing to solicit testimony on the DEIR on July 27, 2013. The Department received written comments on the DEIR from June 28, 2012, to August 13, 2012. The Department published the Responses to Comments on March 7, 2013. The DEIR, together with the Responses to Comments constitute the Final EIR. The FEIR was certified by Planning Commission on March 21, 2013,
by Motion No. 18829. Certification of the FEIR was appealed to the Board of Supervisors. On May 7, 2013, the Board of Supervisors rejected the appeal and affirmed the certification of the FEIR.

E. APPROVAL ACTIONS

1. Actions by the Planning Commission

   • Certification of the Final EIR on March 21, 2013, by Planning Commission Motion No. 18829;

   • General Plan referral to determine project consistency with the General Plan and the Priority Policies.

   • Recommend approval to the Board of Supervisors of a Zoning Map amendment to reclassify the existing 400-foot height limit for the project site, shown on Zoning Map Sheet HT01, and to amend Zoning Map Sheet SU01 to show the Special Use District.

   • Recommend approval to the Board of Supervisors of a Special Use District to address Floor Area Ratio, height, and other land use controls for the project site, which may include additional provisions regarding permitted uses, the provision of cultural/museum use within the SUD, floor area ratio limitations, dwelling unit exposure, height of rooftop equipment, bulk limitations, and curb cut locations.

   • Approval of a Section 309 Determination of Compliance and Request for Exceptions for the construction of a new building in a C-3 District.

   • Approval of amendment of the quantitative shadow standard for Union Square that was established on February 7, 1989, pursuant to Planning Commission Resolution No. 11595; and Section 295 shadow significance determination and allocation to project.

2. Action by this Historic Preservation Commission

   • Approval of a Major Permit to Alter pursuant to Article 11 of the Planning Code.

3. Actions by the Board of Supervisors

   • The Planning Commission’s certification of the Final EIR was appealed to the Board of Supervisors, and on May 7, 2013, the Board of Supervisors upheld the certification of the Final EIR.

   • Adoption of a Zoning Map amendment to reclassify the existing 400-foot height limit for the project site, shown on Zoning Map Sheet HT01, and to amend Zoning Map Sheet SU01 to show the Special Use District.

   • Adoption of a Special Use District to address Floor Area Ratio, height, and other land use controls for the project site, which may include additional provisions regarding permitted uses,
the provision of cultural/museum use within the SUD, floor area ratio limitations, dwelling unit exposure, height of rooftop equipment, bulk limitations, and curb cut locations.

4. Actions by the Recreation and Park Commission

- Approval of amendment of the quantitative shadow standard for Union Square that was established on February 7, 1989, pursuant to Planning Commission Resolution No. 11595;

- Recommendation to the Planning Commission regarding the Section 295 shadow significance determination and allocation to project.

5. Actions by the Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency, and the Oversight Board of the Successor Agency

- Approval of the Agreement of Purchase and Sale for the Mexican Museum parcel and the Jessie Square Garage.

- Approval of parking structure bond purchase/defeasance documents.

6. Actions by the Department of Public Works

- Approval of the tentative map

7. Actions by the Department of Public Works and the SFMTA Board of Directors

- Approval of a street improvement permit and/or encroachment permit to (1) extend the existing Jessie Square passenger loading/unloading zone on Mission Street by approximately 83 feet, 6 inches to the east, resulting in a 154-foot-long passenger loading/unloading zone; and (2) designate the curb along Third Street in front of the project site as a white zone for passenger loading/unloading.

8. Actions by the Department of Building Inspection

- Approval of the site permit

- Approval of demolition, grading, and building permits

9. Actions by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

- Approval of compliance with requirements of the Stormwater Management Ordinance for projects with over 5,000 square feet of disturbed ground area.

F. LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS
The public hearing transcript, a copy of the letters regarding the Draft EIR received during the public review period, the administrative record, and background documentation for the FEIR are located at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, San Francisco. The Commission Secretary is the custodian of records for the Planning Department and the Commission.

These findings are based upon substantial evidence in the entire record before the Commission.

G. FINDINGS REGARDING PROJECT MODIFICATIONS

As noted above, prior to project approval, the Project Sponsor proposed modifications to the project to reduce the height of the proposed tower from 520 feet (with a 30-foot-tall elevator/mechanical penthouse) to 480 feet (with a 30-foot-tall elevator/mechanical penthouse). The project described here includes these, and other conforming, modifications. Thus, the proposed project would include a 43-story, 480-foot-tall tower (with a 30-foot-tall elevator/mechanical penthouse), with two floors below grade on The Mexican Museum parcel and the western portion of the Aronson Building parcel. The overall project would contain space for The Mexican Museum, a ground-floor retail/restaurant use, up to 190 residential units, and associated building services.

The Commission finds that the Project as currently proposed with a height reduction to 480 feet, with a 30-foot-tall elevator/mechanical penthouse, and conforming reductions in unit count, among other conforming changes, is within the scope of the project analyzed in the Final EIR. The Commission finds that the reduction in the height of the Project has resulted in no substantial changes that would require major revisions to the Final EIR or result in new or substantially more severe significant environmental impacts that were not evaluated in the Final EIR, no new information has become available that was not known and could not have been known at the time the Final EIR was certified as complete and that would result in new substantially more severe significant environmental impacts not evaluated in the Final EIR, and no mitigation measures or alternatives previously found infeasible would be feasible or mitigation measures or alternatives considerably different than those analyzed in the Final EIR would substantially reduce significant environmental impacts, but the project proponent declines to adopt them. The Commission finds that no supplemental or subsequent EIR is needed and no addendum to the EIR is needed to augment the analysis presented in the Final EIR for the Proposed Project.

II. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant And Thus Do Not Require Mitigation

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant (Pub. Res. Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091). As more fully described in the Final EIR and based on substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding, the Commission hereby finds that implementation of the Project would not result in any significant impacts in the following areas and that these impact areas therefore do not require mitigation.

A. LAND USE AND LAND USE PLANNING

• Impact LU-1: The proposed project would not physically divide an established community.
• Impact LU-2: The proposed project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

• Impact LU-3: The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse impact on the character of the vicinity.

• Impact C-LU-1: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant adverse cumulative land use impacts related to a physical division of an established community; to conflicts with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; and to the existing character of the vicinity.

B. AESTHETICS

• Impact AE-1: The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

• Impact AE-2: The proposed project tower would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource.

• Impact AE-3: The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

• Impact AE-4: The proposed project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area or which would substantially impact other people or properties.

• Impact C-AE-1: The proposed project, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity, would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant impact related to aesthetics.

C. POPULATION AND HOUSING

• Impact PH-1: The proposed project would not induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly.

• Impact PH-2: The proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or create demand for additional housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

• Impact PH-3: The proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

• Impact C-PH-1: The proposed project, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant adverse cumulative impacts related to population growth, housing, and employment, either directly or indirectly.

D. CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

• Impact CP-5: The proposed rehabilitation, repair and reuse of the Aronson Building under the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the Aronson Building as a historical resource under CEQA.
• **Impact CP-6:** The proposed project tower would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the Aronson Building historical resource.

• **Impact CP-7:** The proposed project tower would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of nearby historical resources.

• **Impact C-CP-2:** The proposed project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity, would not have a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant impact on historic architectural resources.

E. **TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION**

• **Impact TR-1:** The proposed project would not cause a substantial increase in traffic that would cause the level of service to decline from LOS D or better to LOS E or F, or from LOS E to F at seven intersections studied in the project vicinity.

• **Impact TR-2:** The proposed project would not cause a substantial increase in transit demand that could not be accommodated by adjacent transit capacity; nor would it cause a substantial increase in delays or costs such that significant adverse impacts in transit service levels could occur.

• **Impact TR-3:** The proposed project would not result in substantial overcrowding on public sidewalks, nor create potentially hazardous conditions for pedestrians, or otherwise interfere with pedestrian accessibility to the site and adjoining areas.

• **Impact TR-4:** The proposed project would not create potentially hazardous conditions for bicyclists, or otherwise substantially interfere with bicycle accessibility to the site and adjoining areas.

• **Impact TR-5:** The loading demand of the proposed project during the peak hour of loading activities would be accommodated within the proposed on-site loading facilities or within convenient on-street loading zones, and would not create potentially hazardous traffic conditions or significant delays involving traffic, transit, bicycles, or pedestrians.

• **Impact TR-6:** Construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access.

• **Impact TR-7:** Construction-related impacts of the proposed project would not be considered significant due to their temporary and limited duration.

• **Impact C-TR-1:** The proposed project would not contribute considerably to future cumulative traffic increases that would cause levels of service to deteriorate to unacceptable levels at seven intersections.

• **Impact C-TR-2:** The proposed project would not contribute considerably to cumulative increases in transit ridership that would cause the levels of service to deteriorate to unacceptable levels.

• **Impact C-TR-3:** The construction impacts of the proposed project would not result in a considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact when combined with other nearby proposed projects due to the temporary and limited duration of the construction of the proposed project and nearby projects.

F. **NOISE**

• **Impact NO-4:** The proposed project’s new residences and cultural uses would not be substantially affected by existing noise levels.

• **Impact C-NO-1:** Construction of the proposed project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity, would not result in a
cumulatively considerable contribution to significant temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the proposed project.
- **Impact C-NO-3**: Operation of the proposed project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.
- **Impact C-NO-4**: Noise from traffic increases generated by the proposed project, when combined with noise from reasonably foreseeable traffic growth forecast to the year 2030, would not contribute considerably to significant cumulative traffic noise impacts.

G. **AIR QUALITY**
- **Impact AQ-1**: Construction of the proposed project would not violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; nor would it result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria air pollutants, for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable ambient air quality standard.
- **Impact AQ-2**: Construction of the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations of fugitive dust.
- **Impact AQ-4**: Operation of the proposed project would not violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; nor would it result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria air pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable ambient air quality standard.
- **Impact AQ-5**: Operation of the proposed project would not generate emissions of PM2.5 and toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, at levels that would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
- **Impact AQ-6**: Operation of the proposed project would not expose new on-site sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
- **Impact AQ-7**: Construction and operation of the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan (CAP), the applicable air quality plan.
- **Impact AQ-8**: Construction and operation of the proposed project would not expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors.
- **Impact C-AQ-1**: Construction and operation of the proposed project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to exposure of sensitive receptors to significant cumulative substantial pollutant concentrations.

H. **GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**
- **Impact C-GG-1**: The proposed project would be consistent with the City's GHG Reduction Plan and the AB 32 Scoping Plan, and would, therefore, not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative GHG emissions or conflict with any policy, plan, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.

I. **WIND AND SHADOW**
- **Impact WS-1**: The proposed project would not alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas.
• **Impact C-WS-1**: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity, would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative wind impact.

• **Impact WS-2**: The proposed project would not create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities and other public areas.

**J. RECREATION**

• **Impact RE-1**: The proposed project would not increase the use of existing park and recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of facilities would occur or be accelerated.

• **Impact RE-2**: The proposed project would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

• **Impact RE-3**: The proposed project would not physically degrade existing recreational resources.

• **Impact C-RE-1**: Construction of the proposed project, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant adverse cumulative impacts on recreational facilities.

**K. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

• **Impact UT-1**: The proposed project would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

• **Impact UT-2**: The proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new or the expansion of existing water or wastewater treatment facilities, or stormwater drainage facilities, the construction of which could have significant environmental effects.

• **Impact UT-3**: The proposed project would not result in a determination that there is insufficient capacity in the wastewater treatment system to serve the proposed project's estimated demand in addition to its existing demand.

• **Impact C-UT-1**: Construction of the proposed project, in combination with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant adverse cumulative impact regarding the treatment of stormwater runoff or capacity of wastewater treatment facilities or stormwater drainage facilities.

• **Impact UT-4**: The proposed project would be adequately served by existing water entitlements and water supply resources, and would not require new or expanded water supply resources or entitlements.

• **Impact C-UT-2**: Construction of the proposed project, in combination with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant adverse cumulative impact on water supply.

• **Impact UT-5**: The proposed project would increase the amount of solid waste generated on the project site, but would be adequately served by the City's landfill and would comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

• **Impact C-UT-3**: Construction of the proposed project, in combination with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant adverse cumulative impact on solid waste disposal facilities.

**L. PUBLIC SERVICES**

• **Impact PS-1**: The proposed project would not increase demand for public services to the extent that new facilities would have to be constructed or existing facilities altered in order to maintain
acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any public services such as police protection, fire protection and emergency services, schools, or libraries.

- **Impact C-PS-I:** The proposed project, in combination with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant adverse cumulative impacts that would result in a need for construction of new or physically altered facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any public services, including police protection, fire protection and emergency services, schools, and libraries.

**M. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

- **Impact BI-I:** The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS.
- **Impact BI-2:** The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on the movement of native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, nor would it impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.
- **Impact BI-3:** The proposed project would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.
- **Impact C-BI-I:** The proposed project, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity, would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant adverse cumulative impact on biological resources.

**N. GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

- **Impact GE-I:** The proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture, ground-shaking, liquefaction, or landslides.
- **Impact GE-2:** The proposed project would not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil.
- **Impact GE-3:** The proposed project would not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.
- **Impact GE-4:** The proposed project would not be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property.
- **Impact C-GE-I:** The proposed project, in combination with other past, present and other reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant adverse cumulative impacts with respect to geology, soils, or seismicity.

**O. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

- **Impact HY-I:** The proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.
- **Impact HY-2:** The proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge.
- **Impact HY-3:** The proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner
that would result in substantial erosion or siltation or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on or off site.

- **Impact HY-4:** Construction of the proposed project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

- **Impact HY-5:** Operation of the proposed project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

- **Impact C-HY-1:** The proposed project, in combination with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant adverse cumulative impact on hydrology and water quality.

**P. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

- **Impact HZ-1:** The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

- **Impact HZ-3:** The proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

- **Impact HZ-4:** The proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

- **Impact HZ-5:** The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a risk of loss, injury or death involving fires.

- **Impact C-HZ-1:** The proposed project, when combined with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant adverse cumulative impact on hazards and hazardous materials.

**Q. MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES**

- **Impact ME-1:** The proposed project would not have a significant adverse impact on the availability of a known mineral resource and/or a locally important mineral resource recovery site.

- **Impact ME-2:** The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on the use of fuel, water, or energy consumption, and would not encourage activities that could result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use these in a wasteful manner.

- **Impact C-ME-1:** The proposed project, in combination with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant adverse cumulative impact on mineral and energy resources.

**R. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES**

- **Impact AG-1:** The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on the conversion of farmland, would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or with a Williamson Act contract, nor involve other changes that would result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.

- **Impact AG-2:** The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land or timberland, nor would it result in the loss of forest land or the conversion of forest land to non-forest use.
Impact C-AG-1: The proposed project, in combination with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant adverse cumulative impact on agricultural resources or forest land or timberland.

III. Potentially Significant Impacts That Are Avoided Or Reduced To A Less-Than-Significant Level And Findings Regarding Mitigation Measures

The following Sections III and IV set forth the 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 Commission regarding the environmental impacts of the Project and the mitigation measures included as part of the Final EIR and adopted by the Commission and other City decision makers as part of the Project. To avoid duplication and redundancy, and because the Commission agrees with, and hereby adopts, the conclusions in the Final EIR, these findings will not repeat the complete analysis and conclusions in the Final EIR, but instead summarizes and incorporates them by reference herein and relies rely upon them as substantial evidence supporting these findings.

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

As set forth below, the Commission adopts and incorporates all of the mitigation measures within its jurisdiction set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP to substantially lessen or avoid the potentially significant and significant impacts of the Project. The Commission and other City decision makers intend to adopt each of the mitigation measures proposed in the Final EIR. 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.
The potentially significant impacts of the Project that will be mitigated through implementation of mitigation measures are identified and summarized below along with the corresponding mitigation measures.

A. CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

- **Impact CP-1**: Construction activities for the proposed project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resources, if such resources are present within the project site.
  - Ground-disturbing construction activity within the project site, particularly within previously undisturbed soils, could adversely affect the significance of archaeological resources by impairing the ability of such resources to convey important scientific and historical information. This effect would be considered a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource and would therefore be a potentially significant impact under CEQA.
  - The following mitigation measures, as more fully described in the Final EIR, are hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided herein, to mitigate the potentially significant impact of Impact CP-1.
    - **Mitigation Measure M-CP-1a**: Archaeological Test, Monitoring, Data Recovery and Reporting
    - **Mitigation Measure M-CP-1b**: Interpretation
  - Based on the final EIR and the entire administrative record, it is hereby found and determined that implementing Mitigation Measures M-CP-1a and M-CP-1b would reduce Impact CP-1 to a less-than significant level because Mitigation Measure M-CP-1a would ensure that any potentially affected archaeological deposits would be identified, evaluated, and, as appropriate, subject to data recovery and reporting by a qualified archaeologist under the oversight of the Environmental Review Officer, and Mitigation Measure M-CP-1b would ensure that a plan for the post-recovery interpretation of buried or submerged archaeological resources is developed and implemented with the assistance of qualified archaeological and under the oversight of the Environmental Review Officer.

- **Impact CP-2**: Construction activities for the proposed project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of human remains, if such resources are present within the project site.
  - Ground-disturbing construction activity within the project site, particularly within previously undisturbed soils, could adversely affect the significance of human remains, which would be a potentially significant impact under CEQA.
  - The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided herein, to mitigate the potentially significant impact of Impact CP-2.
• Mitigation Measure M-CP-1a: Archaeological Test, Monitoring, Data Recovery and Reporting
  o Based on the final EIR and the entire administrative record, it is hereby found and determined that implementing Mitigation Measure M-CP-1a would reduce Impact CP-2 to a less-than significant level because the mitigation measure would ensure that the treatment of any human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during soil disturbing activities complies with applicable state and federal laws, including immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and, in the event of the Coroner's determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the NAHC, who would appoint an MLD.

• Impact CP-3: Construction activities for the proposed project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of paleontological resources, if such resources are present within the project site.
  o Paleontological resources could exist in the Franciscan, and possibly the Colma, Formations that underlie the project site. Project construction activities could disturb and impair the significance of such paleontological resources, which would be a potentially significant impact under CEQA.
  o The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided herein, to mitigate the potentially significant impact of Impact CP-3.
    • Mitigation Measure M-CP-3: Paleontological Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Program
      o Based on the final EIR and the entire administrative record, it is hereby found and determined that implementing Mitigation Measure M-CP-3 would reduce Impact CP-3 to a less-than significant level because the mitigation measure would ensure that a plan for monitoring, recovery, identification, and curation of paleontologic resources would be developed and implemented by a qualified paleontologist under the oversight of the Environmental Review Officer in the event that paleontological resources are present within the project site.

• Impact CP-4: Construction activities for the proposed project would disturb unknown resources if any are present within the project site.
  o Construction activities could disturb or remove unknown human remains within the project site, which could materially impair the physical characteristics of the unknown resource, resulting in a potentially significant impact under CEQA.
  o The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided herein, to mitigate the potentially significant impact of Impact CP-4.
    • Mitigation Measure M-CP-4: Accidental Discovery
      o Based on the final EIR and the entire administrative record, it is hereby found and determined that implementing Mitigation Measure M-CP-4 would reduce Impact CP-4 to
a less than significant level because the mitigation measure ensures that all field and construction personnel will be informed of the potential presence of archaeological resources within the project site and the procedures that are to be followed in the event such resources are encountered during construction activities.

- **Impact C-CP-1:** Disturbance of archaeological and paleontological resources, if encountered during construction of the proposed project, in combination with other past, present, and future reasonably foreseeable projects, would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact on archaeological resources.
  
  o When considered with other past and proposed development projects within San Francisco and the Bay Area region, the potential disturbance of archaeological and paleontological resources within the project site could make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a loss of significant historic and scientific information about California, Bay Area, and San Francisco history and prehistory, which would be a potentially significant impact under CEQA.

  o The following mitigation measures, as more fully described in the Final EIR, are hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided herein, to mitigate the potentially significant impact of Impact C-CP-1.

    - **Mitigation Measure M-CP-1a:** Archaeological Test, Monitoring, Data Recovery and Reporting
    - **Mitigation Measure M-CP-1b:** Interpretation
    - **Mitigation Measure M-CP-3:** Paleontological Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Program
    - **Mitigation Measure M-CP-4:** Accidental Discovery

  o Based on the final EIR and the entire administrative record, it is hereby found and determined that implementing Mitigation Measures M-CP-1a, M-CP-1b, M-CP-3, and M-CP-4 would reduce the project’s contribution to Impact C-CP-1 to a less than cumulatively considerable level because these mitigation measures would ensure that plans for testing, monitoring, data recovery, documentation and interpretation are approved and implemented to preserve and realize the information potential of archaeological and paleontological resources that may be encountered on the project site.

B. **NOISE**

- **Impact NO-1:** Construction of the proposed project would generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the San Francisco General Plan or noise ordinance and would result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

  o The project’s demolition, excavation, and building construction activities would temporarily and intermittently increase noise in the project vicinity to levels that could be considered an annoyance by occupants of nearby properties, which would be a potentially significant impact under CEQA. The loudest construction activities, such as installing piles, grading, and excavation, would occur over the first two years of the
construction period, and once the activity is completed, the associated high noise levels would no longer be experienced by the affected sensitive receptors.

- The following mitigation measures, as more fully described in the Final EIR, are hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided herein, to mitigate the potentially significant impact of Impact NO-1.
  - **Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a:** Reduce Noise Levels During Construction
  - **Mitigation Measure M-NO-1b:** Noise-Reducing Techniques and Muffling Devices for Pile Installation

- Based on the final EIR and the entire administrative record, it is hereby found and determined that implementing Mitigation Measures M-NO-1a and M-NO-1b would reduce Impact NO-1 to a less than significant level because Mitigation Measure M-NO-1 would require the project contractor to use equipment with lower noise emissions and sound controls or barriers where feasible, locate stationary equipment as far as possible from sensitive receptors, and designate a noise coordinator, and Mitigation Measure M-NO-1b would require the use of feasible noise-reducing techniques for installing piles. The combination of these measures would decrease construction noise levels and minimize the significant effects.

- **Impact NO-2:** Construction of the proposed project would result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

  - Proposed project demolition, excavation, and building construction activities would temporarily generate groundborne vibration in the project vicinity that could be considered an annoyance by occupants of adjacent properties, especially residential and cultural uses adjacent to the site, and could also damage nearby structures, with the highest levels of groundborne vibration expected during demolition and the installation of piles for structural support. This would be a potentially significant impact under CEQA.

  - The following mitigation measures, as more fully described in the Final EIR, are hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided herein, to mitigate the potentially significant impact of Impact NO-2.
    - **Mitigation Measure M-NO-2a:** Minimize Vibration Levels During Construction
    - **Mitigation Measure M-NO-2b:** Pre-Construction Assessment to Protect Structures from Ground Vibration Associated with Pile Installation
    - **Mitigation Measure M-NO-2c:** Vibration Monitoring and Management Plan

  - Based on the final EIR and the entire administrative record, it is hereby found and determined that implementing Mitigation Measures M-NO-2a, M-NO-2b, and M-NO-2c would reduce Impact NO-2 to a less than significant level because Mitigation Measure M-NO-2a would provide for a community liaison to respond to and address complaints and require protective construction techniques, Mitigation Measure M-NO-2b would implement a pre-construction assessment and, if needed, monitoring during vibration causing activities to detect ground settlement or lateral movement of structures, and Mitigation Measure M-NO-2c would implement a vibration monitoring and management
plan to avoid any adverse vibration-related impact to historic structures. With implementation of Mitigation Measures M-NO-2a and M-NO-2b, potential vibration impacts in the project vicinity would be reduced to levels that would be less than significant. With implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-2c, there would be no significant vibration-related impacts to the Aronson Building.

