



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Planning Commission Motion No. 17790

Hearing Date: December 18, 2008
Case No.: **2006.1308E**
Project Title: **Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Program**
Block/Lot: **AB 5066B / 003, 004, 004a, 005, 006, 007, 008, 009; AB 5087/003, 003a, 004, 005; AB 5099/014; AB 5100/ 002, 003, AB 5101/006, 007, 5102/009, 010, 0007; AB 5102 / 009, 010; AB 5107/001, 003, 004, 005; AB 6237/ 048, 066; AB 6247/ 002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008, 009, 010, 011, 012, 013, 014, 015, 016, 017, 018, 019, 042; AB 6248/002, 008, 009, 010, 011, 012, 013, 014, 015, 016, 017, 019, 020, 021, 022, 045; AB 6249/001, 002, 002A, 003, 012, 013, 014, 015, 016, 017, 18, 019, 020, 021, 022, 023; AB 6250 / 001, 017, 018, 019, 020, 021, 022, 023, 024, 028, 029, 030, 031, 034, 035, 036, 037; AB 6251/ 001, 016, 17, 018, 019, 020, 023; AB 6252 / 036; AB 6308/ 001, 001A, 001D, 002, 002B, 003; AB 6309B / 001, 002, 018**

Project Sponsor: S. F. Redevelopment Agency, Planning Department
Staff Contact: Joy Navarrete– (415) 575-9040
joy.navarrete@sfgov.org

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS (AND A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS) UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT AND STATE GUIDELINES IN CONNECTION WITH THE ADOPTION OF THE VISITACION VALLEY REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (“PROJECT”) LOCATED IN THE SOUTHEAST QUADRANT OF SAN FRANCISCO, IMMEDIATELY NORTH OF THE SAN FRANCISCO / SAN MATEO COUNTY LINE AND THE CITY OF BRISBANE IN SAN MATEO COUNTY, CONSISTING OF 46 ACRES BOUNDED TO THE NORTH AND WEST BY MCLAREN PARK AND THE EXCELSIOR AND CROCKER AMAZON DISTRICTS, TO THE EAST BY HIGHWAY 101, EXECUTIVE PARK AND BAYVIEW HUNTERS POINT NEIGHBORHOODS, AND TO THE SOUTH BY THE SAN FRANCISCO / SAN MATEO COUNTY LINE, AND THE CITY OF BRISBANE.

Whereas, the Planning Department, the Lead Agency responsible for the implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) has undertaken a planning and environmental review process for the proposed Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Program (“Project”) and provided for appropriate public hearings before the Planning Commission.

Whereas, The San Francisco Planning Department is seeking to implement the Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Program. A primary focus is the redevelopment of the vacant Schlage Lock property of approximately 20 acres along the east side of Bayshore Boulevard, bounded on the east by Tunnel Avenue, on the south by the City/County line, and on the west by Bayshore Boulevard; the Schlage Lock property is, designated as Redevelopment (sometimes “Zone 1”). In addition, the implementation of such Redevelopment Program will revitalize properties along Bayshore Boulevard and assist in the

background studies and materials, and additional information that became available, constitute the Final Environmental Impact Report ("FEIR").

Whereas, the Planning Commission, on December 18, 2008, by Motion No. 17786, reviewed and considered the FEIR and found that the contents of said report and the procedures through which the FEIR was prepared, publicized, and reviewed complied with the provisions of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31.

Whereas, the Planning Commission by Motion No. XXXX, also certified the FEIR and found that the FEIR was adequate, accurate, and objective, reflected the independent judgment of the Planning Commission and that the Comments and Responses document contains no significant revisions to the DEIR that would have required recirculation under CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, and adopted findings of significant impacts associated with the Project and certified the completion of the FEIR for the Project in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines.

Whereas, the Planning Department prepared proposed Findings, as required by CEQA, regarding the alternatives, mitigation measures, and significant environmental impacts analyzed in the FEIR and overriding considerations for approving the Project, including all of the actions listed in Exhibit E-1 hereto, and a proposed mitigation monitoring and reporting program, attached as Exhibit 1 to Exhibit E-1, which material was made available to the public and this Planning Commission for the Planning Commission's review, consideration, and actions.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the FEIR and the actions associated with the Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Program and hereby adopts the Project Findings attached hereto as Exhibit E-1 including a statement of overriding considerations, and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Motion was **ADOPTED** by the Planning Commission at its regular meeting of December 18, 2008.

Jonas Ionin
Acting Commission Secretary

AYES: Commissioners Olague, Antonioni, Borden, Lee, Miguel, Moore, Sugaya

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ADOPTED: 12/18/2008

ACTION: Adoption of CEQA Findings

VISITACION VALLEY REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

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

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION AND SAN FRANCISCO REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Adopted February 3, 2009 Resolution No. 1-2009

ARTICLE 1. INTRODUCTION

In determining to approve aspects of the revised Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Program (~~Project~~), the San Francisco Planning Commission (the ~~Planning Commission~~) and the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco (~~Redevelopment Commission~~) make and adopt the following findings of fact and decisions regarding mitigation measures and alternatives, and adopt the statement of overriding considerations (collectively the ~~Findings~~) pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, California Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq., (~~CEQA~~), in light of substantial evidence in the record of Project proceedings, including but not limited to, the Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Program Final Environmental Impact Report (~~FEIR~~) prepared pursuant to CEQA, the State CEQA Guidelines, 14 California Code of Regulations Sections 15000 et seq., (the ~~CEQA Guidelines~~), and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code (~~Chapter 31~~).

This document is organized as follows:

Article 2 describes the Project proposed for adoption, the environmental review process, the approval actions to be taken, and the location of records.

Article 3 provides the basis for approval of the Project (the Plans and related actions identified in the FEIR), and evaluates the different Project alternatives, and the economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations that lead to the rejection of alternatives as infeasible that were not incorporated into the Project.

Article 4 sets forth Findings as to the disposition of each of the mitigation measures proposed in the FEIR.

Article 5 identifies the unavoidable, significant adverse impacts of the Project that have not been mitigated to a level of insignificance by the adoption of mitigation measures as provided in Article 5.

Article 6 contains a Statement of Overriding Considerations, setting forth specific reasons in support of the Planning Commission's approval actions for the Project in light of the significant unavoidable impacts discussed in Article 6.

Exhibit 1, attached, contains the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program required by CEQA Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091. It provides a table setting forth each mitigation measure listed in Section IV of the FEIR that is required to reduce or avoid a significant adverse impact. Exhibit 1 also specifies the agency responsible for implementation of each measure, establishes monitoring actions and a monitoring schedule. Finally, Exhibit 1 includes a series of Improvement Measures, which although do not avoid significant impacts described in the FEIR and Article 5 of this document, may provide some reduction the extent of these impacts.

ARTICLE 2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

Section 2.1 Project Description.

The Project Description in the FEIR is the adoption and implementation of the Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Program, applicable to an approximately 46-acre area extending on both sides of Bayshore Boulevard between Sunnydale Avenue and Blanken Avenue. A primary focus is the redevelopment of the vacant Schlage Lock property of approximately 20 acres along the east side of Bayshore Boulevard, bounded on the east by Tunnel Avenue, on the south by the City/County line, and on the west by Bayshore Boulevard; the Schlage Lock property is, designated as Redevelopment Zone 1 (~~Zone 1~~). In addition, the implementation of such Redevelopment Program will revitalize properties along Bayshore Boulevard and assist in the revitalization of the Leland Avenue commercial corridor, comprised primarily of general commercial, light industrial, residential and mixed-use parcels fronting on Bayshore Boulevard and commercial, residential and mixed-use parcels along Leland Avenue extending to Rutland Avenue; this part of the Project Area is designated as Redevelopment Zone 2 (~~Zone 2~~).

The proposed Project was analyzed in the FEIR as follows:

- (1) as to Zone 1, the proposed Project is the redevelopment program for the Schlage Lock property, and
- (2) as to Zone 2, the proposed Project for such area is Alternative 5: No Rezoning on Bayshore Boulevard in Zone 2 and the policies in the proposed Design for Development, as described in the FEIR would also apply, except the parcels on the west side of Bayshore Boulevard in Zone 2 would not be rezoned and the Planning Code designation for the Zone 2 properties would remain "NC-3" Neighborhood Commercial and would not be changed to "NC-T3" Neighborhood Commercial Transit. The height limits however would be increased to 55 feet along Bayshore Boulevard as discussed in

the FEIR. The result of the revised zoning would be approximately 90 fewer net residential units in Zone 2.

(3) All other proposed development under the redevelopment program would remain as described in FEIR Chapter 3 (Project Description) of the FEIR. The Project will encourage transit-oriented development in coordination with new public transit improvements such as the MUNI Third Street Light Rail (MUNI Metro T-Line) and the recently relocated Caltrain Bayshore multi-modal transit station. Regional vehicular access to the Project Area is through U.S. Highway 101 (U.S. 101) via the Bayshore Boulevard-Jamestown Avenue and Third Street Interchange and the future Geneva Avenue Interchange.

Therefore, the proposed Project includes all the redevelopment activities and development proposals discussed in the Project Description contained in Chapter II of the FEIR with the exception of the proposed rezoning of properties along Bayshore Boulevard.

The proposed Project objective is to adopt and carry out a set of long-term revitalization actions within the Project Area aimed at reducing blight, facilitating housing development, providing improved neighborhood-serving commercial facilities, facilitating increased private economic investment, capitalizing upon recent sub-regional (Muni Metro T line) and regional (Caltrain Bayshore station) transit improvements in the area, and generally improving physical and economic conditions that cannot reasonably be expected to be alleviated without redevelopment assistance.

Section 2.2 Actions Included in the Project.

The Project will be implemented through a series of actions that together define the terms under which the Project will occur (collectively the “Project Approvals”). The primary Project Sponsor for the Redevelopment Plan is the Agency. The landowner and potential master development sponsor of the Zone 1 Project is Universal Paragon Corporation (“UPC”).

The City and County of San Francisco, including the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, and the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency will be taking various approval actions related to the Project, including the following major permits and approvals, and related collateral actions:

Planning Commission

- Adoption of these CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations, mitigation measures, and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program;
- Adoption of General Plan consistency and Planning Code § 101.1 findings in regard to the proposed Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Plan;
- Adoption of amendments to the General Plan to bring the General Plan into conformity with the Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Plan;

- Adoption of amendments to the San Francisco Planning Code text and maps,
- Approval of the Visitacion Valley Design for Development;
- Approval of the Visitacion Valley Cooperation and Delegation Agreement; and
- Future rezoning of Zone 1 portions of the Project Area.

Redevelopment Commission

- Adoption of these CEQA Findings, including a statement of overriding considerations, mitigation measures, and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program;
- Approval of the Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Plan;
- Approval of all actions required under the California Community Redevelopment Law (Health and Safety Code Sections 33000 et seq.) for implementation of the Redevelopment Plan and related implementation actions, including the approval of the Report on the Redevelopment Plan, the Rules for Property Owner Participation, a Relocation Plan, and Business Re-Entry Policy for the Redevelopment Project;
- Approval of a Visitacion Valley Cooperation and Delegation Agreement,
- Approval of the Visitacion Valley Design for Development;
- Future adoption of an Owner Participation Agreement for the development of Zone 1; and
- Future approvals of related Redevelopment Plan documents including Infrastructure Plan and Streetscape and Open Space Plans.