- **Impact NO-3**: Operation of the proposed project would generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the San Francisco General Plan or noise ordinance and would result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.
  - Operation of the proposed project would introduce additional noise sources to the area, including additional motor vehicle traffic and new mechanical systems, such as ventilation equipment. Although specific information regarding the proposed stationary noise sources is currently not available, building mechanical systems would be capable of generating noise levels in excess of applicable General Plan noise-land use compatibility thresholds on adjacent sensitive receptors, which could result in potentially significant impacts on both the on-site and adjacent noise-sensitive residential and cultural uses.
  - The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided herein, to mitigate the potentially significant impact of Impact NO-3.
    - **Mitigation Measure M-NO-3**: Stationary Operational Noise Sources
      - Based on the final EIR and the entire administrative record, it is hereby found and determined that implementing Mitigation Measures M-NO-3 would reduce Impact NO-3 to a less than significant level because this mitigation measure would require the screening, shielding, or setting back of stationary noise sources from noise-sensitive receptors, and would require that a qualified acoustical consultant measure the noise levels of operating exterior equipment within three months after its installation.

- **Impact C-NO-2**: Construction of the proposed project, in combination with other past, resent, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity, would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.
  - The project along with other nearby projects such as the SFMOMA Expansion (151 Third Street), the Palace Hotel (2 New Montgomery Street), and the Central Subway project have the potential for cumulatively significant groundborne vibration and noise level impacts, particularly during initial phases of proposed project construction. However, the periods when construction vibration impacts would overlap would be brief and limited, and the overall cumulative construction vibration impacts would not be cumulatively significant.
  - The following mitigation measures, as more fully described in the Final EIR, are hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided herein, to mitigate the potentially significant impact of Impact C-NO-2.
C. AIR QUALITY

- **Impact AQ-3**: Construction of the proposed project would generate emissions of PM2.5 and toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, at levels that would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
  - The Air Quality Technical Report that was prepared for the project found that constructions emissions would exceed the threshold of significance for excess cancer risk at the project MEI if the emissions were not mitigated.
  - The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided herein, to mitigate the potentially significant impact of Impact AQ-3.
    - **Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3**: Construction Emissions Mitigation
      - Based on the final EIR and the entire administrative record, it is hereby found and determined that implementing Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3 would reduce Impact AQ-3 to a less than significant level because this mitigation measure would require a Construction Emissions Mitigation Plan designed to reduce construction-related diesel particulate matter emissions from off-road construction equipment used at the site by at least 65 percent as compared to the construction equipment list, schedule, and inventory provided by the sponsor on May 27, 2011, which would bring emissions below the threshold of significance for excess cancer risk.

D. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

- **Impact HZ-2**: The proposed project would have a substantial adverse effect on the public or the environment through the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment.
  - In order to construct the proposed tower, excavation to a depth of approximately 41 feet below the surface on the west side of the Aronson Building would be required, which could have the potential to expose the public and environment to contaminants in the soil.
  - The following mitigation measure, as more fully described in the Final EIR, is hereby adopted in the form set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided herein, to mitigate the potentially significant impact of Impact HZ-2.
• Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2: Hazardous Materials – Testing for and Handling of Contaminated Soil
  o Based on the final EIR and the entire administrative record, it is hereby found and determined that implementing Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2 would reduce Impact HZ-2 to a less than significant level because this mitigation measure would require soil testing for contaminants of concern, preparation of a Soil Mitigation Plan for managing contaminated soils on the site, and protocols for the handling, hauling, and disposal of contaminated soils, which would reduce the potential for exposure of the public and the environment to a less than significant level.

The Project Sponsor has agreed to implement all mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR for the project. The required mitigation measures are fully enforceable and will be included as conditions of approval by and the Commission and other City decision makers. Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081.6, adopted mitigation measures will be implemented and monitored as described in the MMRP, which is incorporated herein by reference.

With the required mitigation measures, all potential project impacts, with the exception of impacts described in Section IV below, would be avoided or reduced to a less-than-significant level.

As authorized by CEQA Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, 15092, and 15093, based on substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding, the City finds that, unless otherwise stated, all of the changes or alterations to the Project identified in the mitigation measures have been or will be required in, or incorporated into, the project to mitigate or avoid the significant or potentially significant environmental impacts listed herein, as identified in the Final EIR, that these mitigation measures will be effective to reduce or avoid the potentially significant impacts as described in the EIR, and these mitigation measures are feasible to implement and are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City and County of San Francisco to implement or enforce.

IV. Significant Impacts That Cannot Be Avoided Or Reduced To A Less-Than-Significant Level

Based on substantial evidence in the whole record of these proceedings, the Commission finds that, where feasible, changes or alterations have been required, or incorporated into, the Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental impacts. The Commission finds that changes have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21002 and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, may substantially lessen, but do not avoid (i.e., reduce to less than significant levels), the potentially significant environmental effect associated with implementation of the Project. The Commission adopts all of the mitigation measures proposed in the Final EIR and set forth in the MMRP. The Commission further finds, however, for the impact listed below, despite the implementation of mitigation measures, the effects remain significant and unavoidable.

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

A. SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS – CUMULATIVE SHADOW

- Impact C-WS-2: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity, would create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas, resulting in a significant cumulative shadow impact. The proposed project would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to this significant cumulative shadow impact.

  o There are several proposed projects in the project vicinity that have the potential to shadow outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas, including some of the same open spaces that the proposed project would shadow. Reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity of the project site include 151 Third Street (the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art Expansion Project), 2 New Montgomery Street (the Palace Hotel Project), and the Transit Tower, and the other projects contemplated by the Transit Center District Plan. The proposed project in combination with other proposed projects in the vicinity would add new shadow on various open spaces and public areas. By contributing shadow to open spaces and public areas, the proposed project would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to the significant and unavoidable cumulative shadow impacts.

  o There is no feasible mitigation for the proposed project's contribution to cumulative shadow impacts, because any theoretical mitigation that would address the cumulatively considerable contribution to shadow impacts on outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas within the project vicinity would fundamentally alter the project's basic design and programming parameters. Thus, rather than treat a substantial reduction in height as a mitigation measure, the EIR analyzed a reduction in height in two separate alternatives.

With regard to the project's shadow impacts on Union Square, other than a reduction in the height of the tower to approximately 351 feet or less, no further modification of the tower could eliminate the tower's net new shadow on Union Square. The project has already undergone design revisions to sculpt the top of the tower in order to reduce shadow on Union Square. The original project proposed by the project sponsor included an elliptical tower design that was approximately 630 feet tall and 170 feet wide at the highest level. That proposal was modified to reflect a shorter and more slender rectangular tower design that was shifted to the west on the project site to reduce shadow impacts on Union Square. The rectangular design ultimately chosen for the project would break up the tower massing and top into smaller volumes at different or staggered heights, particularly along the eastern edge of the site and tower, to further reduce shadow. In addition, the tower massing and the tower core were moved 15 feet to the
west on the project site, and the tower cantilever over the Aronson Building was reduced from 106 feet to 8 feet to further reduce shadow impacts on Union Square.

- On May 21, 2013, a technical memorandum prepared by Turnstone Consulting was submitted analyzing the shadow impacts of the Project on Union Square, based on the reduced 480-foot roof height. The memorandum concluded that the Project would cast 238,788 sfh of net new shadow on Union Square on a yearly basis, which would be an increase of about 0.06% of the Theoretically Available Annual Sunlight (TAAS) on Union Square. The reduction in the height of the tower results in a reduction of approximately 29% of net new shadow compared with the Project’s 520-foot tower design.

- Even if the project’s shadow impacts to Union Square were eliminated, the project would still shadow other downtown open spaces and public areas such as sidewalks. A further reduction of the building height beyond that already included would substantially reduce the development program of the proposed project. Thus, the project’s cumulatively considerable contribution to the significant and unavoidable impact would remain and there is no feasible mitigation to reduce the project’s contribution to this significant cumulative impact to a less-than-cumulatively considerable level. Because a significant decrease in the tower height affects the Project significantly, these height reductions were discussed as alternatives. See also the discussion of the Existing Zoning Alternative and the Reduced Shadow Alternative, below.

- Therefore, the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity would create new cumulative shadow in a manner that would substantially affect parks, outdoor recreation facilities, or other public areas. This cumulative shadow impact would be significant and unavoidable, and the proposed project would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to this significant cumulative shadow impact.
v. Alternatives Rejected and the Reasons for Rejecting Them as Infeasible

The Commission rejects the Alternatives set forth in the Final EIR and listed below because the Commission finds that there is substantial evidence, including evidence of economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations described in this Section, in addition to those described in Section VI below, under CEQA Guidelines 15091(a)(3), that make infeasible such Alternatives. In making these determinations, the 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 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 Commission adopts the EIR’s analysis and conclusions regarding alternatives eliminated from further consideration, both during the scoping process and in response to comments. The Commission certifies that it has independently reviewed and considered the information on the alternatives provided in the Final EIR and in the record. The Project Sponsor engaged Economic & Planning Systems, Inc. to prepare an economic analysis of the financial feasibility of the project alternatives described in the EIR. (Report on the Financial Feasibility of 706 Mission Street: The Mexican Museum and Residential Tower Project and Alternatives, dated May 2013 (the “EPS Report”). The Successor Agency retained an independent economic consultant Keyser Marston Associates, Inc., to peer review the EPS Report and Keyser Marston Associates prepared the “Peer Review of Financial Feasibility Report for 706 Mission Street” (“Peer Review”). The Peer Review, independently reviewed and evaluated by the Successor Agency, concurs with the results of the EPS Report. Planning Department staff and the Commission have independently reviewed and concur with the results of the EPS Report and the Peer Review. The Final EIR reflects the Commission's and the City's independent judgment as to the alternatives.

The Commission finds that the Project provides the best balance between satisfaction of the project objectives and mitigation of environmental impacts to the extent feasible, as described and analyzed in the EIR, and adopts a statement of overriding considerations as set forth in Section VI below.

While the Commission makes these findings regarding the environmental impacts and feasibility of each of the alternatives analyzed in the final EIR, if feasible mitigation measures substantially lessen or avoid the significant adverse environmental effects of a project, the project may be approved without an evaluation of the feasibility of project alternatives. Laurel Hills Homeowners Association v. City Council of Los Angeles, 83 Cal.App.3d 515, 521 (1978). With respect to the project, all significant impacts can be reduced to a less than significant level with feasible mitigations measures, except for the project’s cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative shadow impacts. Thus, although the Commission makes these findings regarding the environmental impacts of each of the alternatives, CEQA only requires that the Commission make findings regarding the alternatives that would substantially lessen or avoid the project’s cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative shadow
impacts. Findings for the Separate Buildings Alternative and Increased Residential Density Alternative are therefore not required by CEQA, although the Commission nevertheless makes findings for those alternatives below.

The FEIR analyzed five alternatives to the Project: No Project Alternative, Existing Zoning Alternative, Separate Buildings Alternative, Increased Residential Density Alternative, and Reduced Shadow Alternative. These alternatives and the reasons for rejecting them are described below.

1. **No Project Alternative**

Under the No Project Alternative, the site would remain in its existing condition. Assuming that the existing physical conditions at the project site would remain into the foreseeable future, none of the impacts associated with the proposed project would occur.

The No Project Alternative would not create net new shadow on Union Square, or any other public open spaces, privately owned publicly accessible open spaces, or public sidewalks, and therefore would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the significant unavoidable cumulative shadow impact. Because existing conditions on the project site would not change under this alternative, there would be no impacts related to land use and land use planning, aesthetics, population and housing, cultural and paleontological resources, transportation and circulation, noise, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, wind, recreation, utilities and service systems, public services, biological resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, hazards and hazardous materials, mineral and energy resources or agricultural and forest resources. Under the proposed project, the impacts with respect to these environmental topics would be either less than significant or less than significant with mitigation, except for agricultural and forest resources. Both the No Project Alternative and the proposed project would have no impact on agricultural and forest resources.

The No Project Alternative would not be desirable or meet either the Successor Agency or the Project Sponsor's objectives, as more particularly described below. The No Project Alternative is rejected in favor of the project and is found infeasible for the following environmental, economic, legal, social, technological, and/or other reasons:

- The No Project Alternative would not meet any of the Successor Agency or the Project Sponsor's objectives.

- The No Project Alternative would not complete the redevelopment of the YBC Redevelopment Project Area envisioned under the former *Yerba Buena Center Redevelopment Plan*.

- The No Project Alternative would not stimulate and attract private investment and generate sales taxes and other General Fund revenues from new uses on the project site, thereby improving the City's overall economic health, employment opportunities, tax base, and community economic development opportunities.
• The No Project Alternative would not provide for the development of a museum facility and an endowment for the Mexican Museum on Successor Agency-owned property located adjacent to Jessie Square, at the heart of San Francisco's cultural district location, in a manner that is consistent with General Plan Policy VI-1.9, to "create opportunities for private developers to include arts spaces in private developments city-wide."

• The No Project Alternative would not result in construction of a preeminent building with a superior level of design for this important site across from Yerba Buena Gardens and adjacent to Jessie Square in a manner that complements the landscaping and design of Jessie Square.

• The No Project Alternative would not provide housing in an urban infill location to help alleviate the effects of suburban sprawl.

• The No Project Alternative would not provide temporary and permanent employment and contracting opportunities for minorities, women, qualified economically disadvantaged individuals, and other residents both in the South of Market area and in the City generally, in a manner consistent with the City’s current and future equal opportunity programs.

• The No Project Alternative would not maximize the quality of the pedestrian experience along Mission Street and Third Street, while maintaining accessibility to the project site for automobiles and loading.

• The No Project Alternative would not provide for rehabilitation of the historically important Aronson Building.

• The No Project Alternative would not secure funding for new and affordable below-market-rate units.

• The No Project Alternative would not secure additional funding for operations, management, and security of Yerba Buena Gardens.

• The No Project Alternative would not result in the construction of a residential building of superior quality and design that complements and is generally consistent with the downtown area, furthering the objectives of the General Plan’s Urban Design Element and the former Yerba Buena Center Redevelopment Plan.

• The No Project Alternative would not redevelop the project site with a high-quality residential development that includes a ground-floor retail or restaurant use.

• The No Project Alternative would not provide housing in downtown San Francisco that is accessible to local and regional transit, as well as cultural amenities and attractions, such as performing art centers, and art museums and exhibitions.
The Commission finds each of these reasons provide sufficient independent grounds for rejecting the No Project Alternative.

2. **Existing Zoning Alternative**

The intent of the Existing Zoning Alternative is to provide an alternative that meets all applicable provisions of the Planning Code and existing zoning for the project site. In addition, this alternative would reduce the significant and unavoidable cumulative shadow impacts compared to the proposed project, but not to a less than significant level. Under this alternative, a new 13-story, approximately 196-foot-tall building with a 9.0 to 1 FAR would be constructed adjacent to and west of the Aronson Building. As with the proposed project, the Aronson Building would be restored and rehabilitated, and the new building would be connected to it. This alternative would provide an approximately 45,000-gsf cultural space for The Mexican Museum, compared to the approximately 52,285-gsf of cultural space provided for the museum under the proposed project. Vehicular access into and out of the existing subsurface Jessie Square Garage would not change from existing conditions. Unlike the proposed project, under this alternative, there would not be a driveway on Third Street to serve the residential units. The vehicular access variants analyzed for the proposed project would not apply to this alternative.

The Existing Zoning Alternative would reduce as compared to the proposed project the cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant and unavoidable cumulative shadow impact, but not to a less than cumulatively considerable level. While the reduced building height of the new tower under this alternative would not create net new shadow on Union Square, unlike the proposed project, shadow from the proposed tower could still reach some of the same public open spaces, privately owned publicly accessible open spaces, and public sidewalks that would be shadowed by the proposed project, and therefore may contribute to a cumulatively significant shadow impact. As with the proposed project (but generally to a lesser degree than with the proposed project), there would be less-than-significant impacts related to land use and land use planning, aesthetics, population and housing, transportation and circulation, greenhouse gas emissions, wind, recreation, utilities and service systems, public services, biological resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, and mineral and energy resources. As with the proposed project (but generally to a lesser degree than with the proposed project), there would be less-than-significant impacts with mitigation related to cultural and paleontological resources, noise, air quality, and hazards and hazardous materials. Both the Existing Zoning Alternative and the proposed project would have no impact on agricultural and forest resources.

The Existing Zoning Alternative would meet some, but not all, of the Successor Agency and Project Sponsor's objectives. For example, it would attract private investment and generate sales taxes and other General Fund revenues from new uses on the project site, and would provide housing in an urban infill location, near transit and cultural amenities to help alleviate the effects of suburban sprawl, although not as much housing as under the proposed project. The Existing Zoning Alternative would provide temporary and permanent employment and contracting opportunities for minorities, women, qualified economically disadvantaged individuals, and other residents although the scope of these alternatives would be less than with the proposed project due to the reduced size of the Existing Zoning Alternative. The Existing Zoning Alternative would provide for rehabilitation of the historically important Aronson Building. The Existing Zoning Alternative would design and construct the project to a minimum of
Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Silver standards (or such higher and additional requirements as adopted by the City and County of San Francisco), thereby reducing the project’s carbon footprint and maximizing the energy efficiency of the building.

But, the Existing Zoning Alternative would reduce but not avoid the proposed project’s cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant and unavoidable cumulative shadow impact, although the reduced height of the new tower under this alternative would not create net new shadow on Union Square. Furthermore, the Existing Zoning Alternative would not be desirable or meet many of the Successor Agency and Project Sponsor’s objectives and/or would not advance those objectives to the extent that the proposed project would, as more particularly described below.

The EPS Report indicates that the Existing Zoning Alternative is not financially feasible because project costs plus developer targeted return would exceed project revenues under this alternative. The Existing Zoning Alternative is not financially feasible with or without the purchase of TDRs because under this Alternative, the height of the tower is reduced, which reduces the number of revenue generating units, and per square foot construction costs are highest under this alternative due to a decrease in construction cost efficiency. Additionally, the Jessie Square Garage would not be conveyed to the Project Sponsor under this alternative, which means the Alternative does not include defeasance of the outstanding Jessie Square Garage bonds or repayment of the Successor Agency’s debt to the City. It also does not generate parking-related revenue.

The Existing Zoning Alternative is projected to generate approximately $149 million under the Residential Flex Option. With the purchase of TDRs, projected development costs, including developer return, are approximately $292 million under the Residential Flex Option. The Project Residuals, above the minimum return on investment needed for project feasibility, are estimated at approximately negative $142.6 million under the Residential Flex Option. With the purchase of TDRs, the Project Residuals for this Alternative are estimated at approximately negative $143.4 million under the Residential Flex Option. The Peer Review concurs with this opinion.

Therefore, the Existing Zoning Alternative is rejected in favor of the project and is found infeasible for the following environmental, economic, legal, social, technological, and/or other reasons:

- The Existing Zoning Alternative would not avoid the proposed project’s cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant and unavoidable cumulative shadow impact.

- The Existing Zoning Alternative would not transfer ownership of the Jessie Square Garage to a private entity and therefore does not include defeasance of the outstanding Jessie Square Garage bonds or repayment of the Successor Agency’s debt to the City.

- The Existing Zoning Alternative would not create a development that meets the Successor Agency’s and Project Sponsor’s objective to be financially feasible with the ability to fund the Project’s capital costs and ongoing operation and maintenance costs related to the redevelopment and long-term operation of the Mexican Museum parcel without reliance on public funds.
Because the Existing Zoning Alternative would not create a development that is financially feasible, the Existing Zoning Alternative would not be constructed, and none of the benefits associated with the Project, such as the construction of The Mexican Museum core and shell at no cost to the Successor Agency or City, the endowment for The Mexican Museum, funding for new and affordable market rate units, rehabilitation of the historically important Aronson Building, defeasance of the outstanding Jessie Square Garage bonds and repayment of the Successor Agency’s debt to the City, or additional funding for operations, management, and security of Yerba Buena Gardens, would exist under this Alternative. Thus the Existing Zoning Alternative is infeasible because it does not meet the Successor’s Agency’s objectives to: complete the redevelopment of the Yerba Buena Redevelopment Project Area; to stimulate and attract private development on the site; to provide for the development of a museum facility and an endowment for that facility; and others noted in the EIR on pages II.5 to II.6.

Because the Existing Zoning Alternative substantially reduces the residential density and the number of housing units produced at this site, this Alternative is infeasible because it does not fully satisfy General Plan policies such as Housing Element Policies 1.1 and 1.4, among others noted in the Department’s staff report accompany the Project Approvals on the Determination of Compliance with Section 309, among other approvals. The Project site is well-served by transit, services and shopping and is suited for dense residential development, where residents can commute and satisfy convenience needs without frequent use of a private automobile. The Project Site is located immediately adjacent to employment opportunities within the Downtown Core, and is in an area with abundant local and region-serving transit options, including the future Transit Center. For these reasons, a project with fewer residential units at this site is not compatible with the General Plan and is infeasible.

The Existing Zoning Alternative is infeasible because it substantially reduces the residential density and the number of housing units produced at this site, and thus does not meet the Successor Agency’s objectives to the extent that the Project does. Among other objectives, the Existing Zoning Alternative would not stimulate and attractive private investment, sales tax and other General Fund revenues to the extent that the Project would; would not provide temporary and permanent jobs to the extent that the Project would; and due to its reduced height, it may not provide a preeminent building of the same stature as the Project.

The Commission finds each of these reasons provide sufficient independent grounds for rejecting the Existing Zoning Alternative.

3. **Separate Buildings Alternative**

The purpose of the Separate Buildings Alternative is to minimize changes to the Aronson Building, while still meeting most of the Project Sponsor’s objectives and the objectives of the Successor Agency. Under this alternative, a new 47-story, 520-foot-tall building (with 30 foot tall mechanical/elevator penthouse) would be constructed adjacent to and west of the Aronson Building. The Mexican Museum would occupy space on the first through fifth floors of the new building. Unlike the proposed project, the new building would not be connected to the Aronson Building. Unlike the proposed project, the Separate Buildings
Alternative would not undertake the full scope of rehabilitation and restoration of the Aronson Building; only repairs and improvements necessary to prevent further deterioration of the Aronson Building or to permit continued occupancy of the Aronson Building would be undertaken. However, the two non-historic annexes would still be demolished under this alternative. This alternative would include a down ramp along the north side of the Aronson Building from Third Street. The existing curb cut on Third Street would be used to provide vehicular ingress to the existing Jessie Square Garage by project residents for below-grade valet access and project-related delivery and service vehicles via a ramp. The vehicular access variants analyzed for the proposed project would not apply to this alternative.

The Separate Buildings Alternative would result in similar project-level and cumulative impacts as identified under the proposed project. Since the building design and configuration of the proposed tower would be the same as under the proposed project, this alternative would result in significant unavoidable cumulative shadow impact due to the creation of net new shadow on public open spaces, privately owned publicly accessible open spaces, and public sidewalks. As with the proposed project, there would be less-than-significant impacts related to land use and land use planning, aesthetics, population and housing, transportation and circulation, greenhouse gas emissions, wind, recreation, utilities and service systems, public services, biological resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, and mineral and energy resources. As with the proposed project, there would be less-than-significant impacts with mitigation related to cultural and paleontological resources, noise, air quality, and hazards and hazardous materials. Both the Separate Buildings Alternative and the proposed project would have no impact on agricultural and forest resources.

The Separate Building Alternative would meet some but not all of the Successor Agency and Project Sponsor’s objectives. It would complete the redevelopment of the YBC Redevelopment Project Area envisioned under the former Yerba Buena Center Redevelopment Plan and stimulate and attract private investment and generate sales taxes and other General Fund revenues from new uses on the project site. The Separate Buildings Alternative would provide for the development of a museum facility for The Mexican Museum. It would provide housing, near transit and cultural amenities, in an urban infill location to help alleviate the effects of suburban sprawl, although not as many housing units as under the proposed project. The Separate Buildings Alternative would provide temporary and permanent employment and contracting opportunities for minorities, women, qualified economically disadvantaged individuals, and other residents, although not as many opportunities as with the proposed project. The Separate Buildings Alternative would transfer ownership of the Jessie Square Garage to a private entity, while providing adequate parking for other cultural uses. The Separate Buildings Alternative would design and construct the project to a minimum of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Silver standards (or such higher and additional requirements as adopted by the City and County of San Francisco), thereby reducing the project’s carbon footprint.

The Separate Buildings Alternative would result in similar project-level and cumulative impacts as the proposed project, and would not avoid or substantially lessen the proposed project’s cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant and unavoidable cumulative shadow impact. The Separate Buildings Alternative would not be desirable or meet some of the Successor Agency or the Project Sponsor’s objectives, and/or would not advance those objectives to the extent that the proposed project would, as more particularly described below. Therefore, the Separate Buildings Alternative is rejected in favor of the project and is found infeasible for the following environmental, economic, legal, social, technological, and/or other reasons:
The Separate Buildings Alternative would result in similar project-level and cumulative impacts as the proposed project, and, most significantly, would not avoid or substantially lessen the project’s cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative shadow impact.