Board of Supervisors

- Adoption of these CEQA Findings, including a statement of overriding considerations, mitigation measures, and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program;
- The Planning Commission's certification of the EIR may be appealed to the Board of Supervisors. If appealed, the Board of Supervisors will determine whether to uphold the certification or to remand the EIR to the Planning Department for further review;
- Approve the Redevelopment Plan approved by the Redevelopment Commission;
- Adopt the Zoning Map amendments approved by the Planning Commission; and
- Adopt the Planning Code amendments approved by the Planning Commission.

Section 2.3 Project Implementation.

The Project also includes the implementation of the Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Plan, described as redevelopment actions in the Redevelopment Plan, as follows:

- Provide very low-, low- and moderate-income housing, including supportive housing for the homeless;

- Preserve the availability of affordable housing units assisted or subsidized by public entities, which are threatened with conversion to market rates;
- Require the integration of affordable housing sites with sites developed for market rate housing;
- Assist the development of affordable and supportive housing by developers;
- Promote the retention, improvement and expansion of existing businesses and attractions of new business and the provision of assistance to the private sector; if necessary.
- Provide relocation assistance to eligible occupants displaced from property in the Project Area;
- Provide participation in redevelopment by owners presently located in the Project Area and the extension of preferences to business occupants and other tenants desiring to remain or relocate within the redeveloped Project Area;
- Acquire land or building sites;
- Demolish or remove certain buildings and improvements;
- Construct buildings or structures;
- Improve land or building sites with on-site or off-site improvements;
- Rehabilitate structures and improvements by present owners, their successors and/or the Agency;
- Dispose of property by sale, lease, donation or other means to public entities or private developers for uses in accordance with this Redevelopment Plan;
- Finance insurance premiums pursuant to Section 33136 of the Community Redevelopment Law;
- Develop plans, pay principal and interest on bonds, loans, advances or other indebtedness or pay financing or carrying charges; and
- Remedy or remove the release of hazardous substances on, under, within or from property within the Project Area.

Section 2.4 Project Objectives.

The following Project Goals and Objectives were formulated in conjunction with the Visitation Valley Citizens Advisory Committee (“CAC”) and members of the community. These Project Objectives are also set forth in Section 3.6.2 of the FEIR and Section 3.1 of the Redevelopment Plan.

- *Goal 1:* Create a livable, mixed urban community that serves the diverse needs of the community and includes access to public resources and amenities.

Objectives:

- Attract a grocery store and provide a variety of retail options to serve a multi-cultural, multi-generational community at a range of incomes.
- Provide for the expansion of local public services such as a new library, police sub-station, and fire department facilities.
- Provide high quality public infrastructure that serves as a model of sustainable design.

- Create opportunities for the old Schlage Office Building to serve in the Project Area as a landmark that can be used for a variety of civic purposes.
 - Attract educational facilities including job training, English as a Second Language classes, City College extension, arts programs, and multi-cultural resources.
 - Promote neighborhood-serving retail to provide residents and workers with immediate walking access to daily shopping needs.
- Goal 2: Encourage, enhance, preserve, and promote the community and City's long term environmental sustainability.

Objectives:

- Facilitate the clean-up, redesign, and development of vacant and underutilized properties in the Project Area.
 - Protect human health by ensuring that toxic cleanup be the primary consideration in the planning and phasing of new development.
 - Promote environmentally sustainable building practices in the Project Area so that the people, the community and ecosystems can thrive and prosper.
 - Promote, encourage, and adopt design and construction practices to ensure durable, healthier, energy and resource efficient, and/or higher performance buildings and infrastructure that help to regenerate the degraded urban environment.
 - Design Green streets and sidewalks to contribute to the sustainability of the Project Area.
 - Ensure that development balances economics, equity, and environmental impacts and has a synergistic relationship with the natural and built environments.
- Goal 3: Create [a] pedestrian-oriented environment that encourages walking as the primary transportation mode within the Project Area.

Objectives:

- Connect *the* neighborhood through the creation of new streets and multi-use paths throughout the Schlage site linking Visitacion Valley to Little Hollywood.
- Access into the Schlage site shall be fully public accessible and designed as an extension of the block pattern of the surrounding community.
- Construct pedestrian-friendly streets throughout the Project Area to promote and facilitate easy pedestrian travel.
- Ensure [that] new buildings have multiple residential entrances and/or retail at the street level to contribute to sidewalk activity.
- Improve pedestrian safety along Bayshore Boulevard with intersection improvements and traffic calming.

- Goal 4: Encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation by future area residents, workers and visitors and support the development of the Caltrain Station as a major multi-modal transit facility.

Objectives:

- Encourage development that promotes the *use* of public transit, car pooling, shuttles, bikes, walking, and other alternatives to the privately-owned automobile.
- Contribute to regional connectivity of the greater Visitacion Valley area, particularly with the Baylands of Brisbane.
- Coordinate with local and regional transportation and planning agencies to facilitate rights-of-way connectivity and access to public transportation.
- Enhance the attractiveness, safety, and functionality of transit stop locations within the Project Area.
- Encourage new buildings on adjacent parcels to include safe pedestrian connections to the Caltrain facility.
- Minimize the number of curb cuts in new developments, and encourage common parking access where feasible.
-
- Goal 5: Create well-designed open spaces that enhance the existing community and new development.

Objectives:

- Create new parks, greenways, boulevards, and plazas which contribute to the existing open space network *and* serve the diverse needs of a mixed-use community.
- Publicly accessible open spaces should incorporate design elements of the Visitacion Valley Greenway in order to express a cohesive, creative and unique neighborhood character.
- Design new open spaces and streets to contribute to the sustainability of the infrastructure serving the Project Area, including treatment of stormwater, and the creation and maintenance of urban habitat.
- Provide opportunities for ongoing community involvement in the parks through environmental education, interpretation and other active programming.
- Include pedestrian walkways and destination-points such as small plazas that create a sense of place.
- Incorporate local art by local artists in the design of public places.
- Create [a] financing mechanism to ensure the long-term maintenance of parks and streetscapes.
- Goal 6: Develop new housing to help address the City's and the region's house shortfall, and to support regional transit use.

Objectives:

- Avoid the displacement of any residents.
 - Assist with the preservation and rehabilitation of existing affordable housing.
 - Facilitate the construction of new housing for a range of income levels and household sizes.
 - Increase the local supply of well-designed affordable housing for low-income and moderate-income working individuals, families, and seniors.
 - Develop housing to capitalize on transit-oriented opportunities within the Project Area.
- Goal 7: Establish the Project Area and surrounding neighborhoods as a gateway to the City of San Francisco.

Objectives:

- Use thoughtful design that complements and integrates the existing architectural character and natural context of Visitacion Valley.
 - Ensure that buildings reflect high-quality architectural, environmentally sustainable building and urban design standards.
 - Incorporate local historical, ecological, cultural and artistic elements in the designs of buildings, streetscapes, and parks.
 - Improve the district's identity and appearance through streetscape design.
 - Increase the economic viability of small businesses in the Project Area by providing an attractive, pedestrian-friendly street environment.
 - Design housing and public spaces to be family- and multi-generational oriented.
 - Facilitate the preservation, rehabilitation, and seismic retrofitting of historic buildings and landmarks.
 - Design streets, parks, and building facades to provide adequate lighting and visual connectivity to promote public safety.
- Goal 8: Encourage private investment by eliminating blighting influences and correcting environmental deficiencies.

Objectives:

- Assemble and re-subdivide vacant industrial parcels in order to create buildable parcels and provide block patterns that integrate with the architectural character of the existing community.
- Incorporate a mix of uses into the new development within the Project Area, particularly the Schlage site, including different types of housing, retail and community services.
- New development should take advantage of the transit proximity and be designed as a compact, walkable, mixed use community.
- Provide economic opportunities for current Visitacion Valley residents and businesses to take part in the rebuilding and revitalization of the community.
- Provide opportunities for participation of property owners in the redevelopment

of their own properties.

- Strengthen the economic base of the community through commercial functions in the Project Area, and attract citywide attention to the district through events, media campaigns, and district-wide advertising.
- New development should relate to Leland Avenue and help revitalize the neighborhood's traditional main street with local business development.
- New retail is a critical component of the Project on the Schlage site, and should also support and contribute to the existing retail corridors on Leland Avenue and Bayshore Boulevard.

Section 2.5 Environmental Review Process.

The City's Planning Department (–Planning Department”) and the Agency determined that an EIR was required for a proposal to adopt the Redevelopment Plan, and rezone the geographic area covered by the redevelopment plan in accordance with the Planning Department's *Visitacion Valley / Schlage Lock Strategic Concept Plan* ("VV Concept Plan"). The Agency provided public notice of that determination by publication in a newspaper of general circulation on January 31, 2007.

On June 3, 2008, the Planning Department and the Agency published the Draft Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter "Draft EIR ") on the Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Program, and provided public notice in a newspaper of general circulation of the availability of the Draft EIR for public review and comment and of the date and time of the Planning Commission public hearing on the Draft EIR. This notice was mailed to property owners in the Project Area and within a 300-foot radius of the Project Area, anyone who requested copies of the Draft EIR, persons and organizations on the Agency's CAC mailing list, parties on the Planning Department's list of EIR recipients, and to government agencies, the latter both directly and through the State Clearinghouse. Notices were posted at approximately 20 locations in and around the proposed Project Area. The Planning Department and the Agency posted the Draft EIR on their respective websites.

Notice of Completion of the Draft EIR was filed with the State Secretary of Resources via the State Clearinghouse on June 2, 2008.

The Planning Commission held a duly advertised public hearing on the Draft EIR on June 26, 2008, at which opportunity for public comment was given, and public comment was received on the Draft EIR. The Agency Commission held a duly advertised public hearing on the Draft EIR on July 1, 2008. The period for acceptance of written comments ended on July 21, 2008.

The Agency and Planning Department prepared responses to comments on environmental issues received at the public hearing and in writing during the 48-day public review period for the Draft EIR, prepared revisions to the text of the Draft EIR in response to comments received or based on additional information that became available during the

public review period, and corrected errors in the Draft EIR. This material was presented in the Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Project EIR Comments and Responses (“Comments and Responses”), published on December 2, 2008 and was distributed to the Planning Commission, the Redevelopment Commission, the Visitacion Valley Citizen Advisory Committee members (“CAC”), all affected taxing entities, all parties who commented on the Draft EIR, and others who had previously requested the document. Notice of Completion of the Comments and Responses was sent to the State Secretary of Resources via the State Clearinghouse on December 3, 2008. The Comments and Responses document is available to others upon request at the Planning Department and Agency offices and available on both the Agency’s and Planning Department’s websites.

The Agency Commission, on December 16, 2008, and the Planning Commission, on December 18, 2008, reviewed and considered the FEIR and found that the contents of said report and the procedures through which the FEIR was prepared, publicized and reviewed complied with the provisions of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

Section 2.6 Location of Project Records and Custodian of Records.