The Separate Buildings Alternative would not undertake the full scope of rehabilitation and restoration of the historically important Aronson Building as would be the case under the proposed project. Instead, only repairs and improvements necessary to prevent further deterioration and/or to permit continued occupancy would be undertaken meaning that the objective of rehabilitating the building would not be met.

The Commission finds each of these reasons provide sufficient independent grounds for rejecting the Separate Buildings Alternative.

4. **Increased Residential Density Alternative**

The purpose of the Increased Residential Density Alternative is to consider a project that would provide more residential dwelling units within the same amount of floor area as would be provided by the proposed project. Under this alternative, a new 47-story, 520-foot-tall building (with 30 foot tall elevator/mechanical penthouse) would be constructed adjacent to and west of the Aronson Building. As with the proposed project, the Aronson Building would be restored and rehabilitated, and the new building would be connected to the Aronson Building. As with the proposed project, seven floors in the Aronson Building would be designated as flex space for the residential and office flex options. Under the residential flex option, the Aronson Building would include up to 325 residential units (110 more units than under the proposed project) and no office space. Under the office flex option, this building would include up to 283 residential units (92 more units than under the proposed project) and approximately 61,320 gsf of office space. As with the proposed project, the Increased Residential Density Alternative would use the existing curb cut on Third Street to provide vehicular ingress to the existing Jessie Square Garage. This access would be for use by project residents only. As with the proposed project, this alternative would include a residential drop-off area (vehicular access would be the same as under the proposed project). The vehicular access variants analyzed for the proposed project would also apply to this alternative.

The Increased Residential Density Alternative would result in similar project-level and cumulative impacts as identified under the proposed project, although some of the alternative’s impacts, such as traffic and circulation and air quality during project operations, would be slightly greater because of the increased density. The Increased Residential Density Alternative would not avoid or reduce any significant environmental effects of the proposed project. Because the building design and configuration of the proposed tower would be the same as under the proposed project, this alternative would result in significant unavoidable cumulative shadow impact due to the creation of net new shadow on Union Square and other public open spaces, privately owned publicly accessible open spaces, and public sidewalks. As with the proposed project, there would be less-than-significant impacts related to land use and land use planning, aesthetics, population and housing, transportation and circulation, greenhouse gas emissions, wind, recreation, utilities and service systems, public services, biological resources,
geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, and mineral and energy resources. As with the proposed project, there would be less-than-significant impacts with mitigation related to cultural and paleontological resources, noise, air quality, and hazards and hazardous materials. Both the Increased Residential Density Alternative and the proposed project would have no impact on agricultural and forest resources.

The Increased Residential Density Alternative would meet some but not all of the Project Sponsor’s objectives. For example, it would stimulate and attract private investment and generate sales taxes and other General Fund revenues from new uses on the project site, and result in the construction of a preeminent building at this important site across from Yerba Buena Gardens and adjacent to Jessie Square. The Increased Residential Density Alternative would provide housing, close to transit and cultural amenities, in an urban infill location to help alleviate the effects of suburban sprawl. It would provide temporary and permanent employment and contracting opportunities for minorities, women, qualified economically disadvantaged individuals, and other residents, and would transfer ownership of the Jessie Square Garage to a private entity, while providing adequate parking for other existing nonprofit organizations and the public in the Jessie Square Garage. The Increased Residential Density Alternative would provide for rehabilitation of the historically important Aronson Building and would design and construct the project to a minimum of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Silver standards (or such higher and additional requirements as adopted by the City and County of San Francisco), thereby reducing the project’s carbon footprint and maximizing the energy efficiency of the building.

But, the Increased Residential Density Alternative would result in similar project-level and cumulative impacts as identified under the proposed project, would slightly increase some impacts, and would not avoid or substantially lessen the proposed project’s cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant and unavoidable cumulative shadow impact.

The Increased Residential Density Alternative would meet most of the Successor Agency and Project Sponsor’s objectives but not all of the Successor Agency or Project Sponsor’s Objectives. In addition, according to the EPS Report, the Increased Residential Density Alternative is not financially feasible because project costs plus developer targeted return would exceed project revenues under this alternative. The Increased Residential Density Alternative is not financially feasible because the direct per square foot construction costs are higher under the Increased Residential Density Alternative than under the Proposed Project. Though there are more units in the Increased Residential Density Alternative than there are in the Proposed Project, the overall square footage is the same. Because residential revenue is based on a per square foot price (rather than a per unit price), the residential revenue is similar to the Proposed Project.

The Increased Residential Density Alternative is projected to generate approximately $585 million under the Residential Flex Option. Projected development costs, including developer return, are approximately $610 million under the Residential Flex Option. The Project Residuals, above the minimum return on investment needed for project feasibility, are estimated at approximately negative $25.6 million under the Residential Flex Option. The Peer Review concurs with this opinion.
The Increased Residential Density Alternative is rejected in favor of the project and is found not to be feasible or desirable for the following environmental, economic, legal, social, technological, and/or other reasons:

- The Increased Residential Density Alternative would result in similar project-level and cumulative impacts as identified under the proposed project, would slightly increase some impacts, and would not avoid or reduce any significant environmental effects of the proposed project. Specifically, when compared to the proposed project, this alternative would result in incrementally increased impacts under Transportation and Circulation (additional trips on already impacted intersections; additional demand on transit service), Air Quality (additional project related operational emissions), Greenhouse Gas (additional project related emissions increasing the project’s carbon footprint), Recreation (additional residents seeking recreation facilities), Public Services (additional residents seeking police or fire protection services), and Utilities and Service Systems (additional residents increasing water usage and generating additional wastewater).

- The Increased Residential Density Alternative would not meet the objective to create a development that is financially feasible and that can fund the Project’s capital costs and ongoing operation and maintenance costs related to the redevelopment and long-term operation of the Mexican Museum parcel without reliance on public funds.

- Because the Increased Residential Density Alternative would not create a development that is financially feasible, the Increased Density Alternative would not be constructed, and none of the benefits associated with the Project, such as the construction of The Mexican Museum core and shell at no cost to the Successor Agency or City, the endowment for The Mexican Museum, funding for new and affordable market rate units, rehabilitation of the historically important Aronson Building, defeasance of the outstanding Jessie Square Garage bonds and repayment of the Successor Agency’s debt to the City, or additional funding for operations, management, and security of Yerba Buena Gardens, would exist under this Alternative. Thus the Increased Residential Density Alternative is infeasible because it does not meet the Successor’s Agency’s objectives mentioned above including, but not limited to: complete the redevelopment of the Yerba Buena Redevelopment Project Area; to stimulate and attract private development on the site; to provide for the development of a museum facility and an endowment for that facility; and others noted in the EIR on pages II.5 to II.6.

The Commission finds each of these reasons provide sufficient independent grounds for rejecting the Increased Residential Density Alternative.

5. Reduced Shadow Alternative

The purpose of the Reduced Shadow Alternative is to reduce the shadow impacts that would be caused by development under the proposed project. Under this alternative, a new 27-story, approximately 351-foot-tall tower, including a mechanical penthouse, would be constructed adjacent to, west of and connected to the Aronson Building, with approximately 45,000 gsf of cultural space for The Mexican
Museum as compared to approximately 52,285 square feet under the proposed project. As with the proposed project, the Aronson Building would be restored and rehabilitated. This alternative’s residential flex option would include up to 186 residential units (4 fewer residential units than planned under the Proposed Project). This alternative’s office flex option would include up to 162 residential units and approximately 52,560 gsf of office space. This alternative would also include approximately 4,800 gsf of retail/restaurant space. As under the proposed project, the Jessie Square Garage would be converted from a public garage to a private garage. Unlike the proposed project, the Reduced Shadow Alternative would not include a driveway from Third Street to serve the residential units. Vehicular access into and out of the existing subsurface Jessie Square Garage would not change from under existing conditions. The vehicular access variants analyzed for the proposed project would not apply to this alternative. The Reduced Shadow Alternative, like the proposed project, would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant and unavoidable cumulative shadow impact. Although the reduced building height of the new tower under this alternative would substantially reduce shadow impacts and would not create net new shadow on Union Square, unlike the proposed project, shadow from the proposed tower could still reach some of the same public open spaces, privately owned publicly accessible open spaces, and public sidewalks that would be shadowed by the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative may contribute to a cumulatively significant shadow impact. As with the proposed project (but generally to a lesser degree than with the proposed project), there would be less-than-significant impacts related to land use and land use planning, aesthetics, population and housing, transportation and circulation, greenhouse gas emissions, wind, recreation, utilities and service systems, public services, biological resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, and mineral and energy resources. As with the proposed project (but generally to a lesser degree than with the proposed project), there would be less-than-significant impacts with mitigation related to cultural and paleontological resources, noise, air quality, and hazards and hazardous materials. Both the Reduced Shadow Alternative and the proposed project would have no impact on agricultural and forest resources.

The Reduced Shadow Alternative would meet some, but not all of the Successor Agency and Project Sponsor’s objectives. It would complete redevelopment of the YBC Redevelopment Project Area envisioned under the Yerba Buena Center Redevelopment Plan and attract private investment and generate sales taxes and other General Fund revenues from new uses on the project site, although to a lesser extent than with the proposed project. The Reduced Shadow Alternative would provide housing, close to transit and cultural amenities, in an urban infill location to help alleviate the effects of suburban sprawl, although fewer housing units than with the proposed project. The Reduced Shadow Alternative would provide temporary and permanent employment and contracting opportunities for minorities, women, qualified economically disadvantaged individuals, and other residents, although to a lesser extent than with the proposed project. The Reduced Shadow Alternative would transfer ownership of the Jessie Square Garage to a private entity, while providing adequate parking in the Jessie Square Garage for adjacent nonprofit organizations and the public. The Reduced Shadow Alternative would provide for rehabilitation of the historically important Aronson Building and would design and construct the project to a minimum of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Silver standards (or such higher and additional requirements as adopted by the City and County of San Francisco), thereby reducing the project’s carbon footprint and maximizing the energy efficiency of the building.
The Reduced Shadow Alternative, like the proposed project, would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant and unavoidable cumulative shadow impact, although the reduced building height of the new tower under this alternative would reduce shadow impacts and would not create new shadow on Union Square. The Reduced Shadow Alternative would not be desirable or meet many of the Successor Agency or Project Sponsor's objectives, and/or would not advance those objectives to the extent that the proposed project would, as more particularly described below.

In addition, according to the EPS Report, the Reduced Shadow Alternative is not financially feasible because project costs plus developer targeted return would exceed project revenues under this alternative. The Reduced Shadow Alternative is not financially feasible with or without the purchase of TDRs. In this Alternative, the height of the tower is reduced from 480 feet in the Proposed Project to 351 feet, which reduces the number of residential units to 186 under the Residential Flex Option and reduces potential revenue from residential sales. There are fewer units to generate revenue, and the number of upper floors of the Project, which command substantial price premiums due to views, are not available under the Reduced Shadow Alternative. At the same time, per square foot development costs are higher under the Reduced Shadow Alternative relative to the Proposed Project due to a decrease in construction cost efficiency. Within certain construction type thresholds, the taller the structure, the lower the cost per square foot due to cost-spreading efficiencies. The combination of these factors results in an alternative that is not financially feasible.

The Reduced Shadow Alternative is projected to generate approximately $313 million under the Residential Flex Option. With the purchase of TDRs, projected development costs, including developer return, are approximately $452 million under the Residential Flex Option. The Project Residuals, above the minimum return on investment needed for project feasibility, are estimated at approximately $137.6 million under the Residential Flex Option. With the purchase of TDRs, the Project Residuals for this Alternative are estimated at approximately $139.5 million under the Residential Flex Option. The Peer Review concurs with this opinion.

The Reduced Shadow Alternative is rejected in favor of the project and is found infeasible for the following environmental, economic, legal, social, technological, and/or other reasons:

- While the Reduced Shadow Alternative would include a reduced height tower of 27-stories as compared to the proposed project's 43-story tower and would create no new shadow on Union Square, its shadow could still reach some of the same public open spaces, privately owned publicly accessible open spaces, and public sidewalks that would be shadowed by the proposed project.

- The Reduced Shadow Alternative would not result in a development that is financially feasible and thus does not meet the Successor Agency's and Project Sponsor's objective to create a financially feasible project that can fund the project's capital costs and ongoing operation and maintenance costs related to the redevelopment and long-term operation of the Mexican Museum parcel without reliance on public funds.
• Because the Reduced Shadow Alternative would not create a development that is financially feasible, the Reduced Shadow Alternative would not be constructed, and none of the benefits associated with the Project, such as the construction of The Mexican Museum core and shell at no cost to the Successor Agency or City, the endowment for The Mexican Museum, funding for new and affordable market rate units, rehabilitation of the historically important Aronson Building, defeasance of the outstanding Jessie Square Garage bonds and repayment of the Successor Agency’s debt to the City, or additional funding for operations, management, and security of Yerba Buena Gardens, would exist under this Alternative. Thus the Reduced Shadow Alternative is infeasible because it does not meet the Successor’s Agency’s objectives to: complete the redevelopment of the Yerba Buena Redevelopment Project Area; to stimulate and attract private development on the site; to provide for the development of a museum facility and an endowment for that facility; and others noted in the EIR on pages II.5 to II.6.

• Because the Reduced Shadow Alternative substantially reduces the residential density and the number of housing units produced at this site, this Alternative is infeasible because it does not fully satisfy General Plan policies such as Housing Element Policies 1.1 and 1.4, among others noted in the Department’s staff report that accompany the Project Approvals on the Determination of Compliance with Section 309, among other approvals. The Project site is well-served by transit, services and shopping and is suited for dense residential development, where residents can commute and satisfy convenience needs without frequent use of a private automobile. The Project Site is located immediately adjacent to employment opportunities within the Downtown Core, and is in an area with abundant local and region-serving transit options, including the future Transit Center. For these reasons, a project with fewer residential units at this site is not compatible with the General Plan and is infeasible.

• The Reduced Shadow Alternative is infeasible because it substantially reduces the residential density and the number of housing units produced at this site, and thus does not meet the Successor Agency’s objectives to the extent that the Project does. Among other objectives, the Existing Zoning Alternative would not stimulate and attractive private investment, sales tax and other General Fund revenues to the extent that the Project would; would not provide temporary and permanent jobs to the extent that the Project would; and due to its reduced height, it may not provide a preeminent building of the same stature as the Project.

The Commission finds each of these reasons provide sufficient independent grounds for rejecting the Reduced Shadow Alternative.

Alternatives Rejected And Reasons For Rejection

The EIR identifies alternatives that were considered by the Planning Department as lead agency, or the Successor Agency, but were rejected as infeasible during the design development and scoping process, and explains the reasons underlying this determination. Among the factors that were considered include the failure to meet most of the basic objectives of the proposed project and inability to avoid significant environmental impacts. These considered and rejected alternatives are the Off-Site Alternative, a Freestanding Alternative, an Office Use Alternative, and Elliptical Tower Plan Alternative.
1. **Off-Site Alternative.** An Off-Site Alternative that would consist of a project design and programming similar to the proposed project, but in a different, though comparable in-fill location within the City and County of San Francisco was considered but rejected. An Off-Site Alternative would not meet many of the project objectives, particularly the objective of completing the redevelopment of the Yerba Buena Center Redevelopment Project Area and providing for the development of a museum facility and endowment for the Mexican Museum on the Successor Agency-owned property adjacent to Jessie Square. An Off-Site Alternative was also rejected since it would not include rehabilitation of the Aronson Building. The Commission finds each of these reasons provide sufficient independent grounds for rejecting the Off-Site Alternative.

2. **Freestanding Alternative.** A Freestanding Alternative that would result in a development on the Mexican Museum parcel of a freestanding museum with no development, including rehabilitation of the Aronson Building, on the 706 Mission Street parcel, was considered and rejected. Construction of a freestanding museum for the Mexican Museum by the prior San Francisco Redevelopment Agency ("SFRA") was considered not financeable because the SFRA did not, and the Successor Agency does not, have sufficient funds to cover the costs of constructing a freestanding museum on that parcel. Also, this alternative would not meet any of the project objectives. Lastly, a Freestanding Alternative was rejected because it would not result in any reduced impacts that are not already being evaluated in other alternatives, such as the Existing Zoning Alternative. The Commission finds each of these reasons provide sufficient independent grounds for rejecting the Freestanding Alternative.

3. **Office Use Alternative.** An Office Use Alternative that would include only office use in both the proposed tower and Aronson Building was considered and rejected. This alternative was rejected because the proposed project already has an office flex option that includes fewer proposed residential units and office-only use in the existing Aronson Building, and because an Office Use Alternative would generate more peak hour trips than would the proposed project. Further, an Office Use Alternative would not result in any reduced impacts, due to increased trip generation related to a project containing more office space. In addition, the Office Use Alternative was rejected because it would not meet the Successor Agency’s project objective of providing housing in an urban infill location. The Commission finds each of these reasons provide sufficient independent grounds for rejecting the Office Use Alternative.

4. **Elliptical Tower Plan.** The Environmental Evaluation Application, as originally submitted to the Planning Department in 2008, called for partial demolition of the Aronson Building and construction of a 42-story, approximately 630-foot-tall tower to the west of, adjacent to, and partially within, the Aronson Building at its northwest corner. This scheme was disfavored by Planning Department staff both because of its impacts on the physical integrity of the historic Aronson Building, as well as due to staff concerns regarding aesthetics related to its elliptical tower plan design. The Commission finds each of these reasons provide sufficient independent grounds for rejecting the Elliptical Tower Plan.

### Additional Alternatives Proposed By The Public

Various comments have proposed additional alternatives to the project. To the extent that these comments addressed the adequacy of the EIR analysis, they were described and analyzed in the RTC. As
presented in the record, the Final EIR reviewed a reasonable range of alternatives, and CEQA does not require the City or the project sponsor to consider every proposed alternative so long as the CEQA requirements for alternatives analysis have been satisfied. For the foregoing reasons, as well as economic, legal, social, technological and/or other considerations set forth herein, and elsewhere in the record, these alternatives are rejected.

VI. Statement of Overriding Considerations

Pursuant to CEQA section 21081 and CEQA Guideline 15093, the 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 as set forth below independently and collectively outweighs the significant and unavoidable impacts of the project and is an overriding consideration warranting approval of the Project. Any one of the reasons for approval cited below is sufficient to justify approval of the Project. Thus, even if a court were to conclude that not every reason is supported by substantial evidence, the Commission will stand by its determination that each individual reason is sufficient. The substantial evidence supporting the various benefits can be found in the Final EIR and in the documents found in the administrative record.

On the basis of the above findings and the substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding, the Commission specifically finds that there are significant benefits of the Project in spite of the unavoidable significant impacts, and therefore makes this Statement of Overriding Considerations. The Commission further finds that, as part of the process of obtaining Project approval, all significant effects on the environment from implementation of the Project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible. All mitigation measures proposed in the Final EIR for the proposed Project are adopted as part of this approval action. Furthermore, the 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. In addition, the Commission finds that the rejected Project Alternatives are also rejected for the following specific economic, social, or other considerations, in addition to the specific reasons discussed in Section V, above.

- The Project will provide a new permanent home for The Mexican Museum, a longtime cultural attraction of the City. The permanent home of The Mexican Museum will contribute to the City’s reputation as home to first class cultural amenities and attractions.

- The Project will provide a $5 million operating endowment for The Mexican Museum to support its ongoing operations.

- The Project will rehabilitate the historic Aronson Building, which is rated “A” (highest importance) by the Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage and is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places and the California Register of Historical Resources, and which was recently designated as a Category I Significant Building in the expanded New Montgomery-Mission-Second Street Conservation District, and which is in need of repair.
• The Project will create up to 190 new housing units, which will increase the City’s and region’s housing supply. These new housing units will be in close proximity to transit, employment opportunities, and neighborhood serving retail uses.

• The Project will pay an affordable housing in-lieu fee in an amount equivalent to a 28% housing production requirement, which is substantially in excess of the 20% requirement under the City’s Planning Code. The Project’s affordable housing in-lieu fee will be used to construct much needed affordable housing in the City.

• The Project will provide additional private funding for operations, management, and security of Yerba Buena Gardens; funding which would not be available without the project.

• The Project will construct a high quality, world-class, mixed-use development, designed by an internationally recognized architecture firm in accordance with sound urban design principles. The Project will create a new mixed-use residential development on an urban infill site in close proximity to transit, the Downtown and SOMA employment centers, the Yerba Buena cultural district, and retail uses.

• The Project’s residential tower will be built to at least Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Silver construction standards consistent with the requirements of the Building Code for the City and County of San Francisco (or such higher and additional requirements as adopted by the City and County of San Francisco). The LEED Silver standard will help reduce the City’s overall contribution to greenhouse gas emissions and global warming as well as reducing the project’s carbon footprint by providing for a highly energy efficient building.