The FEIR consists of two volumes: Volume 1 is the Draft EIR and Volume II contains the Comments and Responses to the Draft EIR. A copy of each of the following is included in FEIR Volume 2:

- FEIR Appendix 4.1 contains a transcript of the Planning Commission’s June 26, 2008 public hearing on the Draft EIR and a summary of each comment made at such public hearing and response thereto
- FEIR Appendix 4.2 contains a transcript of the Redevelopment Agency’s July 1, 2008 public hearing on the Draft EIR and a summary of each comment made at such public hearing and response thereto
- FEIR Appendix 4.3 contains a copy of each written comment on the Draft EIR submitted during the comment period and response thereto
- FEIR Appendix 4.4 contains an update of the status of remediation activities on Zone 2

The record related to the Project and the Project Findings also include the following:

- The Redevelopment Plan.
- The CAC Goals for the Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Plan.
- The Visitacion Valley/Schlage Lock Design for Development.
- The Strategic Concept Plan for Visitacion Valley/Schlage Lock.

- The Preliminary Report on the Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Plan.
- The Final Report on the Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Plan.
- Rules for Property Owner Participation for the Redevelopment Project.
- The Relocation Plan for the Redevelopment Project.
- Business Re-Entry Policy for the Redevelopment Project.
- The Visitacion Valley Cooperation and Delegation Agreement.
- The FEIR, and all documents referenced in or relied upon by the FEIR.
- All information (including written evidence and testimony) provided by City staff to the Planning Commission relating to the EIR, the proposed approvals and entitlements, the Project, and the alternatives set forth in the FEIR.
- All information (including written evidence and testimony) presented to the Planning Commission by the environmental consultant and subconsultants who prepared the EIR, or incorporated into reports presented to the Planning Commission.
- All information (including written evidence and testimony) presented to the City from other public agencies relating to the Project or the FEIR.
- All applications, letters, testimony and presentations presented to the City by the project sponsor and its consultants in connection with the Project.
- All information (including written evidence and testimony) presented at any public hearing or workshop related to the Project and the FEIR.
- For documentary and information purposes, all locally-adopted land use plans and ordinances, including, without limitation, general plans, specific plans and ordinances, together with environmental review documents, findings, mitigation monitoring programs and other documentation relevant to planned growth in the area.
- The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program is attached as Exhibit 1 to these Findings.

The public hearing transcript, copies of all letters regarding the Draft EIR received during the public review period, the administrative record, and background documentation for the Final EIR are located at both the Planning Department at 1650 Mission Street, San Francisco. (Linda Avery, Commission Secretary, is the custodian of these documents and materials for the Planning Department) and the Redevelopment Agency at One South

Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor, San Francisco (Stanley Muraoka, Environmental Review Officer, is the custodian of these documents and materials for the Agency).

ARTICLE 3. CONSIDERATION OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

This Article describes the Project as well as rejected Project Alternatives. Included in these descriptions are the reasons for selecting or rejecting the alternatives. This Article also outlines the Project's purposes and provides a context for understanding the reasons for selecting or rejecting alternatives, and describes the project alternative components analyzed in the FEIR. The Project's FEIR presents more details on selection and rejection of alternatives.

CEQA mandates that an EIR evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the Project or the Project location that generally reduce or avoid potentially significant impacts of the Project. CEQA requires that every EIR also evaluate a "No Project" alternative. Alternatives provide a basis of comparison to the Project in terms of their significant impacts and their ability to meet Program objectives. This comparative analysis is used to consider reasonable, potentially feasible options for minimizing environmental consequences of the Project.

Section 3.1 Summary of Alternatives Analyzed in the FEIR

The FEIR for the Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Program and Rezoning Project analyzed the environmental effects of the Project and considered six alternatives:

1. No Project Alternative – Expected Growth Without the Project
2. Reduced Housing Development in Zone 1
3. Stand Alone Grocery Store/Retail Along Bayshore Boulevard South of Visitacion Avenue
4. Preservation and Reuse of All Schlage Lock Plant 1 Buildings
5. No Rezoning on Bayshore Boulevard in Zone 2
6. Planning Code Changes But No Redevelopment Plan

As described in Section 2.1 above, the Project proposed for approval is a combination of the proposed redevelopment program for Zone 1 and, as to Zone 2, a modification of Alternative 5 above: No Rezoning on Bayshore Boulevard in Zone 2. As described more fully in the Project Description above, this alternative would implement the proposed redevelopment program and Design for Development, as described in the FEIR except the parcels on the west side of Bayshore Boulevard in Zone 2 would not be rezoned. The Planning Code designation for these properties would remain "NC-3" Neighborhood Commercial and not be changed to "NC-T3" Neighborhood Commercial Transit. The change in height district from 40 to 55 feet however would move forward as discussed in the FEIR. The result would be approximately 90 fewer net residential units. All other proposed development under the redevelopment program would remain as described in chapter 3 (Project Description) of the FEIR.

Section 3.2 Reasons for Selection of the Project as Revised to Include Components of Alternative #5

The Project is selected because it will promote achievement of the Project Goals and Objectives which were formulated in conjunction with the Visitacion Valley Citizens Advisory Committee (“CAC”) and members of the community (set forth in Section 2.4).

The Project is based on a combination of the original proposals for redevelopment of Zone 1, combined with a principal feature of Alternative #5 - *No Rezoning of Bayshore Boulevard in Zone 2*, which consists of no change the Planning Code designation for the Bayshore properties in Zone 2 "NC-T3" Neighborhood Commercial Transit. The result would be approximately 90 fewer net residential units. The Project however maintains the changes to the height map along Bayshore Boulevard in the FEIR, which is proposed at 55 feet in the FEIR project description, rather than the 45-foot height limit proposed in Alternative 5.

The reduction in units was found by the FEIR to have the following environmental benefits, while still meeting the redevelopment goals described above:

Land Use: The Alternative #5 component of the Project provides a transition in housing and development density between the new development of Zone 1 and the existing residential neighborhood.

Population and Housing. The retention of existing NC-3 zoning within Zone 2 and the change in the Zone 2 height limit to 55 feet along Bayshore Boulevard would have a nearly similar beneficial effect on increasing Visitacion Valley housing opportunities as the originally proposed project by enabling development of somewhat fewer new units yet retaining the same ratio of affordable units.

Transportation and Circulation. The Project, including the somewhat reduced residential development resulting from the partial incorporation of Alternative #5, would result in reduced, but still significant unavoidable, transportation and circulation impacts, primarily due to the net increase of daily vehicular trips.

Air Quality. The Project, including the incorporation of part of Alternative #5 as described, would result in reduced, but still potentially significant, air quality impacts from construction period emissions, as well as potentially significant long-term impacts.

Noise. The Project’s incorporation of Alternative #5, would result in lower noise, as a result of its smaller scale.

Section 3.3 Overview of Other Plan Alternatives Considered and Rejected and Reasons Rejected

The following section presents an overview of the Alternatives analyzed in the FEIR. A more detailed description of each Alternative can be found in Chapter 17 of the FEIR.

The Planning Commission and Redevelopment Commission reject the other Alternatives set forth in the Final EIR and listed below because the Commissions find that there is substantial evidence, including evidence of economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations further described in Article 6 below under CEQA Guidelines 15091(a)(3), that make infeasible such Alternatives.

In making these determinations, each of the Commissions 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.” Each Commission is also aware that under CEQA and 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 Project also incorporates elements of Alternative 5, as described below. Thus, the Commissions are not rejecting Alternative #5.

Rejected Alternative #1: No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative would retain the status quo and result in approximately 1,577 fewer net residential units, 130,300 fewer square feet of net retail space, 17,000 fewer square feet of net cultural space, and 45,280 *more* square feet of other net commercial space than the Project. As next discussed, the No Project Alternative is infeasible because it would not achieve the housing and other redevelopment objectives which will result from the adoption and implementation of the proposed Project. Rather, the following would also result if the Project were not approved, as currently proposed.

Population and Housing. Only eight new residences would be anticipated under this No Project Alternative. This alternative would not have the *beneficial effects* associated with facilitating increased housing opportunity within the Visitacion Valley neighborhood such as: new residential development near commercial uses, transit, and other services; and an improved citywide balance between employed residents and jobs. It does not provide needed affordable housing for the community or the city.

Aesthetics. The No Project Alternative would not provide the beneficial visual effects associated with development including the removal of dilapidated buildings and the creation of new parks and streetscape enhancements.

Transportation and Circulation. Trip generation under the No Project Alternative would be minimal. However, this alternative would not advance the Project Objectives as set forth in this document including the creation of a high-density, mixed land use patterns near the Project Area's excellent local and regional transit resources. Additionally, it does not provide the opportunity to make traffic calming improvements to existing roadways, create new streets and circulation facilities within the Schlage Site, nor does it

provide funding for regional transportation improvements as described in the Project Description of the FEIR and the Design for Development.

Air Quality. The No Project Alternative would not meet the Project Objectives of high-density, mixed land use patterns that promote walking, transit use, and shorter commutes.

Cultural and Historic Resources. Under the No Project Alternative, the historic Old Office Building would not be rehabilitated. Rehabilitating the Old Office Building to serve in the Project Area as a landmark that can be used for a variety of civic purposes is an important part of the Project Objectives, specifically Goal 1 – to create a livable, mixed urban community that serves the diverse needs of the community and includes access to public resources and amenities.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials. According to the Department of Toxic Substances Control, the No Project Alternative would impede remediation activities of hazardous materials to the soils beneath and immediately surrounding the existing buildings.

Public Services. The No Project Alternative does not include the Project's proposed improvements to the neighborhood's public space network – an important Project Objective.

Utilities and Service Systems. The No Project Alternative would not result in the benefits of the redevelopment of Visitacion Valley as a LEED neighborhood providing a model for sustainable urban development.

Non-attainment of Project Goals and Objectives by the No Project Alternative:

The No Project Alternative is also rejected as infeasible for the following reasons:

No Remediation of Hazardous Materials – Under the No Project Alternative, the contamination of soil and groundwater would not be remediated. Although some cleanup activities may be possible, the full extent of soil removal and remediation would not be physically or financially possible without elements of the Project.

Reduced Revenues – Under the No Project Alternative, the Agency will receive no tax increment revenues, which would result in few resources being invested back into the neighborhood and its revitalization. Consequently, the No Project Alternative would not achieve the Project objectives of stimulating economic revitalization or eliminating conditions of blight in the Project Area.

Reduced Housing – The No Project Alternative would provide less housing overall and substantially less affordable housing than with the Project.

Reduced Economic and Business Vitality – The No Project Alternative will provide fewer resources for economic revitalization efforts such as façade improvements, catalyst

development programs, business improvement programs, or neighborhood promotional opportunities.

Reduced Community Enhancement Opportunities – The No Project Alternative would not result in plan community enhancements, such as improvements to open space, expanded public facilities, construction of streetscape enhancement, and improved access to public transportation.

As described in detail above, this alternative would not attain the goals and objectives identified in the Project Objectives and the EIR. The current General Plan and associated existing Planning Code provisions do not include the detailed and coordinated strategies, improvements, and contemporary development regulations required under the Project Objectives and proposed by the Design for Development and overall redevelopment program.

The No Project Alternative is rejected as infeasible for the economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations reasons set forth here and in the FEIR.

Rejected Alternative #2: Reduced Housing in Zone 1

Alternative 2 is an alternative that would include 400 dwelling units, a stand-alone grocery store and retail center in Zone 1, all other elements of the Redevelopment Program would remain the same. This alternative would lead to the development of approximately 850 fewer net residential units. This alternative was primarily proposed to reduce peak-period vehicular trip generation in comparison to the proposed Project.