• In redeveloping the project site with a high quality residential development that includes a cultural component and a ground floor retail or restaurant use, the project will further the objectives of the General Plan’s Urban Design Element and complete the development of the former Yerba Buena Center Redevelopment Plan.
DECISION

Based upon the whole record, the submissions by the Project Sponsor, the staff of the Department, and other interested parties, the oral testimony presented to the Commission at the public hearing, and all other written materials submitted by all parties, the Commission hereby adopts the foregoing CEQA Findings, and adopts the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program attached hereto as Exhibit A, which are conditions of approval of this Project, and are incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Motion was ADOPTED by the Planning Commission at its regular meeting on May 23, 2013

[Signature]
Jonas P. Ionin
Acting Commission Secretary

AYES: Fong, Antonini, Hillis, Borden
NOES: Moore, Sugaya, Wu
ABSENT: 
ADOPTED: May 23, 2013
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Actions and Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measures for the 706 Mission Street – The Mexican Museum and Residential Tower Project</strong> (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation Measures and Improvement Measures)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Resources (Archaeological Resources) Mitigation Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure M-CP-1a: Archaeological Testing, Monitoring, Data Recovery and Reporting</td>
<td>Project sponsor to retain qualified professional archaeologist from the pool of archival archaeologists maintained by the Planning Department.</td>
<td>Prior to commencement of soil-disturbing activities, submittal of all plans and reports for approval by the ERO.</td>
<td>The archeological consultant shall undertake an archeological testing program as specified herein. (See below regarding archeological consultant's reports)</td>
<td>Considered complete when Project Sponsor retains a qualified professional archaeological consultant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with Descendant Communities</td>
<td>Project sponsor/archeological consultant</td>
<td>For the duration of soil-disturbing activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Considered complete upon submittal of Final Archaeological Resources Report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On discovery of an archeological site associated with descendant Native Americans or the Overseas Chinese an appropriate representative of the descendant group and the ERO shall be contacted. The representative of the descendant group shall be given the opportunity to monitor archeological field investigations of the site and to consult with ERO regarding appropriate archeological treatment of the site, of recovered data from the site, and, if applicable, any interpretative treatment of the associated archeological site. A copy of the Final Archeological Resources Report shall be provided to the representative of the descendant group.
EXHIBIT A - MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR
THE 706 MISSION STREET – THE MEXICAN MUSEUM AND RESIDENTIAL TOWER PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation Measures and Improvement Measures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Actions and Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archeological Testing Program</td>
<td>Project sponsor/Archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO.</td>
<td>Prior to any excavation, site preparation or construction and prior to testing, an Archaeological Testing Plan (ATP) is to be submitted to and approved by the ERO.</td>
<td>Archaeological consultant to undertake archaeological testing program (ATP) in consultation with ERO.</td>
<td>Considered complete with approval of ATP by ERO and on finding by ERO that ATP is implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project sponsor/Archeological consultant in consultation with the</td>
<td>At the completion of the archaeological testing program</td>
<td>Archaeological consultant to submit results of testing, and if significant archaeological resources</td>
<td>Considered complete on submittal to ERO of report on ATP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT A - MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR
THE 706 MISSION STREET – THE MEXICAN MUSEUM AND RESIDENTIAL TOWER PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation Measures and Improvement Measures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Actions and Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>shall determine if additional measures are warranted. Additional measures that may be undertaken include additional archeological testing, archeological monitoring, and/or an archeological data recovery program. If the ERO determines that a significant archeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the proposed project, at the discretion of the project sponsor either: A) The proposed project shall be re-designed so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archeological resource; or B) A data recovery program shall be implemented, unless the ERO determines that the archeological resource is of greater interpretive than research significance and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible.</td>
<td>ERO.</td>
<td></td>
<td>may be present, in consultation with ERO, determine whether additional measures are warranted. If significant archeological resources are present and may be adversely affected, project sponsor, at its discretion, may elect to redesign the project, or implement data recovery program, unless ERO determines the archeological resource is of greater interpretive than research significance and that interpretive use is feasible.</td>
<td>findings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Archeological Monitoring Program

If the ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant determines that an archeological monitoring program (AMP) shall be implemented the archeological monitoring program shall minimally include the following provisions:

- The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the AMP reasonably prior to any project-related soils disturbing activities commencing. The ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant shall determine what project activities shall be archeologically monitored. In most cases, any soils-disturbing activities, such as demolition, foundation removal, excavation, grading, utilities installation, foundation work, driving of piles (foundation, shoring, etc.), site remediation, etc., shall require archeological monitoring because of the risk these activities pose to potential archeological resources and to their depositional context;
- The archeological consultant shall advise all project contractors to be on the

<p>|                      | Project sponsor, and project archaeological consultant, in consultation with the ERO. | The archaeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet prior to commencement of soils-disturbing activities. If ERO determines that archeological monitoring is necessary, monitor throughout all soils-disturbing | If required, Archaeological Consultant to prepare Archaeological Monitoring Program (AMP) in consultation with the ERO. Project sponsor, project archaeological consultant, archaeological monitor, and project sponsor's contractors shall implement | Considered complete on approval of AMP by ERO; submittal of report regarding findings of AMP, and finding by ERO that AMP is implemented. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Actions and Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>alert for evidence of the presence of the expected resource(s), of how to identify the evidence of the expected resource(s), and of the appropriate protocol in the event of apparent discovery of an archeological resource;</td>
<td></td>
<td>activities.</td>
<td>the AMP, if required by the ERO.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The archeological monitor(s) shall be present on the project site according to a schedule agreed upon by the archeological consultant and the ERO until the ERO has, in consultation with project archeological consultant, determined that project construction activities could have no effects on significant archeological deposits;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The archeological monitor shall record and be authorized to collect soil samples and artifactual/ecofactual material as warranted for analysis;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If an intact archeological deposit is encountered, all soils-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit shall cease. The archeological monitor shall be empowered to temporarily redirect demolition/excavation/pile driving/construction activities and equipment until the deposit is evaluated. If in the case of pile driving activity (foundation, shoring, etc.), the archeological monitor has cause to believe that the pile driving activity may affect an archeological resource, the pile driving activity shall be terminated until an appropriate evaluation of the resource has been made in consultation with the ERO. The archeological consultant shall immediately notify the ERO of the encountered archeological deposit. The archeological consultant shall make a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archeological deposit, and present the findings of this assessment to the ERO.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Archeological Data Recovery Program**

If the ERO, in consultation with the archeological consultant, determines that archeological data recovery programs shall be implemented, the archeological data recovery program shall be conducted in accord with an archeological data recovery plan (ADRP). The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the ADRP prior to preparation of a draft ADRP. The archeological consultant shall submit a draft ADRP to the ERO. The ADRP shall be completed on submittal of ADRP to ERO.
EXHIBIT A - MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR
THE 706 MISSION STREET – THE MEXICAN MUSEUM AND RESIDENTIAL TOWER PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation Measures and Improvement Measures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Actions and Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>identify how the proposed data recovery program will preserve the significant information the archeological resource is expected to contain. That is, the ADRP will identify what scientific/historical research questions are applicable to the expected resource, what data classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions. Data recovery, in general, should be limited to the portions of the historical property that could be adversely affected by the proposed project. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be applied to portions of the archeological resources if nondestructive methods are practical.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements:

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

*Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects*

The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project sponsor and</th>
<th>In the event human</th>
<th>Archaeological consultant/</th>
<th>Considered complete on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## EXHIBIT A - MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE 706 MISSION STREET – THE MEXICAN MUSEUM AND RESIDENTIAL TOWER PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation Measures and Improvement Measures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Actions and Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>discovered during any soils disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and Federal laws. This shall include immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the Coroner’s determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (Pub. Res. Code Sec. 5097.98). The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and MLD shall make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of, with appropriate care, human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects (CEQA Guidelines. Sec. 15064.5(d)). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recording, analysis, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects.</td>
<td>project archaeological consultant, in consultation with the San Francisco Coroner, NAHC and MLD.</td>
<td>remains and/or funerary objects are encountered.</td>
<td>Archaeological monitor/project sponsor or contractor to contact San Francisco County Coroner. Implement regulatory requirements, if applicable, regarding discovery of Native American human remains and associated/unassociated funerary objects. Contact Archaeological consultant and Environmental Review Officer (ERO).</td>
<td>notification of the San Francisco County Coroner and NAHC, if necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Final Archeological Resources Report

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

Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows:

- California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one (1) copy and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Environmental Planning division of the Planning Department shall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project sponsor and project archaeological consultant, in consultation with ERO</th>
<th>If applicable, after completion of archeological data recovery, inventorying, analysis and interpretation. If applicable, upon approval of Final Archaeological</th>
<th>If applicable, Archaeological consultant to submit a Draft Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to ERO. Archaeological Consultant to distribute FARR.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archeological Consultant at the direction of the ERO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Considered complete on submittal of FARR and approval by ERO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Considered complete when Archeological</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT A - MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR
THE 706 MISSION STREET – THE MEXICAN MUSEUM AND RESIDENTIAL TOWER PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation Measures and Improvement Measures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Actions and Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>receive one bound, one unbound and one unlocked, searchable PDF copy on CD of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest in or the high interpretive value of the resource, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.</td>
<td>Resources Report by ERO.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultant to provide written certification to ERO that required FARR distribution has been completed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mitigation Measure M-CP-1b: Interpretation

Based on a reasonable presumption that archaeological resources may be present within the project site, and to the extent that that the potential significance of some such resources is premised on CRHR Criteria 1 (Events), 2 (Persons), and/or 3 (Design/Construction), the following measure shall be undertaken to avoid any potentially significant adverse effect from the proposed project on buried or submerged historical resources.

The project sponsor shall implement an approved program for interpretation of

Project sponsor and archaeological consultant, in consultation with ERO.  

Prior to issuance of final certificate of occupancy

Archaeological consultant shall develop a feasible, resource-specific program for post-recovery interpretation of resources. All plans and recommendations for interpretation by the

Considered complete upon installation of approved interpretation program.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Actions and Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>resources. The project sponsor shall retain the services of a qualified archaeological consultant having expertise in California urban historical and marine archaeology. The archaeological consultant shall develop a feasible, resource-specific program for post-recovery interpretation of resources. The particular program for interpretation of artifacts that are encountered within the project site will depend upon the results of the data recovery program and will be the subject of continued discussion between the ERO, consulting archaeologist, and the project sponsor. Such a program may include, but is not limited to, any of the following (as outlined in the ARDTP): surface commemoration of the original location of resources; display of resources and associated artifacts (which may offer an underground view to the public); display of interpretive materials such as graphics, photographs, video, models, and public art; and academic and popular publication of the results of the data recovery. The archaeological consultant's work shall be conducted at the direction of the ERO, and in consultation with the project sponsor. All plans and recommendations for interpretation by the consultant shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment, and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO.</td>
<td>Project sponsor to retain appropriately qualified consultant to prepare PRMMP, carry out monitoring, and reporting, if required.</td>
<td>Prior to and during construction</td>
<td>Archaeological consultant shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment, and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until deemed final by ERO. ERO to approve final interpretation program. Project sponsor to implement an approved for interpretation program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure M-CP-3: Paleontological Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Program The project sponsor shall retain the services of a qualified paleontological consultant having expertise in California paleontology to design and implement a Paleontological Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Program. The PRMMP shall include a description of when and where construction monitoring would be required; emergency discovery procedures; sampling and data recovery procedures; procedure for the preparation, identification, analysis, and curation of fossil specimens and data recovered; preconstruction coordination procedures; and procedures for reporting the results of the monitoring program. The PRMMP shall be consistent with the Society for Vertebrate Paleontology Standard Guidelines for the mitigation of construction-related adverse impacts to paleontological resources and the requirements of the designated repository for any fossils collected. During construction, earth-moving activities shall be monitored by a qualified paleontological consultant having expertise in California paleontology in the areas where these activities have the potential to disturb previously undisturbed native sediment or sedimentary rocks. Monitoring need not be conducted in areas where the ground has been previously disturbed, in areas of artificial fill, in areas undertaken by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL</td>
<td>Responsibility for Implementation</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Monitoring/Reporting Actions and Responsibility</td>
<td>Status/Date Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nonsedimentary rocks, or in areas where exposed sediment would be buried, but otherwise undisturbed. The consultant’s work shall be conducted in accordance with this measure and at the direction of the City’s ERO. Plans and reports prepared by the consultant shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment, and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Palaeontological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction of the proposed project for as short a duration as reasonably possible and in no event for more than a maximum of four weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of construction can be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce potential effects on a significant palaeontological resource as previously defined to a less-than-significant level.</td>
<td>The project palaeontological consultant to consult with the ERO as indicated.</td>
<td>Prior to and during construction, if required.</td>
<td>Consultant shall provide brief monthly reports to ERO during monitoring or as identified in the PRMMP, and notify the ERO immediately if work should stop for data recovery during monitoring. The ERO to review and approve the final documentation as established in the PRMMP</td>
<td>Considered complete on approval of final documentation by ERO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure M-CP-4: Accidental Discovery</td>
<td>Project sponsor to prepare “ALERT” sheet and provide signed affidavit from project contractor, subcontractor(s) and utilities firm(s) stating that all field personnel have received copies of the “ALERT” sheet</td>
<td>Prior to any soil-disturbing activities</td>
<td>Project sponsor to provide signed affidavit from project contractor, subcontractor(s) and utilities firm(s) to the ERO stating that all field personnel have received copies of the “ALERT” sheet</td>
<td>Considered complete upon submission of affidavit regarding distribution of Alert sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should any indication of an archeological resource be encountered during any soils disturbing activity of the project, the project Head Foreman and/or project sponsor shall immediately notify the ERO and shall immediately suspend any soils disturbing activities in the vicinity of the discovery until the ERO has determined what additional measures should be undertaken.</td>
<td>Project sponsor and project contractor’s Head Foreman</td>
<td>During soil-disturbing activities</td>
<td>Upon potential resource discovery, the project Head Foreman and/or project sponsor shall immediately notify the ERO and shall immediately suspend any soils disturbing activities in</td>
<td>Upon resource discovery, suspension of work and contact of ERO.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**EXHIBIT A - MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE 706 MISSION STREET – THE MEXICAN MUSEUM AND RESIDENTIAL TOWER PROJECT**  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures Adopted as Conditions of Approval</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Actions and Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If the ERO determines that an archeological resource may be present within the project site, the project sponsor shall retain the services of an archaeological consultant from the pool of qualified archaeological consultants maintained by the Planning Department archaeologist. The archeological consultant shall advise the ERO as to whether the discovery is an archeological resource, retains sufficient integrity, and is of potential scientific/historical/cultural significance. If an archeological resource is present, the archeological consultant shall identify and evaluate the archeological resource. The archeological consultant shall make a recommendation as to what action, if any, is warranted. Based on this information, the ERO may require, if warranted, specific additional measures to be implemented by the project sponsor. Measures might include: preservation in situ of the archeological resource; an archeological monitoring program; or an archeological testing program. If an archeological monitoring program or archeological testing program is required, it shall be consistent with the Environmental Planning (EP) division guidelines for such programs. The ERO may also require that the project sponsor immediately implement a site security program if the archeological resource is at risk from vandalism, looting, or other damaging actions. The project archeological consultant shall submit a Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archeological resource and describing the archeological and historical research methods employed in the archeological monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the final report. Copies of the Draft FARR shall be sent to the ERO for review and approval. Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one (1) copy and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Environmental Planning division of the Planning Department shall receive one bound copy, one unbound copy and one unlocked, searchable PDF copy on CD three copies of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation.</td>
<td>Project sponsor and archaeological consultant</td>
<td>When determined necessary by the ERO</td>
<td>the vicinity of the discovery.</td>
<td>Considered complete upon retention by the project sponsor of an archeological consultant from the pool of qualified archaeological consultants maintained by the Planning Department archaeologist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project sponsor and archaeological consultant</td>
<td>When determined necessary by the ERO</td>
<td>ERO to determine if additional measures are necessary to implement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project sponsor and archaeological consultant</td>
<td>When determined necessary by the ERO</td>
<td>Archaeological consultant to prepare draft and final FARR, and to submit FARR to ERO for review final FARR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Once FARR approved by ERO, Project sponsor/archaeological consultant to ensure distribution of FARR as specified in M-CP-4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EXHIBIT A - MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE 706 MISSION STREET – THE MEXICAN MUSEUM AND RESIDENTIAL TOWER PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation Measures and Improvement Measures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Actions and Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest or interpretive value, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Noise Mitigation Measures

**Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a: Reduce Noise Levels During Construction**

The following practices shall be incorporated into the construction contract agreement documents to be implemented by the construction contractor:

- Provide best available noise control techniques for equipment and trucks, such as providing acoustic enclosures and mufflers for stationary equipment, shield or shield impact tools, and installing barriers around particularly noisy activities at the construction sites so that the line of sight between the construction activities and nearby sensitive receptor locations is blocked to the maximum feasible extent. The placement of barriers or acoustic blankets shall be reviewed and approved by the Director of Public Works prior to issuance of permits for construction activities.
- Use construction equipment with lower noise emission ratings whenever possible, particularly for air compressors.
- Provide sound-control devices on equipment no less effective than those provided by the manufacturer.
- Locate stationary equipment, material stockpiles, and vehicle staging areas as far as practicable from sensitive receptor locations.
- Prohibit unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines.
- Require applicable construction-related vehicles and equipment to use designated truck routes to access the project sites.
- Prior to the issuance of the building permit, along with the submission of construction documents, the project sponsor shall designate a Noise Disturbance Coordinator (on-site construction complaint and enforcement manager) and submit to the Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection (DBI) a protocol to respond to and track complaints pertaining to construction noise. This shall include (1) a procedure and phone numbers for notifying DBI, the Department of Public Health, and the Police Department (during regular construction hours and off-hours); (2) a sign conspicuously posted on-site describing noise complaint procedures and a complaint hotline.

| | Project sponsor and project construction contractor(s) | Prior to receiving building permit, incorporate practices identified in M-NO-1a into the construction contract agreement documents. Throughout construction duration, at least 14 days prior to any extreme noise-generating activities, the project sponsor shall notify building owner and occupants within 300 feet of the project construction area of the expected dates, hours, and duration of such activities. | Project sponsor to submit to Planning Department and DBI documentation designating a Noise Disturbance Coordinator and protocol for complaints pertaining to noise. Project sponsor to provide copies of contract documents to Planning Department that show construction contractor agreement with specified practices. | Considered complete upon submittal of contract documents incorporating identified practices. |
## Exhibit A - Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for The 706 Mission Street - The Mexican Museum and Residential Tower Project

(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation Measures and Improvement Measures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures Adopted as Conditions of Approval</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Actions and Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Number that shall be answered at all times during construction; (3) identification of the Noise Disturbance Coordinator for the project (name, phone number, email address); and (4) notification of property owners and occupants within 300 feet of the project construction area at least 14 days in advance of extreme noise generating activities (activities expected to generate levels of 90 dBA or greater) about the estimated duration of the activity.  
• Obtain a work permit from the Director of Public Works or the Director of Building Inspection for any nighttime work, pursuant to San Francisco Noise Ordinance Section 2908.  
• Obtain noise variances (as necessary) consistent with San Francisco Police Code Section 2910. | Project sponsor and project construction contractor(s) | At least 48 hours prior to construction activities that require pile driving, the project sponsor shall notify building owners and occupants within 500 feet of the project site of the dates, hours, and expected duration of such activities. | Project sponsor to provide evidence of pile driving schedule established in consultation with DPW and copies of notices to building owners and occupants to Planning Department. If piles are necessary, the project sponsor shall require its construction contractor to use noise-reducing pile installation techniques including: avoiding impact pile driving where possible, pre-drilling pile holes (if feasible, based on soils; see Mitigation Measure M-NO-2b). | Considered complete upon submittal of schedule and copies of notices to the Planning Department and documentation of noise-reducing pile installation techniques utilized. |

### Mitigation Measure M-NO-1b: Noise-Reducing Techniques and Muffling Devices for Pile Installation

If piles are determined to be necessary, the project sponsor shall require its construction contractor to use noise-reducing pile installation techniques including: avoiding impact pile driving where possible, pre-drilling pile holes (if feasible, based on soils; see Mitigation Measure M-NO-2b, pp. IV.F.26-IV.F.27) to the maximum feasible depth, installing intake and exhaust mufflers on pile installation equipment, vibrating piles into place when feasible, and installing shrouds around the pile driving hammer where feasible. Should impact pile-driving be necessary for the proposed project, the project sponsor would require that the construction contractor limit pile driving activity to result in the least disturbance to neighboring uses, and establish pile-driving hours, in consultation with the Director of Public Works, to disturb the fewest people. At least 48 hours prior to pile driving activities, the project sponsor shall notify building owners and occupants within 500 feet of the project site of the dates, hours, and expected duration of pile driving.

### Mitigation Measure M-NO-2a: Minimize Vibration Levels During Construction

The following practices shall be incorporated into the construction contract agreement documents to be implemented by the construction contractor:
### EXHIBIT A - MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE 706 MISSION STREET – THE MEXICAN MUSEUM AND RESIDENTIAL TOWER PROJECT

(Indicates Text for Adopted Mitigation Measures and Improvement Measures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Actions and Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Make the Noise Disturbance Coordinator (see Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a) available to respond to vibration complaints from nearby vibration-sensitive uses, and submit to the Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection (DBI) a protocol to respond to and track complaints pertaining to vibration. Recurring disturbances shall be evaluated by a qualified acoustical consultant to ensure compliance with applicable standards;</td>
<td>Project sponsor, project contractor(s), and qualified geotechnical engineers</td>
<td>Prior to building permit issuance</td>
<td>agreement documents to be implemented by the construction contractor the measures to minimize vibration levels specified in M-NO-2a, including designation of a Noise Disturbance Coordinator and protocol for complaints pertaining to vibration. Project sponsor to provide copies of contract documents and protocol for complaints to Planning Department that show construction contractor agreement with specified practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Avoid impact pile driving where possible. Utilize drilled piles or the use of a sonic pile driver where the geological conditions permit their use (see Mitigation Measure M-NO-2b);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Select demolition methods not involving impact tools, where possible;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Avoid vibratory rollers and packers, where possible;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Operate earth-moving equipment as far away from vibration-sensitive receptors as possible; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Phase demolition and ground-impacting activity (excavation and shoring) to reduce occurrences in the same time period, when and where feasible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mitigation Measure M-NO-2b: Pre-Construction Assessment to Protect Structures from Ground Vibration Associated with Pile Installation**

If impact pile driving is necessary, the project sponsor shall retain a qualified geotechnical engineer to conduct a pre-construction assessment of existing subsurface conditions and the structural integrity of nearby buildings subject to ground vibration prior to receiving a building permit. If recommended by the geotechnical engineer, for structures or facilities within 80 feet of pile installation activities (Westin Hotel and Contemporary Jewish Museum [formerly known as the Jessie Street Substation]), the project sponsor shall require groundborne vibration monitoring of nearby structures. The assessment shall be based on the specific conditions at the construction site such as, but not limited to, the following:

- Pre-construction surveying of potentially affected structures;
- Underpinning of foundations of potentially affected structures, as necessary;
- The need for a monitoring program during vibration-causing construction activities to detect ground settlement or lateral movement of structures in the vicinity of excavation, shoring, or impact activities, should pile driving be required. If pile driving is found to be needed, results of ground vibration monitoring shall be submitted to DBI during vibration-causing construction activities.
EXHIBIT A - MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE 706 MISSION STREET – THE MEXICAN MUSEUM AND RESIDENTIAL TOWER PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation Measures and Improvement Measures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Actions and Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>monitoring shall be submitted to the Department of Building Inspection (DBI). In the event of unacceptable ground movement, as determined by the DBI, pile installation shall cease and corrective measures, protective shoring, and alternative construction methods shall be implemented. Corrective measures to reduce ground movement from pile driving include: jetting or using a high-pressure stream of air and water to erode the soil adjacent to the pile; predrilling; using cast-in-place or auger cast piles; using pile cushioning; or using nonimpact drivers. The pile installation program and ground stabilization measures shall be reevaluated and approved by the Department of Building Inspection.</td>
<td>Inspection weekly during construction.</td>
<td>(Westin Hotel and Contemporary Jewish Museum [formerly known as the Jessie Street Substation]), the project sponsor shall require groundborne vibration monitoring of nearby structures. Results of ground vibration monitoring shall be submitted to the Department of Building Inspection (DBI).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mitigation Measure M-NO-2c: Vibration Monitoring and Management Plan
A Pre-Construction Assessment of the Aronson Building shall be conducted by a qualified structural engineer and preservation architect who meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Historic Preservation Professional Qualification Standards. The Pre-Construction Assessment prepared shall establish a baseline, and shall contain written descriptions of the existing condition, along with photographs, measured drawings, sketches, and/or CAD drawings of all cracks, spalling, or similar. Particular attention shall be paid to loose terra cotta, cracks, bulges and planes in and out of plumb, floors in and out of level, openings and roof planes, as needed.

A vibration management and continuous monitoring plan shall be developed and adopted to protect the Aronson Building against damage caused by vibration or differential settlement caused by vibration during project construction. The vibration management and monitoring plan related to the Aronson Building shall be submitted to the Planning Department Preservation Staff prior to issuance of any building permits. The vibration management and monitoring plan shall include pre-construction surveys, continuous vibration monitoring throughout the duration of the major structural project activities, and for one year following project completion if determined necessary by the preservation architect. The vibration management and monitoring plan shall be at the direction of the qualified structural engineer and shall constitute a blended approach, using both optical survey targets and crack monitors. The use of optical survey targets and crack monitors during construction shall |

Project sponsor to retain appropriately qualified structural engineer and preservation architect | Prior to building permit issuance | Project sponsor to retain appropriately qualified structural engineer and preservation architect to prepare Pre-Construction Assessment of the Aronson Building. Planning Department to review and approve Pre-Construction Assessment of the Aronson Building. | Considered complete upon approval of Pre-Construction Assessment of the Aronson Building. |

Continuous vibration monitoring of the Aronson Building shall occur throughout the duration of major structural project construction activities and, if determined necessary by the preservation architect, for one year following project completion. Vibration management plan and monitoring plan shall be prepared prior to building |

Considered complete upon development, submittal, and approval by DBI and the Planning Department of a vibration management and continuous monitoring plan.
### EXHIBIT A - MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE 706 MISSION STREET – THE MEXICAN MUSEUM AND RESIDENTIAL TOWER PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation Measures and Improvement Measures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Actions and Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>measure whether ground displacement during construction is approaching levels at which damage to the historic resource may be possible. Construction methods shall be reevaluated if measurements and levels of vibration are found to exceed the levels established in the vibration management and monitoring plan and/or if damage to the historical resource may be possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td>project completion.</td>
<td>permit issuance</td>
<td>for the Aronson Building. Monitoring reports to be submitted to DBI.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mitigation Measure M-NO-3: Stationary Operational Noise Sources**

All fixed, stationary sources of noise (e.g., building mechanical systems (HVAC equipment), standby power generator, ventilation equipment, etc.) shall be located away from noise-sensitive receptors, be enclosed within structures with adequate setback and screening, be installed adjacent to noise reducing shields, or constructed with some other adequate noise attenuating features, to achieve compliance with the noise level limits of the San Francisco Noise Ordinance. Noise from fixed, stationary sources must not exceed the performance standard of Section 2909(d) of the San Francisco Police Code for any sleeping or living room in any dwelling unit located on residential property: an interior noise level of 45 dBA between the hours of 10:00 PM to 7:00 AM or 55 dBA between the hours of 7:00 AM to 10:00 PM. Once the stationary noise sources have been installed, the project sponsor shall retain a qualified acoustical consultant to measure the noise levels of operating exterior equipment within three months after the installation. If project stationary noise sources exceed the applicable noise standards, a qualified acoustical consultant shall be retained by the project sponsor to evaluate whether additional noise attenuation measures or acoustic insulation should be installed in order to meet the applicable noise standards. Examples of such measures include acoustical enclosures, replacement of equipment, or relocation of equipment. Results of the measurements shall be provided to the City to show compliance with the standards.

- Project sponsor to retain qualified acoustical consultant
- Within three months after installation of stationary noise sources, project sponsor to retain acoustical consultant to measure noise levels in dwelling unit most likely to be affected by operating exterior equipment.
- Project sponsor to provide results of stationary noise measurements to DPH and the Planning Department.
- Considered complete upon submittal of noise measurement results to DPH and the Planning Department, and documentation of noise attenuation measures or acoustic insulation installed, if required to meet the applicable noise standards.

**Air Quality Mitigation Measures**

**Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3: Construction Emissions Minimization**

To reduce the potential health risk resulting from project construction activities, the project sponsor shall prepare a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan (included as Appendix G) designed to reduce construction-related diesel particulate matter emissions from off-road construction equipment used at the site by at least 65 percent as compared to the construction equipment list, schedule, and inventory provided by

- Project sponsor and project construction contractor(s) shall prepare and implement Construction Emissions Minimization Plan to the ERO demonstrating
- At least 14 days prior to the commencement of construction activities
- Project sponsor/contractor to submit a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan to the ERO Planning Department review and
## EXHIBIT A - MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR
THE 706 MISSION STREET – THE MEXICAN MUSEUM AND RESIDENTIAL TOWER PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation Measures and Improvement Measures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Actions and Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the sponsor on May 27, 2011.</td>
<td>Minimization Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td>construction-related diesel</td>
<td>approval of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>particulate matter</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>emissions from off-road construction</td>
<td>Emissions’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>equipment used at the site is reduced</td>
<td>Minimization Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>by at least 65 percent as compared to the</td>
<td>or alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>construction equipment list, schedule, and</td>
<td>measures that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>inventory provided by the sponsor on</td>
<td>achieve the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sponsor may elect to submit to the ERO a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>demonstration that alternative measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>achieve the specified emissions reduction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limit idling times by either</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shutting equipment off when</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not in use or reducing the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maximum idling time to two</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>minutes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prohibit use of diesel generators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for electric power because on-site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>distribution of electricity is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Require construction contractors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to use electric or propane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>powered devices for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>following types of equipment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Tower Crane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Fork Lifts and Manlifts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Portable Welders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Concrete Placing Booms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Require construction contractors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to use portable compressors that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>are either electric powered or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>powered by gasoline engines or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>engines compliant with Tier 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Require use of Interim Tier 4 or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tier 4 equipment where such</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>equipment is available and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>feasible for use. Use of Interim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tier 4 or Tier 4 equipment would</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be feasible for the following</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>types of equipment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Backhoes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Rubber-Tired Dozers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Require use of Tier 2/Tier 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>equipment retrofitted with ARB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 3 verified Diesel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emissions Control System (VDECS,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>which includes diesel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>particulate filters). The</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>following types of equipment are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>identified as candidates for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>retrofitting with ARB-certified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 3 VDECS (which are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>capable of reducing DPM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>emissions by 85 percent or more,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>due to their expected operating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>modes (i.e., fairly constant use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at high revolutions per minute).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT A - MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE 706 MISSION STREET – THE MEXICAN MUSEUM AND RESIDENTIAL TOWER PROJECT (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation Measures and Improvement Measures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Actions and Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exciavators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Boom Pumps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Trailer Pumps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Tier 3 equipment for the following types of equipment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portable Cranes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Mix Drill Rigs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldier Pile Drill Rigs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoring Drill Rigs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the foregoing requirements are implemented, no further quantification of emissions shall be required. Alternatively, the project sponsor may elect to substitute alternative measures in the Construction Emissions Minimization Plan for review and approval by the Environmental Review Officer (ERO). Such alternative measures would be subject to demonstrating that the alternative measures would achieve the required 65 percent reduction in construction period diesel particulate matter emissions, including without limitation the following:

- Use of other late-model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and add-on devices such as particulate filters; and
- Other options as such become available.

The project sponsor shall submit the Construction Emissions Minimization Plan to the ERO for review and approval by an Environmental Planning Air Quality Specialist prior to the commencement of construction activities.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials Mitigation Measures:


During excavation, the project sponsor shall hire a consultant to collect soil samples (boring), including, but not limited to, the location of the underground storage tank on the north side of the Aronson Building. The soil samples shall be tested for petroleum hydrocarbons and lead. If petroleum hydrocarbons and/or lead are present in soil, the soil shall be removed under the supervision of the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) and disposed of in a suitable landfill, or otherwise addressed consistent with applicable Federal, State, and local laws. In addition, the sponsor shall perform the

- Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant for Steps 1, 2 and 4.
- Project construction
- Soil report on the soil testing and Site Mitigation Plan (SMP) shall be approved by the Department of Public Health (DPH) prior to building permit issuance.
- Project sponsor and/or Project construction contractor to submit reports as specified in steps 1 to 4 to Department of Public Health (DPH) and/or the
- Step 1 complete upon submittal of soils testing results to DPH for review.
- Step 2 complete with submittal and
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(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation Measures and Improvement Measures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Actions and Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>following actions with respect to contaminated soil:</td>
<td>contractor to carry out and report on activities required in Step 3.</td>
<td>with a copy to the Planning Department. Project construction contractor shall conduct handling, hauling and disposal of soils pursuant to measures specified in Step 3 for duration of construction activities.</td>
<td>Planning Department.</td>
<td>approval of the SMP by DPH. Steps 3 and 4 considered complete upon approval and implementation of closure / certification report by DPH. A copy of the closure report shall be provided to the Planning Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: Soil Testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to obtaining building permits, the project sponsor shall hire a consultant to collect soil samples (borings) from selected locations in the work area in which soil would be disturbed and/or excavated. This initial soil sampling and reporting shall be done prior to excavation, but additional soil testing from on-site soil stockpiles may also be required, if there are indications [e.g., odors, visible staining] of contamination in the excavated soil.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The soil samples shall be tested for these Compounds of Concern: total lead, petroleum hydrocarbons, and volatile organic compounds (VOCs). The consultant shall analyze the soil borings as discrete, not composite samples. The consultant shall prepare a report on the soil testing for the Compounds of Concern that includes the laboratory results of the soil testing and a map that shows the locations from which the consultant collected the soil samples. (See Step 3, below).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project sponsor shall submit the report on the soil testing for the Compounds of Concern for the Sub-Phase and the current fee in the form of a check payable to the San Francisco Department of Public Health, to the Hazardous Waste Program, Department of Public Health, 1390 Market Street, Suite 210, San Francisco, California 94102. The current fee shall cover three hours of soil testing report review and administrative handling. If additional review is necessary, DPH shall bill the project sponsor for each additional hour of review over the first three hours. These fees shall be charged pursuant to Section 31.23(c) of the San Francisco Administrative Code. DPH shall review the soil testing program to determine whether soils on the project site are contaminated with any of the Compounds of Concern at or above potentially hazardous levels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: Preparation of Site Mitigation Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project sponsor shall prepare a Site Mitigation Plan (SMP). The SMP shall include a discussion of the level of contamination of soils by Compounds of Concern, if any, based on the soils testing in Step 1. The SMP shall set forth mitigation measures for managing contaminated soils on the site, if any, including but not limited to: 1) the alternatives for managing contaminated soils on the site (e.g., encapsulation, partial or complete removal, treatment, recycling or reuse, or a combination); 2) the preferred alternative for managing contaminated soils on the site and a brief justification; and 3) the specific practices to be used to handle, haul, and dispose of contaminated soils on the site. The SMP shall be submitted to the DPH for review and approval. A copy of the SMP shall be submitted to the Planning Department to become part of the case file. Additionally, the DPH may require confirmatory samples for the project site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT A - MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Actions and Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 3: Handling, Hauling, and Disposal Contaminated Soils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Specific work practices: The construction contractor shall be alert for the presence of contaminated soils during excavation and other construction activities on the site (detected through soil odor, color, and texture and results of on-site soil testing), and shall be prepared to handle, profile (i.e., characterize), and dispose of such soils appropriately (i.e., as dictated by local, State, and Federal regulations, including OSHA work practices) when such soils are encountered on the site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Dust suppression: Soils exposed during excavation for site preparation and project construction activities shall be kept moist throughout the time they are exposed, both during and after work hours.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Surface water runoff control: Where soils are stockpiled, visqueen shall be used to create an impermeable liner, both beneath and on top of the soils, with a berm to contain any potential surface water runoff from the soil stockpiles during inclement weather.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Soils replacement: If necessary, clean fill or other suitable material(s) shall be used to bring portions of the project site, where lead-contaminated soils have been excavated and removed, up to construction grade.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Hauling and disposal: If soils are contaminated such that they must be hauled off-site for treatment and/or disposal, contaminated soils shall be hauled off the project site by waste hauling trucks appropriately certified with the State of California and adequately covered to prevent dispersion of the soils during transit, and shall be disposed of at the permitted hazardous waste disposal facility registered with the State of California.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4: Preparation of Closure/Certification Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After excavation and foundation construction activities are completed, the project sponsor shall prepare and submit a closure/certification report to DPH for review and approval for that area. The closure/certification report shall include the mitigation measures (if any were necessary) in the SMP for handling and removing contaminated soils, if any, from the project site, and if applicable, whether the construction contractor modified any of these mitigation measures, and how and why the construction contractor modified those mitigation measures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Actions and Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Measure 1-TR-A: Traffic Signal Timing Modifications. As an improvement measure to enhance ability of drivers exiting Stevenson Street at Third Street to merge into and across Third Street traffic flow, the project sponsor shall request that the SFMTA consider revising the signal timing and offset sets to ensure that sufficient clearance time is provided so that vehicles do not spill back into the midblock intersection (the intersection is currently striped “KEEP CLEAR”). In addition, the project sponsor shall request that SFMTA consider relocating the pedestrian signal north of Stevenson Street closer to the intersection to reduce the propensity of pedestrians crossing Stevenson Street during a “don’t walk” phase.</td>
<td>Project sponsor</td>
<td>Coordination to occur prior to building occupancy</td>
<td>Project sponsor to request the SFMTA consider revising the signal timing and offset sets to ensure that sufficient clearance time is provided so that vehicles do not spill back into the midblock intersection (the intersection is currently striped “KEEP CLEAR”). The project sponsor shall request that SFMTA consider relocating the pedestrian signal north of Stevenson Street closer to the intersection to reduce the propensity of pedestrians crossing Stevenson Street during a “don’t walk” phase.</td>
<td>Considered complete after request and coordination with SFMTA for the two requests specified in 1-TR-A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Measure 1-TR-B: “Garage Full” Sign on Third Street. As an improvement measure to minimize the number of vehicles accessing Stevenson Street when the Jessie Square Garage is full, the project sponsor shall strive to install, or cause to be installed, an LED (or similar) “Garage Full” sign at the intersection of Third Street at Stevenson Street.</td>
<td>Project sponsor and project construction contractor(s)</td>
<td>Prior to building occupancy prior to building occupancy.</td>
<td>Project sponsor to strive to install an LED (or similar) “Garage Full” sign at the intersection of Third Street at Stevenson Street.</td>
<td>Considered complete after installation of “Garage Full” sign and documentation of same provided to ERO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Measure 1-TR-C: Monitoring and Abatement of Queues. As an improvement measure to reduce the potential for queuing by vehicles accessing the project site, the owner/operator of the proposed project shall strive to ensure that recurring vehicle queues do not occur on Third Street or Mission Street adjacent to the proposed project site. A vehicle queue is defined as one or more vehicles (destined to</td>
<td>Project sponsor or building management representative</td>
<td>Ongoing during building occupancy</td>
<td>Project Sponsor to ensure that recurring vehicle queues do not occur on Mission Street adjacent to</td>
<td>This improvement measure is ongoing during the life of the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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*Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation Measures and Improvement Measures*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Actions and Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>the parking facility</strong> blocking any portion of the Third Street or Mission Street sidewalk or roadway for a consecutive period of three minutes or longer on a daily or weekly basis. If the Planning Director, or his or her designee, suspects that a recurring queue is present, the Planning Department shall notify the project sponsor in writing. Upon request, the owner/operator shall hire a qualified transportation consultant to evaluate the conditions at the site for no less than 7 days. The consultant shall prepare a monitoring report to be submitted to the Department for review. If the Planning Department determines that a recurring queue does exist, the facility owner/operator shall have 90 days from the date of the written determination to abate the queue.**</td>
<td>and Planning Department/Project Sponsor</td>
<td>Ongoing during building occupancy</td>
<td>the proposed project site. If the Planning Director, or his or her designee, suspects that a recurring queue is present, the Planning Department shall notify the project sponsor in writing. Upon request, the owner/operator shall hire a qualified transportation consultant to evaluate the conditions at the site for no less than 7 days. If the Planning Department determines that a recurring queue does exist, the facility owner/operator shall have 90 days from the date of the written determination to abate the queue.</td>
<td>Considered complete upon Planning Department determination that no queuing exists. Otherwise, if monitoring shows that a recurring queue exists, considered complete when queue is abated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Improvement Measure I-TR-D: Installation of Eyebolts.** As an improvement measure to reduce pole clutter on Third Street and on Mission Street, the project sponsor could review with Planning Department and SFMTA staff whether it would be appropriate to install eyebolts in the renovated building to support Muni's overhead wire system.

| Project sponsor | Prior to building permit issuance | Project sponsor to consult with Planning Department and SFMTA. If necessary, Planning Department and SFMTA shall review eyebolt installation plan. | Considered complete upon consultation with Planning Department and SFMTA. If eyebolt installation is determined appropriate by City agencies, then considered complete with approval of eyebolt installation |
### EXHIBIT A - MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE 706 MISSION STREET – THE MEXICAN MUSEUM AND RESIDENTIAL TOWER PROJECT  
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation Measures and Improvement Measures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Actions and Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvement Measure I-TR-E: Consolidation of Traffic Signal and Overhead Wire Poles</strong> To eliminate pole clutter and reduce pedestrian obstructions on the Third Street sidewalk adjacent to the project site, and to improve pedestrian flow, it may be possible to consolidate the three traffic signal and overhead wire poles, and relocate the existing mailbox which extends further from the curb than the adjacent newspaper rack. (The newspaper rack and mailbox are proposed to be removed from the sidewalk during project construction.) The project sponsor could make these requests to the San Francisco Department of Public Works (DPW) (newspaper rack), the U.S. Postal Service (mail box), and SFMTA (overhead wire poles and traffic signals).</td>
<td>Project sponsor</td>
<td>Requests made prior to building permit issuance</td>
<td>Project sponsor to consult with and request Planning Department, SFMTA, DPW, and the U.S. Postal Service consider measures to eliminate pole clutter and pedestrian obstructions on the Third Street sidewalk as described in I-TR-E.</td>
<td>Considered complete upon requests made by project sponsor for traffic signal and overhead wire pole consolidation and the relocation of the existing mailbox.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Improvement Measure I-TR-F: Pedestrian Measures on Third Street.** This improvement measure includes the following measures to reduce conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles on Third Street adjacent to the project site:  
  - During peak periods of pedestrian activity on Third Street (7 AM to 7 PM), the project sponsor shall staff the driveway entry on Third Street with a traffic control attendant to facilitate vehicular ingress into the project driveway from Third Street.  
  - The project sponsor shall provide adequate valet service to ensure that queuing space for a minimum of two vehicles within the internal drop-off area is available at all times (the internal driveway can accommodate up to six vehicles).  
  - The project sponsor shall use alternate pavement treatment for the sidewalk at the driveway on Third Street, as determined appropriate by DPW, SFMTA, and the Planning Department.  
  - The project sponsor shall explore the potential for providing audio and/or visual treatments to alert pedestrians that a vehicle is about to cross the sidewalk from the adjacent travel lanes (typically such treatments are for vehicles exiting, not entering, a driveway). | Project sponsor or building management representative  
Project sponsor or building management representative  
Project sponsor and project contractor  
Project sponsor or building management representative | Ongoing, after building occupancy  
Ongoing, after building occupancy  
Prior to completion of construction  
Prior to building occupancy | Project sponsor or building management representative shall staff the driveway on Third Street with a traffic control attendant. Such attendant shall facilitate vehicular ingress during peak periods of pedestrian activity.  
Project sponsor and project contractor use alternate pavement treatment for the sidewalk at the driveway on Third Street, as determined appropriate by DPW, SFMTA, and the Planning Department. | This improvement measure is an ongoing activity. Provide documentation of compliance to the ERO.  
Considered complete upon application of pavement treatment.  
Considered complete with documentation to the ERO regarding potential audio and/or visual treatments. |
| **Improvement Measure I-TR-G: Reduce Pedestrian-Vehicle Conflict Areas.** Pedestrian conditions on Third Street between Mission and Market Streets include an | Project sponsor in consultation with DPW, | Prior to building occupancy, provided that | Project sponsor shall work with DPW, SFMTA, and | Considered complete |
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(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation Measures and Improvement Measures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Actions and Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>existing pedestrian-vehicle conflict zone associated with the Westin Hotel passenger loading operations located on the west side of Third Street. To improve the pedestrian experience on Third Street between Mission and Market Streets, the project sponsor shall work with DPW, SFMTA, and the Planning Department to assess the feasibility of other measures or treatments to reduce pedestrian-vehicle conflicts in this area. Measures to be assessed for feasibility could include the construction of bulb outs at the intersection of Third and Mission Streets, additional signage, alternate pavement treatment for sidewalks at driveways, automated warning devices, and/or the potential reconfiguration of parking and loading strategies in the area. The project sponsor shall cooperate with the City in seeking the consent to or participation in such measures by other property owners on Third Street between Mission and Market Streets, provided that such measures shall not be required for the project where such consent or participation cannot be secured in a reasonable, timely, and economic manner.</td>
<td>SFMTA, and the Planning Department.</td>
<td>such measures shall not be required for the project where such consent or participation cannot be secured in a reasonable, timely, and economic manner.</td>
<td>the Planning Department to assess the feasibility of other measures or treatments to reduce pedestrian-vehicle conflicts in this area. If required, the project sponsor shall cooperate with the City in seeking the consent to, or participation in, such measures by other property owners on Third Street between Mission and Market Streets.</td>
<td>following consultation with DPW, SFMTA, and the Planning Department and upon determination of feasibility of measures or treatment to reduce pedestrian-vehicle conflicts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Improvement Measure I-TR-H: Coordination of Moving Activities.** To ensure that residential move-in and move-out activities do not impede traffic flow on Mission Street or Third Street, the project sponsor shall encourage that move-in and move-out operations, as well as larger deliveries, should be scheduled and coordinated through building management.

| Improvement Measure I-TR-I: Construction - Traffic Control Plan. As an improvement measure to reduce potential conflicts between construction activities and pedestrians, transit and autos, SFMTA could require that the contractor prepare a traffic control plan for project construction. The project sponsor and construction contractor(s) shall meet with DPW, SFMTA, the Fire Department, Muni, the Planning Department and other City agencies to coordinate feasible measures to reduce traffic congestion, including temporary transit stop relocations (if determined necessary) and other measures to reduce potential traffic and transit disruption and pedestrian circulation effects during construction of the proposed project. The contractor could be required to comply with the City of San Francisco’s Regulations for Working in San Francisco Streets, which establish rules and permit | Project sponsor or building management representative | Ongoing, after building occupancy | The project sponsor shall encourage that move-in and move-out operations, as well as larger deliveries, should be scheduled and coordinated through building management. | Provide documentation to the Planning Department regarding procedures to implement this improvement measure. Ongoing for the life of the project. |

| Project sponsor and project construction contractor(s) | Throughout the construction duration | Project sponsor and project construction contractor(s) to coordinate with DPW, SFMTA, the Fire Department, the Planning Department and other applicable City agencies. If required, contractor to prepare a Traffic Control Plan (TCP) for project construction activities. | Considered complete once project sponsor and construction contractor(s) meet with DPW, SFMTA, the Fire Department, Muni, the Planning Department and other City |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Actions and Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>requirements so that construction activities can be done safely and with the least possible interference with pedestrians, bicyclists, transit and vehicular traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>agencies to coordinate feasible measures for maintenance of traffic during project construction. If required the contractor will implement the TCP as agreed upon by DPW until completion of construction activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvement Measure I-TR-J:</strong> Construction – Carpools. As an improvement measure to minimize parking demand associated with construction workers, the project sponsor could request the construction contractor to encourage carpooling and transit access to the site by construction workers.</td>
<td>Project sponsor and project construction contractor(s)</td>
<td>During project construction</td>
<td>Project sponsor could request the construction contractor to encourage carpooling and transit access to the site by construction workers.</td>
<td>Considered complete upon providing documentation of such request to the Planning Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvement Measure I-TR-K:</strong> Construction - Truck Traffic Management. As an improvement measure to minimize construction traffic impacts on Third Street and Mission Street, and on pedestrian, transit and traffic operations, the construction contractor could be required to retain San Francisco Police Department traffic control officers during peak construction periods.</td>
<td>Project sponsor and project construction contractor(s)</td>
<td>During peak periods of project construction</td>
<td>Project Sponsor to retain SFPD traffic control officers to minimize construction traffic impacts on Third Street and Mission Street, and on pedestrian, transit and traffic operations. DPW to monitor implementation.</td>
<td>Project sponsor provides documentation of retention of San Francisco Police Department traffic control officers during peak construction periods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvement Measure I-TR-L:</strong> Construction - Update Adjacent Businesses and Residents. As an improvement measure to minimize construction impacts on access for nearby institutions and businesses, DPW could require the project sponsor to provide nearby residences and adjacent businesses with regularly-updated information.</td>
<td>Project sponsor and project construction contractor(s)</td>
<td>During project construction</td>
<td>Project sponsor to provide nearby residences and adjacent businesses with regularly-updated information.</td>
<td>Provide documentation regarding compliance with I-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Actions and Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>regarding project construction, including construction activities, peak construction vehicle activities (e.g., concrete pours), travel lane closures, and lane closures. The information should include contact information, including that the public can contact the SFMTA General Enforcement Division for blocked driveways and access, DPW’s Street Use and Mapping for complaints regarding construction activities interfering with travel lanes, or the San Francisco Police Department for violations related to construction street space permits issued by DPW or Special Traffic Permits issues by SFMTA. A web site could be created by project sponsor that would provide current construction information of interest to neighbors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>information regarding project construction and appropriate contact information as described in 1-TR-L. A web site could be created by project sponsor that would provide current construction information of interest to neighbors.</td>
<td>TR-L to Planning Department. Considered complete with provision of documentation and completion of construction activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Measure 1-TR-M: Transportation Demand Management. As an improvement measure to encourage use of alternative modes and reduce the proposed project’s parking demand and parking shortfall, the project sponsor could implement the following Transportation Demand Management strategies:</td>
<td>Project sponsor or building management representative</td>
<td>Ongoing, after building occupancy</td>
<td>Project sponsor to implement TDM measures specified in 1-TR-M and provide documentation to the Planning Department.</td>
<td>This improvement measure is ongoing during the life of the project. Project sponsor to provide documentation of implementation of TDM measures to the Planning Department.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Actions and Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>modes of travel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Measure I-TR-N: Monitoring and Abatement of Queues on Mission Street. To reduce the potential for queuing by vehicles accessing the project site, it shall be the responsibility of the owner/operator of the proposed project to ensure that recurring vehicle queues do not occur on Mission Street adjacent to the proposed project site. A vehicle queue is defined as one or more vehicles (destined to the parking facility) blocking any portion of the Mission Street sidewalk or roadway for a consecutive period of three minutes or longer on a daily or weekly basis. If the Planning Director, or his or her designee, suspects that a recurring queue is present, the Planning Department shall notify the project sponsor in writing. Upon request, the owner/operator shall hire a qualified transportation consultant to evaluate the conditions at the site for no less than 7 days. The consultant shall prepare a monitoring report to be submitted to the Department for review. If the Planning Department determines that a recurring queue does exist, the facility owner/operator shall have 90 days from the date of the written determination to abate the queue.</td>
<td>Project sponsor and Planning Department/Project Sponsor</td>
<td>Ongoing during building occupancy</td>
<td>Project Sponsor to ensure that recurring vehicle queues do not occur on Mission Street adjacent to the proposed project site. If the Planning Director, or his or her designee, suspects that a recurring queue is present, the Planning Department shall notify the project sponsor in writing. Upon request, the owner/operator shall hire a qualified transportation consultant to evaluate the conditions at the site for no less than 7 days. If the Planning Department determines that a recurring queue does exist, the facility owner/operator shall have 90 days from the date of the written determination to abate the queue.</td>
<td>This improvement measure is ongoing during the life of the project. Considered complete upon Planning Department determination that no queuing exists. Otherwise, if monitoring shows that a recurring queue exists, considered complete when queue is abated. queue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Measure I-NO-A: Residential Use/Cultural Component Plan Review by Qualified Acoustical Consultant. To ensure that interior noise levels at proposed noise-sensitive uses on the project site do not result in excessive awakenings or disturbances, or exceed an interior noise level standards of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations and the San Francisco Noise Ordinance including Section 2909(d), a qualified acoustical consultant shall review plans for all new residential uses, cultural component areas (The Mexican Museum), and any other sensitive use area and provide recommendations to provide acoustical insulation or other equivalent measures to reduce interior noise levels. The project sponsor would</td>
<td>Project sponsor, qualified acoustical consultant, and project construction contractor(s).</td>
<td>Acoustical studies provided to DBI at the time the Architectural Addendum Permit is submitted for review.</td>
<td>Project sponsor to engage a qualified acoustical consultant to provide recommendations regarding acoustical insulation or other equivalent measures to reduce interior noise levels. Considered complete upon submission of studies to DBI and implementation of any measures required to ensure that interior noise ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL</td>
<td>Responsibility for Implementation</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Monitoring/Reporting Actions and Responsibility</td>
<td>Status/Date Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>include noise insulating features to ensure that interior noise would not exceed 45 dBA (Ldn) in any habitable room. These studies shall be presented to DBI at the time that the Architectural Addendum Permit is submitted for review. Noise-insulating features for the exterior façade and envelope of the 706 Mission Street tower and rehabilitated Aronsen Building may include acoustically designed systems for appropriate Outside-Inside Transmission Class ratings for curtain-wall assemblies; acoustically designed systems for appropriate Outside-Inside Transmission Class ratings for exterior punched windows and window wall assemblies; and acoustically designed exterior wall openings, such as trickle vents or Z-ducts, as required.</td>
<td>Project sponsor in coordination with the Planning Department and adjacent property owners.</td>
<td>Project sponsor to meet with Planning Department staff prior to building occupancy. Project sponsor shall strive to install, or cause to be installed, wind reduction measures prior to building occupancy, provided that occupancy shall not be delayed in the event that measure has not been implemented.</td>
<td>Project sponsor to coordinate with the Planning Department staff to determine which locations would benefit the most from wind reduction measures and what types of wind reduction measures could be implemented at these locations. In the event that some locations are not on property owned or otherwise controlled by the project sponsor, the project sponsor shall discuss the implementation of these wind reduction measures with the appropriate parties, which could include the Successor Agency, other City departments, or other property owners.</td>
<td>Considered complete upon meeting with Planning Department, and if determined appropriate, the implementation of wind reduction measures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Improvement Measure I-WS-A**: As an improvement measure to reduce ground-level wind speeds in areas used for public seating, the project sponsor shall meet with Planning Department staff to determine which locations would benefit the most from wind reduction measures and what types of wind reduction measures could be implemented at these locations. The project sponsor shall strive to install, or cause to be installed, wind reduction measures that could include hedges, planter boxes, trees, and trellises. In the event that some locations are not on property owned or otherwise controlled by the project sponsor, the project sponsor shall discuss the implementation of these wind reduction measures with the appropriate parties, which could include the Successor Agency, other City departments, or other property owners.