Population and Housing. Due to the reduced housing opportunities of this alternative, it would produce substantially reduced beneficial effects in achieving a better city-wide balance of job and more housing near commercial uses, transit and other services. It will provide less affordable housing than the Project proposal.

Transportation and Circulation. This alternative would result in reduced impacts when compared to the proposed Project, but still significant, unavoidable transportation and circulation impacts. This Alternative would be less effective than the proposed Project in meeting the Project Objectives of high-density mixed land use, and shorter commutes.

Air Quality. This alternative would result in reduced impacts when compared to the proposed Project, but still potentially significant air quality impacts related to construction-period emissions and long-term regional emission increases. Long-term emissions, although reduced from the proposed Project, would remain significant and unavoidable even after mitigation. Construction emissions would also be reduced to less than significant levels. This Alternative would be less effective in meeting the Project Objective of reducing long-term regional emissions.

Cultural and Historic Resources. This alternative would have similar significant unavoidable impacts as the Project on cultural and historic resources.

Attainment of Project Goals and Objectives. This alternative would be less than effective in attaining the goals and objectives of the Project as identified in Section 1.

The Reduced Housing Alternative is rejected as infeasible for the following reasons:

Reduced Revenues – Under the Reduced Housing Alternative, the Agency will receive less tax increment revenues, which would result in fewer resources being invested back into the neighborhood and its revitalization. Consequently, the Reduced Housing Alternative would not achieve the Project objectives of stimulating economic revitalization or eliminating conditions of blight in the Project Area.

Reduced Housing – The Reduced Housing Alternative would provide less housing overall and substantially less affordable housing than with the Project.

Reduced Economic and Business Vitality – The Reduced Housing Alternative will provide fewer resources for economic revitalization efforts such as façade improvements, catalyst development programs, business improvement programs, or neighborhood promotional opportunities.

Reduced Community Enhancement Opportunities – The Reduced Alternative and would make infeasible the plans for community enhancements, such as improvements to open space, expanded public facilities, construction of streetscape enhancement and improved access to public transportation.

The Reduced Housing Alternative is rejected as infeasible due to loss of revenues from the reduction in dwelling units and retail commercial space. This alternative fails to capitalize on the full transit-oriented opportunities of the Schlage Site, nor does it provide the number of affordable housing units proposed in the Project. Therefore, it is infeasible for the economic, social, technological and other considerations as set forth here and in the FEIR. This Alternative is rejected.

Rejected Alternative #3: Stand Alone Grocery Store/Retail Along Bayshore Boulevard

Alternative 3 would include a stand-alone grocery store and retail center of approximately 70,000 square feet in Zone 1 along Bayshore Boulevard south of Visitacion Avenue. This alternative would provide approximately 950 (instead of 400) residential units in Zone 1 and unlike the Project, no housing would be provided on the upper floors of the grocery store and retail center. The result would be approximately 300 fewer net residential units.

Land Use. The fewer residential units and reduced mixed-use relationships anticipated under this alternative would reduce these co-location benefits of housing and retail proposed in the Project.

Aesthetics. Compared to the Project, the resulting stand alone parking area provides a less desirable urban design landscape when viewed from Bayshore Boulevard or from neighboring vantage points.

Transportation and Circulation. This alternative would result in reduced, but still significant, transportation and circulation impacts and would be less effective than the Project in promoting walking, transit use, and shorter commutes.

Air Quality. This alternative would result in reduced, but still potentially significant, air quality impacts from construction period emissions, as well as potentially significant long-term impacts. This alternative would be less effective in reducing long term emissions impacts through promoting walking, transit use, and shorter commutes.

Attainment of Project Goals and Objectives. This alternative would be less effective in attaining the goals and objectives of the Project as identified in the EIR. The Stand Alone Grocery Store Alternative is rejected as infeasible for the following reasons:

Reduced Revenues – Under the Stand Alone Grocery Store Alternative, the Agency will receive less tax increment revenues, which would result in fewer resources being invested back into the neighborhood and its revitalization. Consequently, the No Project Alternative would not achieve the Project objectives of stimulating economic revitalization or eliminating conditions of blight in the Project Area.

Reduced Housing – The Stand Alone Grocery Store Alternative would provide less housing overall and substantially less affordable housing than with the Project.

Reduced Mixed Use Land Uses – The Stand Alone Grocery Store Alternative would not facilitate the vertical mixing of neither uses nor take full opportunity of the transit facilities nearby. I would also create a surface parking lot or garage which would have limited urban design appeal and impacts on the pedestrian oriented design goals of the Revised Plan.

The Stand Alone Grocery Store/Retail Along Bayshore Boulevard alternative is rejected as infeasible due to the loss of revenues from the reduction in dwelling units the reduced beneficial effect on Visitacion Valley housing opportunities, and the reduced impact on San Francisco's ability to achieve a better citywide balance between employed residents and jobs and ability to increase housing concentration near commercial uses, transit, and other services. This alternative fails to capitalize on the full transit-oriented opportunities of the Schlage Site, and instead results in a single use retail and parking area next to a light rail station. This alternative does not present any significant benefits over the Project regarding identified environmental impacts. Therefore, it is infeasible for the economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations set forth here and in the FEIR. This Alternative is rejected.

Rejected Alternative #4 – Preservation and Re-Use of All Schlage Lock Plant 1 Building

This alternative would preserve two additional buildings more than the Proposed Project which includes the preservation and re-use of the Old Office Building as a community center. The two additional buildings are Building B - the Sawtooth Building of approximately 188,000 square feet and Building C - the Ancillary Building, of approximately 1,500 square feet. These buildings are considered contributory to a potential "Schlage Lock Historic Site." This alternative suggests the re-use of these buildings as additional community space. This alternative would result in approximately 200 fewer net residential units compared to the proposed Project.