**Improvement Measure I-WS-B**: As an improvement measure, the project sponsor would address the wind conditions and usability of the proposed private roof terraces.
## EXHIBIT A - MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR
THE 706 MISSION STREET – THE MEXICAN MUSEUM AND RESIDENTIAL TOWER PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation Measures and Improvement Measures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Actions and Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>on the west side of the tower and the common open space on the north side of the Aronson Building roof through the implementation of building design considerations as well as wind control measures in order to improve wind conditions in these locations. Wind control measures to be implemented may include trellises, landscaping, tall parapets and/or wind screens.</td>
<td>contractor(s)</td>
<td>occupancy shall not be delayed in the event that this measure has not been completed.</td>
<td>usability of the proposed private roof terraces on the west side of the tower and the common open space on the north side of the Aronson Building roof through implementation of building design considerations as well as wind control measures as described in 1-WS-B. Project sponsor to provide documentation of compliance to Planning Department.</td>
<td>implementation and documentation to the Planning Department of wind control measures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE SECTION 295 IMPLEMENTATION MEMO ADOPTED IN 1989 TO RAISE THE ABSOLUTE CUMULATIVE SHADOW LIMIT ON UNION SQUARE IN ORDER TO ALLOW THE PROPOSED PROJECT AT 706 MISSION STREET, AND ADOPTING FINDINGS UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT.

PREAMBLE

The people of the City and County of San Francisco, in June 1984, adopted an initiative ordinance, commonly known as Proposition K, codified as Section 295 of the Planning Code.

Section 295 requires that the Planning Commission disapprove any building permit application to construct a structure that will cast shadow on property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department, unless it is determined that the shadow would not be significant or adverse. The Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission must adopt criteria for the implementation of that ordinance.

Section 295 is implemented by analyzing park properties that could be shadowed by new construction, including the current patterns of use of such properties, how such properties might be used in the future,
and assessing the amount of shadowing, its duration, times of day, and times of year of occurrence. The Commissions may also consider the overriding social or public benefits of a project casting shadow.

Pursuant to Planning Code Section 295, the Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission, on February 7, 1989, adopted standards for allowing additional shadows on the greater downtown parks (Resolution No. 11595).

Union Square ("Park"), which is 0.25 miles northwest of 706 Mission Street ("Project Site"), is a public open space that is under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission. Union Square is an approximately 2.58-acre park that occupies the entire block bounded by Post Street on the north, Stockton Street on the east, Geary Street on the south, and Powell Street on the west. The plaza is primarily hardscaped and oriented to passive recreational uses, large civic gatherings, and ancillary retail. There are no recreational facilities and some grassy areas exist along its southern perimeter. There are pedestrian walkways and seating areas throughout the park, several retail kiosks, and two cafés on the east side of the park. The park includes portable tables and chairs that can be moved to different locations. A 97-foot-tall monument commemorating the Battle of Manila Bay from the Spanish American War occupies the center of the park. Residents, shoppers, tourists, and workers use the park as an outdoor lunch destination and a mid-block pedestrian crossing. Throughout the year, the park is sunny during the middle of the day; it is shadowed by existing buildings to the east, south, and west during the early morning, late afternoon, and early evening. During the spring and autumn, Union Square is sunny from approximately 9:00 AM until 3:00 PM; it is shadowed by existing buildings during the early morning, late afternoon, and early evening. During the summer, Union Square is sunny from approximately 10:00 AM until 4:00 PM; it is shadowed by existing buildings during the early morning, late afternoon, and early evening. During the winter, Union Square is mostly sunny from approximately noon until 2:00 PM; it is shadowed by existing buildings during the rest of the day.

Union Square receives about 392,663,521 square-foot-hours ("sfh") of theoretical annual sunlight ("TAAS"). Currently, there are about 150,265,376 sfh of existing annual shadow on the park. The ACL that was established for Union Square in 1989 is additional shadow that was equal to 0.1 percent of the TAAS on Union Square, which is approximately 392,663.5 sfh. Until October of 2012, Union Square currently has a remaining shadow allocation, or shadow budget, of approximately 323,123.5 sfh. Since the quantitative standard for Union Square was established in 1989, two completed development projects have affected the shadow conditions on Union Square. In 1996, a project to expand Macy's department store altered the massing of the structure and resulted in a net reduction of 194,293 sfh of existing shadow (with a corresponding increase in the amount of sunlight on the park), and in 2003, a project at 690 Market Street added 69,540 sfh of net new shadow on Union Square. Although the Macy's expansion project reduced the amount of existing shadow and increased the amount of available sunlight on Union Square, this amount has not been added back to the shadow budget for Union Square by the Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission to account for these conditions.

Additionally, on October 11, 2012, the Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission held a duly noticed joint public hearing and adopted Planning Commission Resolution No. 18717 and Recreation and Park Commission Resolution No. 1201-001 amending the 1989 Memo and raising the absolute cumulative shadow limits for seven open spaces under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department that could be shadowed by likely cumulative development sites in the Transit Center District Plan ("Plan") Area, including Union Square. In revising these ACLs, the Commissions also
adopted qualitative criteria for each park related to the characteristics of shading within these ACLs by development sites within the Plan Area that would not be considered adverse, including the duration, time of day, time of year, and location of shadows on the particular parks. Under these amendments to the 1989 Memo, any consideration of allocation of "shadow" within these newly increased ACLs for projects within the Plan Area must be consistent with these characteristics. The Commissions also found that the "public benefit" of any proposed project in the Plan Area should be considered in the context of the public benefits of the Transit Center District Plan as a whole. During a joint public hearing on October 11, 2012, the Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission increased the ACLs for seven downtown parks, including Union Square, to allow for shadow cast by development proposed under the Transit Center District Plan (TCDP). The ACL for Union Square was increased from the original limit of 0.1 percent of the TAAS (approximately 392,663.5 sfh) to 0.19 percent of the TAAS (approximately 746,060.7 sfh), but all of the available ACL was reserved for development sites within the Plan Area.

On October 11, 2012, following the joint hearing regarding the TCDP, the Recreation and Park Commission reviewed the shadow impacts of the proposed Transbay Tower at 101 First Street and made a formal recommendation to the Planning Commission to allocate a portion of the newly adopted ACL for Union Square to the Transbay Tower. On October 18, 2012, the Planning Commission allocated a portion of the newly adopted ACL to the Transbay Tower (Motion No. 18724, Case No. 2008.0789K).

On November 15, 2012, the Recreation and Park Commission made a formal recommendation to the Planning Commission to allocate a portion of the newly adopted ACL for Union Square to a proposed project at 181 Fremont Street. On December 6, 2012, the Planning Commission allocated a portion of the newly adopted ACL to 181 Fremont Street. As a result of these actions, the remaining ACL for Union Square is 0.1785 percent of the TAAS, which means that approximately 700,904.4 sfh of net new shadow could be cast on Union Square by other development proposed under the TCDP (Motion No. 18763, Case No. 2007.0456K).

On September 25, 2008, Margo Bradish, Esq., of Cox, Castle & Nicholson LLP on behalf of 706 Mission Street, LLC ("Project Sponsor") submitted a request for review of a development exceeding 40 feet in height, pursuant to Section 295, analyzing the potential shadow impacts of the Project to properties under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Parks Department (Case No. 2008.1084K). Department staff prepared a shadow fan depicting the potential shadow cast by the development and concluded that the Project could have a potential impact to properties subject to Section 295.

On October 24, 2012, the Project Sponsor filed an application with the Planning Department ("Department") for a Determination of Compliance pursuant to Planning Code Section ("Section") 309 with requested Exceptions from Planning Code ("Code") requirements for "Reduction of Ground-Level Wind Currents in C-3 Districts", "Off-Street Parking Quantity", "Rear Yard, and "General Standards for Off-Street Parking and Loading" to allow curb cuts on Third and Mission Streets, for a project to rehabilitate an existing 10-story, 144-foot tall building (the Aronson Building), and construct a new, adjacent 47-story tower, reaching a roof height of 520 feet with a 30-foot tall mechanical penthouse. The two buildings would be connected and would contain up to 215 dwelling units, a "core-and-shell" museum space measuring approximately 52,000 square feet, and approximately 4,800 square feet of retail space. The project would reconfigure portions of the existing Jessie Square Garage to increase the number of parking spaces from 442 spaces to 470 spaces, add loading and service vehicle spaces, and would
allocate up to 215 parking spaces within the garage to serve the proposed residential uses. The Project Sponsor has proposed a “flex option” that would retain approximately 61,000 square feet of office uses within the existing Aronson Building, and would reduce the residential component of the project to 191 dwelling units. On May 20, 2013, the Project Sponsor reduced the height of the proposed tower from 520 feet (with a 30-foot-tall elevator/mechanical penthouse) to 480 feet (with a 30-foot-tall elevator/mechanical penthouse). As a result, the number of dwelling units in the Project was reduced from a maximum of 215 dwelling units to a maximum of 190 dwelling units, the number of residential parking spaces was reduced from a maximum of 215 spaces to a maximum of 190 spaces, and the “flex option” of retaining office space within the project was deleted. The project is located at 706 Mission Street, Lots 093, 276, and portions of Lot 277 within Assessor’s Block 3706 (“Project Site”), within the C-3-R District and the 400-I Height and Bulk District (collectively, “Project”, Case No. 2008.1084X).

On October 24, 2012, the Project Sponsor submitted a request for a General Plan Referral Case No. 2008.1084R, regarding the changes in use, disposition, and conveyance of publicly-owned land, reconfiguration of the public sidewalk along Mission Street, and subdivision of the property. On May 23, 2013, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting and adopted Motion No. 18878 determining that these actions are consistent with the objectives and policies of the General Plan and the Priority Policies of Section 101.1.

On October 24, 2012, the Project Sponsor submitted a request to amend Height Map H101 of the Zoning Maps of the San Francisco Planning Code to reclassify the Project Site from the 400-I Height and Bulk District to the 520-I Height and Bulk District. (Case No. 2008.1084Z). On May 20, 2013, in association with the reduced height of the Project, the Project Sponsor revised the request for a Height Reclassification to reclassify a portion of the Project Site from the 400-I Height and Bulk District to the 480-I Height and Bulk District. On May 23, 2013, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting and adopted Resolution No. 18879, recommending that the Board of Supervisors approve the requested Height Reclassification.

On October 24, 2012, the submitted a request to amend Zoning Map SU01 and the text of the Planning Code to establish the “Yerba Buena Center Mixed-Use Special Use District” (SUD) on the property. The proposed SUD would modify specific Planning Code regulations related to permitted uses, the provision of a cultural/museum use within the SUD, floor area ratio limitations, dwelling unit exposure, height of rooftop equipment, bulk limitations, and curb cut locations (Case No. 2008.1084T). On May 23, 2013, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting and adopted Resolution No. 18879, recommending that the Board of Supervisors approve the requested Planning Code Text Amendment.

A technical memorandum, prepared by Turnstone Consulting, was submitted on June 9, 2011, analyzing the potential shadow impacts of the Project (at its originally proposed 520-foot roof height) to properties under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Parks Department (Case No. 2008.1084K). The memorandum concluded that the Project would cast 337,744 sft of net new shadow on Union Square on a yearly basis, which would be an increase of about 0.09% of the TAAS on Union Square for projects outside of the TCDP. On May 21, 2013, a technical memorandum prepared by Turnstone Consulting was submitted analyzing the shadow impacts of the Project on Union Square, based on the reduced 480-foot roof height. The memorandum concluded that the Project would cast 238,788 sft of net new shadow on Union Square on a yearly basis, which would be an increase of about 0.06% of the TAAS on Union Square. The
reduction in the height of the tower results in a reduction of approximately 29% of net new shadow compared with the Project's original design.

As part of their actions on October 11, 2012 to increase the ACLs for seven downtown parks, the Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission designated the ACLs exclusively for projects that meet the criteria set forth in the TCDP. Projects that do not meet the criteria set forth in the TCDP may not utilize any portion of the amended ACLs if they cast net new shadow on any of the seven downtown parks for which the ACLs were amended. Such projects would be required to seek their own amendments to the ACLs for these seven downtown parks. The Project is located outside the Plan area and is not eligible to utilize newly adopted ACL on the Park.

On March 21, 2013, the 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 complied with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.) ("CEQA"), 14 California Code of Regulations Sections 15000 et seq. ("the CEQA Guidelines"), and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code ("Chapter 31").

The Commission found the Final EIR was adequate, accurate and objective, reflected the independent analysis and judgment of the Department and the Commission, and that the summary of comments and responses contained no significant revisions to the draft EIR, and certified the Final EIR for the Project in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31.

The EIR concludes that the Project would not result in a project-specific significant shadow impact to recreation facilities or other public areas. With respect to Union Square, the EIR indicates that the net new shadow would be of limited duration and the new shadowing would occur at times when the use of Union Square is limited. The EIR concludes that the Project would, however, make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative shadow impact on public open spaces when taking into account other reasonably foreseeable future projects, such as the Transit Tower and the Palace Hotel Project, that would also result in new shadowing of public areas, including Union Square.

Three separate appeals of the Commission's certification of the EIR to the Board of Supervisors were filed before the April 10, 2013 deadline. The Board of Supervisors considered these appeals at a duly noticed public hearing on May 7, 2013, and unanimously voted to affirm the Planning Commission's certification of the Final EIR. The Board of Supervisors 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 complied with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31. The Board of Supervisors found the Final EIR was adequate, accurate and objective, reflected the independent analysis and judgment of the Board of Supervisors, and that the summary of comments and responses contained no significant revisions to the draft EIR, and approved the Final EIR in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31.

On May 23, 2013, the Commission adopted Motion No. 18875, adopting CEQA findings, including a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and adopting the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP"), which findings and adoption of the MMRP are hereby incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein. The Commission found that the reduction in the height of the Project has resulted in
no substantial changes that would require major revisions to the Final EIR or result in new or substantially more severe significant environmental impacts that were not evaluated in the Final EIR, no new information has become available that was not known and could not have been known at the time the Final EIR was certified as complete and that would result in new substantially more severe significant environmental impacts not evaluated in the Final EIR, and no mitigation measures or alternatives previously found infeasible would be feasible or mitigation measures or alternatives considerably different than those analyzed in the Final EIR would substantially reduce significant environmental impacts, but the project proponent declines to adopt them.

The Planning Department, Jonas Ionin, is the custodian of records for this action, and such records are located at 1650 Mission Street, Fourth Floor, San Francisco, California.

The Project Sponsor has requested that, as part of the requested increase in the ACL for Union Square, the Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission formally add to the ACL the additional sunlight that resulted from the Macy's expansion project in 1996, which consisted of 194,293 sfh (equal to approximately 0.05% of the TAAS for Union Square). The Project at 706 Mission would cast 44,495 sfh of net new shadow (equal to approximately 0.01% of the TAAS for Union Square) beyond the additional sunlight from the Macy’s expansion project, for a total of 238,788 sfh of net new shadow (equal to approximately 0.06% of the TAAS for Union Square).

The Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission held a duly advertised joint public hearing on May 23, 2013 to consider whether to increase the ACL for Union Square by 0.05 percent of the TAAS for Union Square to account for the additional sunlight that resulted from the Macy’s expansion project, and to increase the ACL an additional 0.01 percent, for a total increase of 0.06 percent of the TAAS for Union Square.

The Planning Commission has reviewed and considered reports, studies, plans and other documents pertaining to the Project.

The Planning Commission has heard and considered the testimony presented at the public hearing and has further considered the written materials and oral testimony presented on behalf of the Project Sponsor, Department staff, and other interested parties.

Therefore, the Commission hereby resolves:

**FINDINGS**

Having reviewed the materials identified in the recitals above, and having heard all testimony and arguments, this Commission finds, concludes, and determines as follows:

1. The foregoing recitals are accurate, and also constitute findings of this Commission.

2. The staffs of both the Planning Department and the Recreation and Park Department have recommended increasing the ACL for Union Square by 0.05 percent of the TAAS for Union Square to account for the additional sunlight that resulted from the Macy’s expansion project, and to increase the ACL an additional 0.01 percent, for a total increase of 0.06 percent of the TAAS for Union Square, equal to approximately 238,788 square-foot-hours of net new shadow.
3. The additional shadow cast by the Project on Union Square, while numerically significant, would not be adverse to the use of Union Square, and is not expected to interfere with the use of the Park, for the following reasons: (1) the new shadow would not occur after 9:15 a.m. any day of the year (maximum new shadow range would be 8:30 a.m. to 9:15 a.m. during daylight savings time, or 7:30 a.m. to 8:15 a.m. during standard time) and would be consistent with the 1989 Memo qualitative standards for Union Square in that the new net shadow would not occur during mid-day hours; (2) the new shadow would generally occur in the morning hours during periods of relatively low park usage; (3) the new shadow would occur for a limited amount of time from October 11th to November 8th and from February 2nd to March 2nd for less than one hour on any given day during the hours subject to Section 295; and (4) the new shadow does not affect the manner in which Union Square is used, which is mainly for passive recreational opportunities.

4. A determination by the Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission to raise the absolute cumulative shadow limit for the park in an amount that would accommodate the additional shadow that would be cast by the Project does not constitute an approval of the Project.

5. The reduction in the height of the Project has resulted in no substantial changes that would require major revisions to the Final EIR or result in new or substantially more severe significant environmental impacts that were not evaluated in the Final EIR, no new information has become available that was not known and could not have been known at the time the Final EIR was certified as complete and that would result in new substantially more severe significant environmental impacts not evaluated in the Final EIR, and no mitigation measures or alternatives previously found infeasible would be feasible or mitigation measures or alternatives considerably different than those analyzed in the Final EIR would substantially reduce significant environmental impacts, but the project proponent declines to adopt them.
DECISION

That based upon the Record, the submissions by the Applicant, the staff of the Planning Department, the recommendation of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, in consultation with the Recreation and Park Commission, and other interested parties, the oral testimony presented to the Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission at the public hearing, and all other written materials submitted by all parties, the Planning Commission hereby ADOPTS, under Shadow Analysis Application No. 2008.1084K, an amendment of the absolute cumulative limit ("ACL") for Union Square to (a) include the approximately 194,293 sfh of shadow (equal to 0.05% of the TAAS) that resulted from a 1996 project modifying the Macy's department store that reduced shadow on Union Square (the "Macy's Adjustment") that had not been previously added back to the ACL for Union Square and (b) increase the ACL by an additional 44,495 sfh of net new shadow (equal to 0.01% of the TAAS). Should the building envelope of the Project be reduced, the increase in the cumulative shadow limit authorized by this action shall be reduced to the amount of shadow that would be cast by the revised Project.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Motion was ADOPTED by the Planning Commission at the meeting on May 23, 2013.

Jonas P. Ionin
Acting Commission Secretary

AYES: Fong, Antonini, Borden, Hillis

NAYS: Moore, Sugaya, Wu

ABSENT:

ADOPTED: May 23, 2013
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ADOPTING FINDINGS, WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE GENERAL MANAGER OF THE RECREATION AND PARK DEPARTMENT, IN CONSULTATION WITH THE RECREATION AND PARK COMMISSION THAT THE NET NEW SHADOW FROM THE PROPOSED PROJECT AT 706 MISSION STREET WILL NOT HAVE AN ADVERSE IMPACT ON UNION SQUARE, AS REQUIRED BY PLANNING CODE SECTION 295 (THE SUNLIGHT ORDINANCE), AND ALLOCATE NET NEW SHADOW ON UNION SQUARE TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT AT 706 MISSION STREET.

PREAMBLE

Under Planning Code Section 295 (also referred to as Proposition K from 1984), a building permit application for a project exceeding a height of 40 feet cannot be approved if there is any shadow impact on a property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department, unless the Planning Commission, upon recommendation from the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, in consultation with the Recreation and Park Commission, makes a determination that the shadow impact will not be significant or adverse to the use of the property.

www.sfplanning.org
On February 7, 1989, the Recreation and Park Commission and the Planning Commission adopted criteria establishing absolute cumulative limits ("ACL") for additional shadows on 14 parks throughout San Francisco (Planning Commission Resolution No. 11595), as set forth in a February 3, 1989 memorandum (the "1989 Memo"). The ACL for each park is expressed as a percentage of the Theoretically Available Annual Sunlight ("TAAS") on the Park (with no adjacent structures present).

Union Square ("Park"), which is 0.25 miles northwest of 706 Mission Street ("Project Site"), is a public open space that is under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission. Union Square is an approximately 2.58-acre park that occupies the entire block bounded by Post Street on the north, Stockton Street on the east, Geary Street on the south, and Powell Street on the west. The plaza is primarily hardscaped and oriented to passive recreational uses, large civic gatherings, and ancillary retail. There are no recreational facilities and some grassy areas exist along its southern perimeter. There are pedestrian walkways and seating areas throughout the park, several retail kiosks and two cafés on the east side of the park. The park includes portable tables and chairs that can be moved to different locations. A 97-foot-tall monument commemorating the Battle of Manila Bay from the Spanish American War occupies the center of the park. Residents, shoppers, tourists, and workers use the park as an outdoor lunch destination and a mid-block pedestrian crossing. Throughout the year, the park is sunny during the middle of the day; it is shadowed by existing buildings to the east, south, and west during the early morning, late afternoon, and early evening. During the spring and autumn, Union Square is sunny from approximately 9:00 AM until 3:00 PM; it is shadowed by existing buildings during the early morning, late afternoon, and early evening. During the summer, Union Square is sunny from approximately 10:00 AM until 4:00 PM; it is shadowed by existing buildings during the early morning, late afternoon, and early evening. During the winter, Union Square is mostly sunny from approximately noon until 2:00 PM; it is shadowed by existing buildings during the rest of the day.

Union Square receives about 392,663,521 square-foot-hours ("sfh") of TAAS. Currently, there are about 150,265,376 sf of existing annual shadow on the park. The ACL that was established for Union Square in 1989 is additional shadow that was equal to 0.1 percent of the TAAS on Union Square, which is approximately 392,663.5 sfh. Until October of 2012, Union Square currently had a remaining shadow allocation, or shadow budget, of approximately 323,123.5 sfh. Since the quantitative standard for Union Square was established in 1989, two completed development projects have affected the shadow conditions on Union Square. In 1996, a project to expand Macy's department store altered the massing of the structure and resulted in a net reduction of 194,293 sfh of existing shadow (with a corresponding increase in the amount of sunlight on the park), and in 2003, a project at 690 Market Street added 69,540 sfh of net new shadow on Union Square. Although the Macy's expansion project reduced the amount of existing shadow and increased the amount of available sunlight on Union Square, this amount has not been added back to the shadow budget for Union Square by the Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission to account for these conditions.

Additionally, on October 11, 2012, the Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission held a duly noticed joint public hearing and adopted Planning Commission Resolution No. 18717 and Recreation and Park Commission Resolution No. 1201-001 amending the 1989 Memo and raising the absolute cumulative shadow limits for seven open spaces under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department that could be shadowed by likely cumulative development sites in the Transit Center.
District Plan ("Plan") Area, including Union Square. In revising these ACLs, the Commissions also adopted qualitative criteria for each park related to the characteristics of shading within these ACLs by development sites in the Plan Area that would not be considered adverse, including the duration, time of day, time of year, and location of shadows on the particular parks. Under these amendments to the 1989 Memo, any consideration of allocation of "shadow" within these newly increased ACLs for projects within the Plan Area must be consistent with these characteristics. The Commissions also found that the "public benefit" of any proposed project in the Plan Area should be considered in the context of the public benefits of the Transit Center District Plan as a whole. During a joint public hearing on October 11, 2012, the Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission increased the ACLs for seven downtown parks, including Union Square, to allow for shadow cast by development proposed under the Transit Center District Plan (TCDP). The ACL for Union Square was increased from the original limit of 0.1 percent of the TAAS (approximately 392,663.5 sfh) to 0.19 percent of the TAAS (approximately 746,060.7 sfh), but all of the available shadow budget within this ACL was reserved for development within the Plan Area.

On October 11, 2012, following the joint hearing regarding the TCDP, the Recreation and Park Commission reviewed the shadow impacts of the proposed Transbay Tower at 101 First Street and made a formal recommendation to the Planning Commission to allocate a portion of the newly adopted ACL for Union Square to the Transbay Tower. On October 18, 2012, the Planning Commission allocated a portion of the newly adopted ACL to the Transbay Tower (Motion No. 18724, Case No. 2008.0789K).

On November 15, 2012, the Recreation and Park Commission made a formal recommendation to the Planning Commission to allocate a portion of the newly adopted ACL for Union Square to a proposed project at 181 Fremont Street. On December 6, 2012, the Planning Commission allocated a portion of the newly adopted ACL to 181 Fremont Street. As a result of these actions, the remaining ACL for Union Square is 0.1785 percent of the TAAS, which means that approximately 700,904.4 sfh of net new shadow could be cast on Union Square by other development proposed under the TCDP (Motion No. 18763, Case No. 2007.0456K).

On September 25, 2008, Sean Jeffries of Millennium Partners, acting on behalf of 706 Mission Street, LLC ("Project Sponsor") submitted a request for review of a development exceeding 40 feet in height, pursuant to Section 295, analyzing the potential shadow impacts of the Project to properties under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Parks Department (Case No. 2008.1084K). Department staff prepared a shadow fan depicting the potential shadow cast by the development and concluded that the Project could have a potential impact to properties subject to Section 295.

On October 24, 2012, the Project Sponsor filed an application with the Planning Department ("Department") for a Determination of Compliance pursuant to Planning Code Section ("Section") 309 with requested Exceptions from Planning Code ("Code") requirements for "Reduction of Ground-Level Wind Currents in C-3 Districts", "Off-Street Parking Quantity", "Rear Yard, and "General Standards for Off-Street Parking and Loading" to allow curb cuts on Third and Mission Streets, for a project to rehabilitate an existing 10-story, 144-foot tall building (the Aronson Building), and construct a new, adjacent 47-story tower, reaching a roof height of 520 feet with a 30-foot tall mechanical penthouse. The two buildings would be connected and would contain up to 215 dwelling units, a "core-and-shell" museum space measuring approximately 52,000 square feet, and approximately 4,800 square feet of retail space. The project would reconfigure portions of the existing Jessie Square Garage to increase the number
of parking spaces from 442 spaces to 470 spaces, add loading and service vehicle spaces, and would allocate up to 215 parking spaces within the garage to serve the proposed residential uses. The Project Sponsor has proposed a "flex option" that would retain approximately 61,000 square feet of office uses within the existing Aronson Building, and would reduce the residential component of the project to 191 dwelling units. On May 20, 2013, the Project Sponsor reduced the height of the proposed tower from 520 feet (with a 30-foot-tall elevator/mechanical penthouse) to 480 feet (with a 30-foot-tall elevator/mechanical penthouse). As a result, the number of dwelling units in the Project was reduced from a maximum of 215 dwelling units to a maximum of 190 dwelling units, the number of residential parking spaces was reduced from a maximum of 215 spaces to a maximum of 190 spaces, and the "flex option" of retaining office space within the project was deleted. The project is located at 706 Mission Street, Lots 093, 276, and portions of Lot 277 within Assessor’s Block 3706 (“Project Site”), within the C-3-R District and the 400-I Height and Bulk District (collectively, "Project", Case No. 2008.1084X).

On October 24, 2012, the Project Sponsor submitted a request for a General Plan Referral Case No. 2008.1084R, regarding the changes in use, disposition, and conveyance of publicly-owned land, reconfiguration of the public sidewalk along Mission Street, and subdivision of the property. On May 23, 2013, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting and adopted Motion No. 18878 determining that these actions are consistent with the objectives and policies of the General Plan and the Priority Policies of Section 101.1.

On October 24, 2012, the Project Sponsor submitted a request to amend Height Map HT01 of the Zoning Maps of the San Francisco Planning Code to reclassify the Project Site from the 400-I Height and Bulk District to the 520-I Height and Bulk District. (Case No. 2008.1084Z). On May 20, 2013, in association with the reduced height of the Project, the Project Sponsor revised the request for a Height Reclassification to reclassify a portion of the Project Site from the 400-I Height and Bulk District to the 480-I Height and Bulk District. On May 23, 2013, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting and adopted Resolution No. 18879, recommending that the Board of Supervisors approve the requested Height Reclassification.

On October 24, 2012, the submitted a request to amend Zoning Map SU01 and the text of the Planning Code to establish the “[Yerba Buena Center Mixed-Use Special Use District] (SUD) on the property. The proposed SUD would modify specific Planning Code regulations related to permitted uses, the provision of a cultural/museum use within the SUD, floor area ratio limitations, dwelling unit exposure, height of rooftop equipment, bulk limitations, and curb cut locations (Case No. 2008.1084T). On May 23, 2013, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting and adopted Resolution No. 18879, recommending that the Board of Supervisors approve the requested Planning Code Text Amendment.

A technical memorandum, prepared by Turnstone Consulting, was submitted on June 9, 2011, analyzing the potential shadow impacts of the Project (at its originally proposed 520-foot roof height) to properties under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Parks Department (Case No. 2008.1084K). The memorandum concluded that the Project would cast 337,744 sfh of net new shadow on Union Square on a yearly basis, which would be an increase of about 0.09% of the TAAS on Union Square for projects outside of the TCDP. On May 21, 2013, a technical memorandum prepared by Turnstone Consulting was submitted analyzing the shadow impacts of the Project on Union Square, based on the reduced 480-foot roof height. The memorandum concluded that the Project would cast 238,788 sfh of net new shadow on Union Square.
on a yearly basis, which would be an increase of about 0.06% of the TAAS on Union Square. The reduction in the height of the tower results in a reduction of approximately 29% of net new shadow compared with the Project’s original design.

On March 21, 2013, the 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 complied with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.) ("CEQA"), 14 California Code of Regulations Sections 15000 et seq. ("the CEQA Guidelines"), and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code ("Chapter 31").

The Commission found the Final EIR was adequate, accurate and objective, reflected the independent analysis and judgment of the Department and the Commission, and that the summary of comments and responses contained no significant revisions to the draft EIR, and certified the Final EIR for the Project in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31.

The EIR concludes that the Project would not result in a project-specific significant shadow impact to recreation facilities or other public areas. With respect to Union Square, the EIR indicates that the net new shadow would be of limited duration and the new shadowing would occur at times when the use of Union Square is limited. The EIR concludes that the Project would, however, make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative shadow impact on public opens spaces when taking into account other reasonably foreseeable future projects, such as the Transit Tower and the Palace Hotel Project, that would also result in new shadowing of public areas, including Union Square.

Three separate appeals of the Commission’s certification of the EIR to the Board of Supervisors were filed before the April 10, 2013 deadline. The Board of Supervisors considered these appeals at a duly noticed public hearing on May 7, 2013, and unanimously voted to affirm the Planning Commission’s certification of the Final EIR. The Board of Supervisors 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 complied with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31. The Board of Supervisors found the Final EIR was adequate, accurate and objective, reflected the independent analysis and judgment of the Board of Supervisors, and that the summary of comments and responses contained no significant revisions to the draft EIR, and approved the Final EIR in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31.

As part of their actions on October 11, 2012 to increase the ACLs for seven downtown parks, the Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission designated the ACLs exclusively for projects that meet the criteria set forth in the TCDP. Projects that do not meet the criteria set forth in the TCDP may not utilize any portion of the amended ACLs if they cast net new shadow on any of the seven downtown parks for which the ACLs were amended. Such projects would be required to seek their own amendments to the ACLs for these seven downtown parks. The Project is located outside the Plan area and is not eligible to utilize newly adopted ACL on the Park.

On May 23, 2013, the Commission adopted Motion No. 18875, adopting CEQA findings, including a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and adopting the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP"), which findings and adoption of the MMRP are hereby incorporated by reference as though
fully set forth herein. The Commission found that the reduction in the height of the Project has resulted in no substantial changes that would require major revisions to the Final EIR or result in new or substantially more severe significant environmental impacts that were not evaluated in the Final EIR, no new information has become available that was not known and could not have been known at the time the Final EIR was certified as complete and that would result in new substantially more severe significant environmental impacts not evaluated in the Final EIR, and no mitigation measures or alternatives previously found infeasible would be feasible or mitigation measures or alternatives considerably different than those analyzed in the Final EIR would substantially reduce significant environmental impacts, but the project proponent declines to adopt them.

The Planning Department, Jonas Ionin, is the custodian of records for this action, and such records are located at 1650 Mission Street, Fourth Floor, San Francisco, California.

The Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission held a duly advertised joint public hearing on May 23, 2013 and adopted Planning Commission Resolution No. 18876, and Recreation and Park Commission Resolution No. 1305-014 amending the ACL for Union Square to (a) include the approximately 194,293 sfh of shadow (equal to 0.05% of the TAAS) that resulted from a 1996 project modifying the Macy’s department store that reduced shadow on Union Square (the “Macy’s Adjustment”) that had not been previously added back to the ACL for Union Square and (b) increase the ACL by an additional 44,495 sfh of net new shadow (equal to 0.01% of the TAAS).

On May 23, 2011, The Recreation and Park Commission conducted a duly notice public hearing at regularly scheduled meeting and recommended that the Planning Commission find that the shadows cast by the Project on Union Square will not be adverse to the use of Union Square.

The Planning Commission has reviewed and considered reports, studies, plans and other documents pertaining to the Project.

The Planning Commission has heard and considered the testimony presented at the public hearing and has further considered the written materials and oral testimony presented on behalf of the Project Sponsor, Department staff, and other interested parties.

**FINDINGS**

Having reviewed the materials identified in the recitals above, and having heard all testimony and arguments, this Commission finds, concludes, and determines as follows:

1. The foregoing recitals are accurate, and also constitute findings of this Commission.

2. The additional shadow cast by the Project on Union Square, while numerically significant, would not be adverse to the use of Union Square, and is not expected to interfere with the use of the Park, for the following reasons: (1) the new shadow would not occur after 9:15 a.m. any day of the year (maximum new shadow range would be 8:30 a.m. to 9:15 a.m. during daylight savings time, or 7:30 a.m. to 8:15 a.m. during standard time) and would be consistent with the 1989 Memo qualitative standards for Union Square in that the new net shadow would not occur during mid-day hours; (2) the new shadow would generally occur in the morning hours during periods of relatively low park usage; (3) the new shadow would occur for a limited amount of
time from October 11th to November 8th and from February 2nd to March 2nd for less than one hour on any given day during the hours subject to Section 295; and (4) the new shadow does not affect the manner in which Union Square is used, which is mainly for passive recreational opportunities.

3. A determination by the Planning Commission and/or the Recreation and Park Commission to allocate net new shadow to the Project does not constitute an approval of the Project.
DECISION

Based upon the Record, the submissions by the Project Sponsor, the staff of the Planning Department, the recommendation of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, in consultation with the Recreation and Park Commission, and other interested parties, the oral testimony presented to the Commission at the public hearing, and all other written materials submitted by all parties, the Commission hereby DETERMINES, under Shadow Analysis Application No. 2008.1084K, that the net new shadow cast by the Project on Union Square would not be adverse to the use of the park, and ALLOCATES to the Project 238,788 square-foot-hours of additional shadow on Union Square (representing approximately 0.06% of the Theoretically Available Annual Sunlight for Union Square), including (a) the approximately 194,293 sqf of shadow (equal to 0.05% of the TAAS) that resulted from the “Macy’s Adjustment”, and (b) an additional 44,495 sqf of net new shadow (equal to 0.01% of the TAAS). Should the building envelope of the Project be reduced, the allocation of additional shadow to the Project that is authorized by this action shall be reduced to the amount of shadow that would be cast by the revised Project.

FURTHERMORE, the Commission adopts findings under the California Environmental Quality Act, including the Statement of Overriding Considerations and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program prepared for the Project, as set forth in Motion No. 18875, which are hereby incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Motion was ADOPTED by the Planning Commission at the meeting on May 23, 2013.

[Signature]
Jonas P. Ionin
Acting Commission Secretary

AYES: Fong, Antonini, Borden, Hillis

NAYS: Moore, Sugaya, Wu

ABSENT:

ADOPTED: May 23, 2013
Planning Commission Resolution 18879
Zoning Map Amendment
Planning Code Text Amendment
HEARING DATE: MAY 23, 2013

Date: March 28, 2013
Case No.: 2008.1084EHKXRTZ
Project Address: 706 Mission Street
Project Site Zoning: C-3-R (Downtown, Retail, Commercial)
400-I Height and Bulk District
Block/Lots: 3706/093, 275, portions of 277 (706 Mission Street)
0308/001 (Union Square)
Project Sponsor: 706 Mission Street, LLC
c/o Sean Jeffries of Millennium Partners
735 Market Street, 4th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94107
Staff Contact: Kevin Guy – (415) 558-6163
Kevin.Guy@sfgov.org


RECITALS
1. WHEREAS, On October 24, 2012, 706 Mission Street Co LLC (“Project Sponsor”) filed entitlement applications with the San Francisco Planning Department for the development of a mixed-use

www.sfplanning.org
development project ("Project") at the northwest corner of Third and Mission Streets, including an application for a Planning Code Text Amendment to create a new Yerba Buena Center Mixed-Use Special Use District, and an application for a Height Reclassification to reclassify the property at 706 Mission Street from the 400-I Height and Bulk District to the 520-I Height and Bulk District. On May 20, 2013, the Project Sponsor reduced the height of the proposed Project from 520 feet (with a 30-foot-tall elevator/mechanical penthouse) to 480 feet (with a 30-foot-tall elevator/mechanical penthouse). In association with the reduced height of the Project, the Project Sponsor revised the request for a Height Reclassification to reclassify the Project site from the 400-I Height and Bulk District to the 480-I Height and Bulk District.

2. WHEREAS, The Project is proposed to be developed on three parcels: (1) the entirety of Assessor’s Block 3706, Lot 093, which is currently owned by the Applicant and which is improved with an existing 10-story, 144-foot-tall building with a 10-foot-tall mechanical penthouse ("Aronson Building"); (2) a portion of Assessor’s Block 3706, Lot 277, which is currently owned by the Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco ("Successor Agency"), and which was chosen by the former Redevelopment Agency Commission and The Mexican Museum Board of Trustees as the future permanent home of The Mexican Museum (the "Mexican Museum Parcel"); and (3) a portion of Assessor’s Block 3706, Lot 277 and the entirety of Lot 275, which is currently owned by the Successor Agency, and which is improved with the below-grade, 442 parking space Jessie Square Garage (the "Garage Parcel"). The Aronson Building is designated as a Category I Significant Building within the expanded New Montgomery-Mission-Second Street Conservation District.

3. WHEREAS, As part of the Project, and pursuant to transaction documents to be entered into between the Successor Agency and the Applicant, the Successor Agency would convey the Garage Parcel and the Mexican Museum Parcel to the Applicant. The Applicant would then construct a new 43-story, 480-foot-tall tower (with a 30-foot-tall elevator/mechanical penthouse), with two floors below grade. The new tower would be adjacent to and physically connected to the existing Aronson Building, which would be rehabilitated in compliance with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards.

4. WHEREAS, The new tower would contain up to 39 floors of residential space. The Mexican Museum would occupy the ground through fourth floors of the tower and the second and third floors and possibly some of the ground floor of the Aronson Building. The overall project would contain up to 190 residential units, space for The Mexican Museum, a ground-floor retail/restaurant use, and associated building services. The project would also entail certain reconfigurations of the Jessie Square Garage.

5. WHEREAS, Pursuant to transaction documents to be entered into between the Successor Agency and the Applicant, the Project would result in several public benefits, including the rehabilitation of the Category I Aronson Building, the construction of a core-and-shell for future occupancy by the Mexican Museum, a $5,000,000 operating endowment for the Mexican Museum, and the creation of affordable housing opportunities through the payment of an in-lieu fee equal to 20% of the residential units, pursuant to the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program in Sections 415 through
415.9, as well as the payment of an additional affordable housing fee to the Successor Agency equal to 8% of the residential units.

6. WHEREAS, In order for the Project to proceed and be developed as contemplated by the Applicant, the Successor Agency, and The Mexican Museum, a height reclassification and amendments to certain provisions of the Planning Code are required, including modifications of regulations related to permitted uses, the provision of a cultural/museum use within the SUD, floor area ratio limitations, dwelling unit exposure, height of rooftop equipment, bulk limitations, and curb cut locations.

7. WHEREAS, On June 27, 2012, the Department published a draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for public review. The draft EIR was available for public comment until August 13, 2012. On August 2, 2012, the Planning Commission (“Commission”) conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to solicit comments regarding the draft EIR. On March 7, 2013, the Department published a Comments and Responses document, responding to comments made regarding the draft EIR prepared for the Project. On March 21, 2013, the 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 complied with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.) (“CEQA”), 14 California Code of Regulations Sections 15000 et seq. (“the CEQA Guidelines”), and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code (“Chapter 31”). The Commission found the Final EIR was adequate, accurate and objective, reflected the independent analysis and judgment of the Department and the Commission, and that the summary of comments and responses contained no significant revisions to the draft EIR, and approved the Final EIR for the Project in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31. The Planning Department, Jonas Ionin, is the custodian of records, located in the File for Case No. 2008.1084E, at 1650 Mission Street, Fourth Floor, San Francisco, California.

8. WHEREAS, Three separate appeals of the Commission’s certification were filed before the April 10, 2013 deadline. The Board of Supervisors considered these appeals at a duly noticed public hearing on May 7, 2013, and unanimously voted to affirm the Planning Commission’s certification of the Final EIR. The Board of Supervisors 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 complied with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31. The Board of Supervisors found the Final EIR was adequate, accurate and objective, reflected the independent analysis and judgment of the Board of Supervisors, and that the summary of comments and responses contained no significant revisions to the draft EIR, and approved the Final EIR in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31.

9. WHEREAS, The Project would affirmatively promote, be consistent with, and would not adversely affect the General Plan, including the following objectives and policies, for the reasons set forth set forth in Item #8 of Motion No. 18894, Case No. 2008.1084X, which are incorporated herein as though fully set forth.
10. WHEREAS, The Project complies with the eight priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1, for the reasons set forth set forth in Item #9 of Motion No. 18894, Case No. 2008.1084X, which are incorporated herein as though fully set forth.

11. WHEREAS, A proposed ordinance, attached hereto as Exhibit A, has been prepared in order to make the amendment to the Sheet HT01 of the Zoning Map by changing the height and bulk district for the Project Site, from the existing 400-I Height and Bulk District to a height limit of 480 feet. The proposed ordinance would also amend Zoning Map SU01 and the text of the Planning Code to establish the “Yerba Buena Center Mixed-Use” SUD on the property.

12. WHEREAS, the Office of the City Attorney has approved the proposed ordinance as to form.

13. WHEREAS, Section 4.105 of the San Francisco Charter and Section 302 of the Planning Code require that the Commission consider any proposed amendments to the City’s Zoning Maps or Planning Code, and make a recommendation for approval or rejection to the Board of Supervisors before the Board of Supervisors acts on the proposed amendments.

14. WHEREAS, On May 23, 2013, the Commission adopted Motion No. 18875, adopting CEQA findings, including a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and adopting the MMRP, which findings and adoption of the MMRP are hereby incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein. The Commission found that the reduction in the height of the Project has resulted in no substantial changes that would require major revisions to the Final EIR or result in new or substantially more severe significant environmental impacts that were not evaluated in the Final EIR, no new information has become available that was not known and could not have been known at the time the Final EIR was certified as complete and that would result in new substantially more severe significant environmental impacts not evaluated in the Final EIR, and no mitigation measures or alternatives previously found infeasible would be feasible or mitigation measures or alternatives considerably different than those analyzed in the Final EIR would substantially reduce significant environmental impacts, but the project proponent declines to adopt them.

15. WHEREAS, On May 23, 2013, the Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider the Proposed Zoning Map Amendment and Zoning Text Amendment.

16. WHEREAS, The Commission has had available to it for its review and consideration studies, case reports, letters, plans, and other materials pertaining to the Project contained in the Department’s case files, and has reviewed and heard testimony and received materials from interested parties during the public hearings on the Project.
NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, the Commission finds, based upon the entire Record, the submissions by the Applicant, the staff of the Department, and other interested parties, the oral testimony presented to the Commission at the public hearing, and all other written materials submitted by all parties, that the public necessity, convenience and general welfare require that Sheet HT01 of the Zoning Maps be amended to reclassify the height limit for the property from the existing 400-I Height and Bulk District to a height limit of 480 feet, and to amend Zoning Map SU01 and the text of the Planning Code to establish the “Yerba Buena Center Mixed-Use” SUD on the property, as proposed in Application No. 2008.1084TZ; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT, the Planning Commission recommends the Board of Supervisors approve the proposed Zoning Map Amendment and Planning Code Text Amendment.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED by the Planning Commission at its regular meeting on May 23, 2013.

Jonas P. Ionin
Acting Commission Secretary

AYES:      Fong, Antonini, Borden, Hillis

NOES:      Moore, Sugaya, Wu

ABSENT:

ADOPTED:   May 23, 2013
Proposed Zoning Map Amendments

Reclassify Height from 400-I to 480-I Height and Bulk District; Establish "Yerba Buena Center Mixed-Use Special Use District".
Executive Summary

SECTION 309 DETERMINATION OF COMPLIANCE
ZONING MAP AMENDMENT
PLANNING CODE TEXT AMENDMENT
GENERAL PLAN REFERRAL
SECTION 295 SHADOW ANALYSIS

HEARING DATE: APRIL 11, 2013

Date: March 28, 2013
Case No.: 20081084EHKXRTZ
Project Address: 706 Mission Street
Project Site Zoning: C-3-R (Downtown, Retail, Commercial)
400-I Height and Bulk District
Block/Lots: 3706/093, 275, portions of 277 (706 Mission Street)
0308/001 (Union Square)
Project Sponsor: 706 Mission Street, LLC
c/o Sean Jeffries of Millennium Partners
735 Market Street, 4th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94107
Staff Contact: Kevin Guy – (415) 558-6163
Kevin.Guy@sfplanning.org

Recommendations: Adopt CEQA Findings
Approve Section 309 Determination of Compliance with Conditions
Recommend Approval (Zoning Map/Planning Code Text Amendments)
Adopt General Plan Referral Findings
Raise Cumulative Shadow Limit for Union Square
Adopt Findings Regarding Shadow Impacts

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The Project would rehabilitate the existing 10-story, 144-foot tall Aronson Building, and construct a new, adjacent 47-story tower, reaching a roof height of 520 feet with a 30-foot tall mechanical penthouse. The two buildings would be connected and would contain up to 215 dwelling units, a “core-and-shell” museum space measuring approximately 52,000 square feet that will house the permanent home of the Mexican Museum, and approximately 4,800 square feet of retail space. The project would reconfigure portions of the existing Jessie Square Garage to increase the number of parking spaces from 442 spaces to 470 spaces, add loading and service vehicle spaces, and would allocate up to 215 parking spaces within the garage to serve the proposed residential uses. The Project Sponsor has proposed a “flex option” that would retain approximately 61,000 square feet of office uses within the existing Aronson Building, and would reduce the residential component of the project to approximately 191 dwelling units.
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The Project includes the reclassification of the subject property from the existing 400-foot height limit to a 520-foot height limit, as well as the adoption of the “Yerba Buena Center Mixed-Use Special Use District” (“SUD”). The proposed SUD would modify specific Planning Code regulations related to permitted uses, the provision of a cultural/museum use within the SUD, floor area ratio limitations, dwelling unit exposure, height of rooftop equipment, bulk limitations, and curb cut locations.

Through transactional documents between the project sponsor and the Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency (“Successor Agency”), the Successor Agency would convey to the Project Sponsor the Jessie Square garage and the portion of property located between the Aronson Building parcel and Jessie Square that would be developed with the tower portion of the Project (portions of Lot 277, Assessor’s Block 3706). The Successor Agency would also convey to the Project Sponsor the parcel containing the garage access driveway (Lot 275, Assessor’s Block 3706) from Stevenson Street. In addition, the Project Sponsor would provide $5 million endowment for the operation of the Mexican Museum, and would contribute an additional affordable housing fee to the Successor Agency equal to 8% of the residential units.

SITE DESCRIPTION AND PRESENT USE

The Project Site measures 72,181 sq. ft. and is comprised of three separate parcels within Assessor’s Block 3706. Lot 093 is located at the northwest corner of Third and Mission Streets, and is currently developed with the existing 10-story, 144-foot tall Aronson Building. The Aronson Building is designated as a Category I (Significant) Building in Article 11 of the Planning Code, and is located within the New Montgomery-Mission-Second Street Conservation District. The building contains approximately 96,000 sq. ft. of office uses and approximately 10,600 sq. ft. of ground-floor retail uses.

Lot 275 is improved with an existing vehicular access ramp that leads from Stevenson Street into the subterranean Jessie Square Garage. Lot 277 includes the property located between the Aronson Building parcel and Jessie Square, fronting along Mission Street. This property is the location of the proposed tower portion of the Project, and is currently unimproved except for a subsurface foundation structure. Lot 277 also includes the subterranean Jessie Square Garage, which is improved with the Jessie Square public plaza on the surface. The Project would reconfigure and utilize a portion of the Jessie Square garage, which is considered a part of the Project Site. However, the Jessie Square plaza located on the surface of a portion of Lot 277 would not be changed by this Project, and is not considered part of the Project Site.

SURROUNDING PROPERTIES & NEIGHBORHOOD

The Project Site is situated within the C-3-R Downtown Commercial zoning district, and is within the former Yerba Buena Center Redevelopment Area, a context characterized by intense urban development and a diverse mix of uses. Numerous cultural institutions are clustered in the immediate vicinity, including SFMOMA, the Yerba Buena Center for the Arts, the Museum of the African Diaspora, the Contemporary Jewish Museum, the Cartoon Art Museum, the Children’s Creativity Museum, the California Historical Museum, and others. Multiple hotels and high-rise residential and office buildings are also located in the vicinity, including the W Hotel, the St. Regis Hotel and Residences, the Four Seasons, the Palace Hotel, the Paramount Apartments, One Hawthorne Street, the Westin, the Marriott Marquis, and the Pacific Telephone building. Significant open spaces in the vicinity include Yerba Buena
Gardens to the south, and Jessie Square immediately to the west of the project site. The Moscone Convention Center facilities are located one block to the southwest, and the edge of the Union Square shopping district is situated two blocks northwest of the site. The Financial District is located in the blocks to the northeast and to the north. The western edge of the recently-adopted Transit Center District Plan area is located one-half block to the east at Annie Street.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW
On June 27, 2012, the Department published a draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for public review (Case No. 2008.1084E). The draft EIR was available for public comment until August 13, 2012. On August 2, 2012, the Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to solicit comments regarding the draft EIR. On March 7, 2013, the Department published a Comments and Responses document, responding to comments made regarding the draft EIR prepared for the Project. On March 21, 2013, the Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing and certified the final EIR for the Project.

HEARING NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>REQUIRED PERIOD</th>
<th>REQUIRED NOTICE DATE</th>
<th>ACTUAL NOTICE DATE</th>
<th>ACTUAL PERIOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classified News Ad</td>
<td>20 days</td>
<td>March 22, 2013</td>
<td>March 22, 2013</td>
<td>20 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posted Notice</td>
<td>20 days</td>
<td>March 22, 2013</td>
<td>March 22, 2013</td>
<td>20 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailed Notice</td>
<td>20 days</td>
<td>March 22, 2013</td>
<td>March 22, 2013</td>
<td>20 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PUBLIC COMMENT
To date, the Department has not received any specific communications related to the requested entitlements. However, numerous written and verbal comments were provided during the public comment period for the draft EIR prepared for the Project. These comments related to a wide variety of topic areas, and were addressed as part of the Comments and Responses document prepared during the environmental review of the Project.

ISSUES AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
- **Height Reclassification/Special Use District**: The Project proposes to reclassify the property from the 400-I to the 520-I Height and Bulk District, and to establish the "Yerba Buena Center Mixed-Use Special Use District” (SUD) on the property. The proposed SUD would modify specific Planning Code regulations related to permitted uses, the provision of a cultural/museum use within the SUD, floor area ratio limitations, dwelling unit exposure, height of rooftop equipment, bulk limitations, and curb cut locations, as follows:

  - **Permitted Uses** – The SUD specifies that development within the SUD must include a cultural, museum, or similar public-serving institutional use measuring at least 35,000 sq. ft., no fewer than 162 dwelling units, and ground-floor retail or cultural uses within the Aronson Building.

  - **Floor Area Ratio** – Section 124 establishes basic floor area ratios (FAR) for all zoning districts. As set forth in Section 124(a), the FAR for the C-3-R District is 6.0 to 1. Under Sections 123 and 128, the FAR can be increased to a maximum of 9.0 to 1 with the purchase of transferable development rights (TDR). The FAR of the Project would exceed the base maximum FAR limit, as well as the
maximum FAR that could be achieved through the purchase of TDR. The proposed SUD would exempt the Project from the FAR limitations of Section 124, and the Project would not require the purchase of TDR.

- **Dwelling Unit Exposure** – Dwelling units on the south side of the Project would have exposure onto Mission Street, and units within the east side of the Aronson Building would have exposure onto Third Street. However, units that solely have exposure to the Westin walkway to the north, to Jessie Square to the west, and east-facing units within the tower above the 20th floor do not meet the requirements for dwelling unit exposure onto on-site open areas. The proposed SUD would exempt the Project from the exposure requirements of Section 140. It should be noted that Jessie Square and the Westin walkway are open spaces that are unlikely to be developed with structures in the future. Therefore, units that face these areas would continue to enjoy access to light and air. Additionally, units in the Tower that face east would have exposure onto the open area above the Aronson Building, as well as the width of Third Street beyond. Therefore, these units would also continue to enjoy access to light and air.

- **Rooftop Equipment Height** - The Project would reach a height of 520 feet to the roof, with rooftop mechanical structures and screening reaching a maximum height of approximately 550 feet. The Project Sponsor has proposed to reclassify the Project Site from the 400-I Height and Bulk District to the 520-I Height and Bulk District. In addition, the SUD would allow for an additional 30 feet of height above the roof to accommodate mechanical equipment and screening.

- **Bulk Limitations** - Section 270 establishes bulk controls by district. In the “I” Bulk District, all portions of the building above a height of 150 feet are limited to a maximum length dimension of 170 feet and a maximum diagonal dimension of 200 feet. Above a height of 150 feet, the maximum horizontal length of the Project is approximately 123 feet, and the maximum diagonal dimension is approximately 158 feet. Therefore, the Project complies with the bulk controls of the “I” Bulk District. The proposed SUD would further limit the maximum bulk controls to the maximum horizontal and diagonal dimensions proposed for the Project.

- **Curb Cuts** - Section 155 regulates the design of parking and loading facilities. Section 155(r)(3) specifies that no curb cuts may be permitted on the segment of Mission Street abutting the Project, except through Conditional Use authorization. The SUD proposed for the project would modify the regulations of Section 155 to allow a curb cut on Mission Street through an exception granted through the Section 309 review process, rather than through Conditional Use authorization.

- **Planning Code Exceptions**. The project does not strictly conform to several aspects of the Planning Code. As part of the Section 309 review process, the Commission may grant exceptions from certain requirements of the Planning Code for projects that meet specified criteria. The Project requests exceptions regarding “Rear Yard” (Section 134), “Reduction of Ground-Level Wind Currents in C-3 Districts” (Section 148), “Limitations on Residential Accessory Parking” (Section 151.1), and “General Standards for Off-Street Parking and Loading” to allow curb cuts on Mission and Third Streets (Section 155). Compliance with the specific criteria for each exception is summarized below, and is described in the attached draft Section 309 motion.

- **Rear Yard**. The Planning Code requires that the project provide a rear yard equal to 25 percent of the lot depth at the first level containing a dwelling unit, and at every subsequent level.
Exceptions to the rear yard requirements may be granted if the building location and configuration assure adequate light and air to the residential units and the open space provided. The property fronts on both Mission and Third Streets. Therefore, a complying rear yard would be situated toward the interior of the property, either abutting the Westin walkway or Jessie Square. It is unlikely that these open areas on the adjacent properties would be redeveloped in the foreseeable future. Therefore, adequate light and separation will be provided by the open spaces for residential units within the Project. The Project exceeds the Code requirements for common and private residential open space. In addition, residents would have convenient access to Jessie Plaza, Yerba Buena Gardens, and other large open public open spaces in the vicinity.

- **Ground Level Wind Currents.** The Code requires that new buildings in C-3 Districts must be designed so as to not cause ground-level wind currents to exceed specified comfort levels. When preexisting ambient wind speeds exceed the comfort levels, new buildings must be designed to attenuate ambient wind speeds to meet the specified comfort level. According to the wind analysis prepared for the project, 67 of the 95 test points in the vicinity currently exceed the pedestrian comfort level. Seven of the existing comfort exceedances would be eliminated, and nine new exceedances would be created, for a net increase of two exceedances. An exception under Section 148 (a) is therefore required. An exception to these requirements may be granted if the building cannot be shaped to meet the requirements without creating an ungainly building form and unduly restricting the development potential of the building site.

The Project would result in relatively modest changes in ground-level winds. The average wind speed would increase slightly from 12.6 to 12.7 mph. The average wind speed across all test points (nine mph) would not change appreciably, nor would the amount of time (17 percent) during which winds exceed the applicable criteria. The Project would not create any new exceedances in areas used for public seating. The Project incorporates several design features intended to baffle winds and reduce ground-level wind speeds. The third floor of the museum cantilevers over the on-site open space below, shielding this open space and redirecting some wind flows away from Jessie Square. The exterior of this cantilever includes projecting fins that will capture and diffuse winds before reaching the ground. In addition, the exterior of the museum at the first and second floors is chamfered to avoid localized wind eddies that would result from a typical rectilinear exterior.

- **Residential Accessory Parking.** The Planning Code does not require that residential uses in the C-3-R District provide off-street parking, but allows up to .25 cars per dwelling unit as-of-right. Residential uses may provide up to .75 cars per dwelling unit (or up to one car for each dwelling unit with at least two bedrooms and at 1,000 square feet of floor area), if the Commission makes specific findings that the parking is provided in a space-efficient manner, that the additional parking will not adversely affect pedestrian, bicycler, and transit movement, that the parking will not degrade the quality of the streetscape, and that free carshare memberships will be provided to households in the project.

While the parking is being provided at the maximum possible 1:1 ratio, the relatively small number of 215 off-street parking spaces is not expected to generate substantial traffic that would adversely impact pedestrian, transit, or bicycle movement. Given the proximity of the Project Site to the employment opportunities and retail services of the Downtown Core, it is expected that residents will prioritize walking, bicycle travel, or transit use over private automobile travel. In
addition, the proposed residential spaces are being reallocated from spaces within the existing garage that are currently used for general public parking. Residential uses generally generate fewer daily trips than the uses that are served by the existing public parking. Therefore, the conversion of spaces for residential use would not create new vehicular movement compared with existing conditions.

- **Curb Cuts.** Section 155 regulates the design of parking and loading facilities. Section 155(r)(4) specifies that no curb cuts may be permitted on the segment of Third Street abutting the Project. Within the C-3 Districts, the Planning Commission may grant an exception for this curb cut through the Section 309 Review process. Section 155(r)(3) specifies that no curb cuts may be permitted on the segment of Mission Street abutting the Project, except through Conditional Use authorization. The SUD proposed for the project would modify the regulations of Section 155 to allow a curb cut on Mission Street through an exception granted through the Section 309 review process, rather than through Conditional Use authorization.

Currently, the access for the Jessie Square garage is provided by an ingress/ egress driveway from Stevenson Street, as well as an egress-only driveway that exits onto Mission Street. The Project would retain the Mission Street curb cut, but would relocate it slightly, approximately 2.5 feet to the east. This curb cut would continue its present function to provide egress from the Jessie Street garage, helping to divide vehicular travel between the Stevenson Street and Mission Street driveways.

The Project also proposes to utilize an existing curb cut on Third Street for ingress-only vehicular access for residents. This curb-cut would access a driveway leading to two valet-operated car elevators, which would move vehicles into the Jessie Square garage. This curb cut was previously used to access a loading dock for the Aronson Building. This loading dock would be demolished as part of the Project. The EIR concludes that the Project, including the use of the existing curb-cuts on Third Street and Mission Street, would not result any significant pedestrian impacts, such as overcrowding on public sidewalks or creating potentially hazardous conditions. Given the limitations on the use of the curb cut (for inbound, valet service only), and given that the use of the curb cut would not cause any significant pedestrian impacts, the exception to allow the Project to utilize the Third Street curb cut is appropriate. However, because there could be improvements that might enhance pedestrian comfort and/or provide pedestrian amenities at the project site and in the vicinity, a condition of approval has been added requiring that the Project Sponsor collaborate with the Planning Department, DPW, and SFMTA to conduct a study to assess the existing pedestrian environment on the subject block, and to make recommendations for improvements that could be implemented to enhance pedestrian comfort and provide pedestrian amenities.

- **Shadow Impacts.** Section 295 (also known as Proposition K from 1984) requires that the Planning Commission disapprove any building permit application to construct a structure that will cast shadow on property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department, unless it is determined that the shadow would not have an adverse impact on park use. In 1989, the Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission adopted criteria for the implementation of Section 295, which included the adopting of Absolute Cumulative Shadow Limits (ACLs) for certain parks in and around the Downtown core.
A technical memorandum, prepared by Turnstone Consulting, was submitted on June 9, 2011, analyzing the potential shadow impacts of the Project to properties under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Parks Department (Case No. 2008.1084K). The memorandum concluded that the Project would cast 337,744 sfh of net new shadow on Union Square on a yearly basis, which would be an increase of about 0.09% of the theoretical annual available sunlight ("TAAS") on Union Square.

October 11, 2012, the Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission held a joint public hearing and raised the absolute cumulative shadow limits for seven open spaces under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department that could be shadowed by likely cumulative development sites in the Transit Center District Plan ("TCDP") Area, including Union Square. As part of this action, the Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission designated the ACLs exclusively for shadows that are anticipated from the development of projects within the TCDP. Because the proposed Project lies outside the TCDP area, the Project requires a separate amendment to the ACL for Union Square.

The impact of the shadow cast by the Project on Union Square would be limited. The new shadow would occur for a limited amount of time during the year, from October 11th to November 8th, and from February 2nd to March 2nd for no more than one hour on any given day. The new shadow would not occur after 9:30 a.m. (the maximum new shadow range would be 8:30 a.m. to 9:30 a.m.), and would be consistent with the 1989 Memo qualitative standards for Union Square in that the new net shadow would not occur during mid-day hours. Usage of Union Square is relatively low in the morning hours.

**REQUIRED ACTIONS**

In order for the project to proceed, the Commission must 1) Adopt findings under the California Environmental Quality Act, including findings rejecting alternatives as infeasible and adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations and Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Programs; 2) Adopt Findings of Consistency with the General Plan and Priority Policies of Planning Code Section 101.1; 3) Approved jointly with the Recreation and Park Commission an increase of the absolute cumulative shadow limit for Union Square; 4) Adopt findings that the net new shadow cast by the Project on Union Square will not be adverse to the use of the park, and to allocate to the Project the absolute cumulative shadow limit for Union Square; 5) Recommend that the Board of Supervisors approve a Height Reclassification to reclassify the site from the 400-I Height and Bulk District to the 520-I Height and Bulk District; 6) Recommend that the Board of Supervisors approve a Zoning Text Amendment and Zoning Map Amendment to establish the "Yerba Buena Center Mixed-Use Special Use District" (SUD) on the site; and, 7) Approve a Determination of Compliance pursuant to Planning Code Section 309, with requests for exceptions from Planning Code requirements including "Reduction of Ground-Level Wind Currents in C-3 Districts", "Off-Street Parking Quantity", "Rear Yard", and "General Standards for Off-Street Parking and Loading" to allow curb cuts on Third and Mission Streets.

**BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION**

- The Project will add housing opportunities within an intense, walkable urban context.
- The Project will provide space for a permanent home for the Mexican Museum, within a cluster of art museums and cultural instutions, in an area served by abundant existing and planned transit service.
The Project will contribute to an operating endowment for the Mexican Museum.

- The Project will rehabilitate the existing Aronson Building, which is a Category I (Significant) Building in Article 11 of the Planning Code located within the New Montgomery-Mission-Second Street Conservation District
- The Project would enhance the City’s supply of affordable housing by participating in the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program. The project will also contribute an additional affordable housing fee to the Successor Agency equal to 8% of the residential units.
- Residents of the Project would be able to walk or utilize transit to commute and satisfy convenience needs without reliance on the private automobile. This pedestrian traffic will activate the sidewalks and open space areas in the vicinity.
- The project meets all applicable requirements of the Planning Code, aside from the exceptions requested pursuant to Planning Code Section 309, and the Planning Code provisions that would be modified by the proposed SUD.

RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

Attachments:
Draft CEQA Findings, including Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (to be transmitted under separate cover)
Draft Section 309 Motion
Draft Section 295 Resolution
Draft Section 295 Motion
Draft General Plan Referral Motion
Draft Resolution for Height Reclassification and Planning Code Text Amendment
  - Including Draft Ordinance
Shadow Analysis Technical Memorandum
Residential Pipeline Report
Term Sheet, excerpt from Exclusive Negotiation Agreement between Project Sponsor and Successor Agency
Block Book Map
Aerial Photograph
Zoning District Map
Graphics Package from Project Sponsor
Exhibit Checklist

- Executive Summary
- Draft Motion
- Environmental Determination
- Zoning District Map
- Height & Bulk Map
- Parcel Map
- Sanborn Map
- Aerial Photo
- Context Photos
- Site Photos

- Project sponsor submittal
  - Drawings: Existing Conditions
    - Check for legibility
  - Drawings: Proposed Project
    - Check for legibility

- Wireless Telecommunications Materials
  - Health Dept. review of RF levels
  - RF Report
  - Community Meeting Notice

- Housing Documents
  - Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program: Affidavit for Compliance
  - Residential Pipeline

Exhibits above marked with an "X" are included in this packet
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NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
LAND USE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Land Use and Economic Development Committee will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard:

Date: Monday, July 15, 2013
Time: 1:30 p.m.
Location: Committee Room 263, located at City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA

Subject: File No. 130570. Ordinance amending the Planning Code and Zoning Map, by adding Section 249.71, to create the Yerba Buena Center Mixed-Use Special Use District (SUD) located at 706 Mission Street, Assessor’s Block No. 3706, Lot No. 093 and portions of Lot No. 277, to facilitate the development of the 706 Mission Street, The Mexican Museum and Residential Tower Project, by modifying specific Planning Code regulations related to permitted uses, the provision of a cultural/museum use within the SUD, floor area ratio limitations, dwelling unit exposure, height of rooftop equipment, bulk limitations, and curb cut locations; amending the Zoning Map to add the SUD and increase the height of property in the SUD from 400 feet to 480 feet; and making environmental findings and findings of consistency with the General Plan.

In accordance with San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments to the City prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made a part of the official public record in this matter, and shall be brought to the attention of the members of the Committee. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, Room 244, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102. Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board. Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, July 12, 2013.

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

DATED: June 28, 2013
PUBLISHED: July 5, 2013
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EXM 2506021

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
OF THE CITY AND
COUNTY OF SAN FRAN-
CISCO

LAND USE AND ECO-
NOMIC DEVELOPMENT
COMMITTEE
MONDAY, JULY 15, 2013 -
1:30 PM
COMMITTEE ROOM 263,
CITY HALL,
1 DR. CARLTON B.
GOODLETT PLACE, SAN
FRANCISCO, CA

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN
THAT the Land Use and
Economic Development
Committee will hold public
hearings to consider the
following proposals and said
public hearing will be held as
follows, at which time all
interested parties may attend
and be heard:
File No. 130237.
Adopting the 2009 San
Francisco Bicycle Transpor-
tation Plan, and enacting
Ordinance No. 100465 in its
entirety;
File No. 130970.
Amending the General Plan in
connection with the San Francisco
Bicycle Plan, adopting modified
environmental findings and
findings that the General Plan amend-
ment is consistent with the
General Plan and the eight
priority policies of the Planning
Code, Section 101.1; and
authorizing official acts in
connection therewith;
File No. 130970.
Ordinance
amending the Planning Code and
Zoning Map, by adding
Section 249.71, to create the
Yerba Buena Center Mixed-
Use Special Use District
(SUD) located at 700
Mission Street, Assessor's
Block No. 3708, Lot No. 593,
and portions of Lot No. 277,
to facilitate the development
of the 700 Mission Street
Project, by modifying specific
Planning Code regulations
related to permitted uses, the
provision of a cultural
museum use within the
SUD, floor area ratio
limitations, dwelling unit
limitations, height of rooftop
equipment, bulk limitations,
and curb cut locations.
Amending the Zoning Map
to add the SUD and increase
the height of property in the
SUD from 400 feet to 680
feet, and making environ-
mental findings and findings
of consistency with the
General Plan.

In accordance with San Francisco Administrative
Code, Section 67.71, persons who are unable
to attend the hearings on these