Population and Housing. This alternative would have reduced beneficial effects when compared to the proposed Project due to the reduced dwelling units. As a result of the reduction in residential uses, this alternative does not achieve the jobs/housing balance or affordable housing production benefits that are important Project Objectives.

Aesthetics. This alternative would result in similar potentially significant, aesthetic and visual resource impacts as the Project. Portions of the Sawtooth Building create a tall blank along Bayshore Boulevard and thus this Alternative does not achieve all of the urban design objectives of the Design for Development.

Transportation and Circulation. This alternative would result in a greater traffic trip generation than the proposed Project both in terms of daily and P.M. peak period traffic generation and potentially increased intersection impacts as the increased community uses, while not defined, could draw more activity to the site, particularly in the afternoon. Additionally, this alternative would eliminate at least one major circulation connection within the site and another to Bayshore Boulevard.

Cultural and Historic Resources. This alternative would result in fewer potentially significant impacts on cultural and historic resources than all other alternatives as it would rehabilitate two more "contributory" buildings to a potential Schlage Lock Factory Historic Site. There would still be significant, unavoidable impacts to the historic resources as a result of this alternative.

Attainment of Project Goals and Objectives. As compared to the proposed Project, this alternative would be less effective in attaining the Proposed Project Objectives and would potentially have more negative environmental impacts due to the increased vehicle trips and impeding the remediation of hazardous materials in the soils under the buildings to be preserved.

Reduced Revenues – Under the Preservation Alternative, the Agency will receive less tax increment revenues, which would result in fewer resources being invested back into the neighborhood and its revitalization. Consequently, the Preservation Alternative would not achieve the Project objectives of stimulating economic revitalization or eliminating conditions of blight in the Project Area.

Reduced Housing – The Preservation Alternative would provide less housing overall and substantially less affordable housing than with the Project.

Reduced Economic and Business Vitality – The Preservation Alternative will provide fewer resources for economic revitalization efforts along Leland Avenue, such as façade improvements, catalyst development programs, business improvement programs, or neighborhood promotional opportunities.

Reduced Community Enhancement Opportunities – The Preservation Alternative would reduce project revenues and remove land available for other uses including streets and parks. Therefore, this alternative would make infeasible some of the plans for open space, construction of new streets and improved access from Zone 1 to public transportation along Bayshore Boulevard.

The Preservation and Re-use Alternative is rejected due to its potential negative impacts on the remediation efforts to clean up hazardous materials in the soil, and its loss of revenue due to the reduction in dwelling units. The Preservation and Re-use Alternative interferes with the new circulation system proposed including roadways and pedestrian pathways. This alternative also reduces the transit-oriented uses envisioned in the Refined Projects goals and does not fully utilize the opportunities of the Schlage Site for new housing production, including affordable housing development. It would also mean a reduction of other community benefits including constraints on the inter-connected open space system and reductions of the existing Visitacion Valley impact fees for community facilities would not be collected or distributed to the Visitacion Valley community. Therefore, this alternative is infeasible for the economic, legal, cultural, environmental, technological, and social considerations set forth here and in the FEIR. This Alternative is rejected.

Rejected Alternative #6: Planning Code Changes but No Redevelopment Plan

This alternative would adopt the 2008 Design for Development, the General Plan Amendments and the Planning Code changes for the proposed Project, but it would not adopt the Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Plan. The Redevelopment Agency would not participate in the Project. As a result, the following implementation actions would not occur: (1) housing improvement actions, such as facilitation of affordable housing programs and units; (2) business revitalization actions, including, but not limited to, promotion of existing business, attraction of new businesses, and encouragement and assistance to private sector investment (e.g., financing of insurance premiums); and (3) blight elimination actions, including but not limited to, acquisition and/or demolition of blighted and deteriorated properties, rehabilitation of existing structures and improvements, disposal (sale, lease, etc.) of properties to public or private entities, and clean-up and remediation of existing hazardous materials.

All future development would occur solely through the efforts of the private sector. As a result, the growth increment to facilitate the Project would occur at a slower rate.

Specifically, it would not be completed by 2025, and it is projected that approximately only 75% of the proposed Project would be completed by that time. This would mean that only 75% of the new residential units would be developed by this time and only 75% of the new retail square footage would be developed. The higher affordable housing production requirements proposed by the Redevelopment Plan would not be imposed or facilitated by the new development in Zone 1 or Zone 2. It would also mean that significant amounts of the tax increment revenues would not be collected or distributed to the Visitacion Valley community for community benefits or affordable housing. This alternative would also eliminate the community center uses in the Old Office Building as there would be no public agency to facilitate its redevelopment.

Land Use. This alternative would generally create new beneficial land use elements under the Design for Development but such improvements would likely occur at a slower rate and to a reduced degree of beneficial uses.

Population and Housing. This alternative would have a reduced beneficial effect by 2025 in achieving a better city-wide balance of jobs and housing concentrated near commercial uses, transit, and other services as development would be expected to take place over a longer period of time. This alternative would reduce the affordable housing production planned under the Revised Plan.

Cultural and Historical Resources. This alternative would result in greater potentially significant impacts on cultural and historic resources due to the potential lack of preservation and rehabilitation of the Schlage Lock Old Office Building.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials. This alternative would not necessarily negatively impact the current remediation program. However, the delay of the development in Zone 1 may inhibit the remediation activities from occurring on a timely basis.

Public Services. This alternative would not result in any significant public service impacts. However, the beneficial effects of the improvements to the Project Area park and public open space may not occur.

Attainment of Project Goals and Objections. This alternative would be substantially less effective in attaining the Project Objectives. Specifically, some historic and cultural resources may be lost, public benefits such as affordable housing and open space may be reduced, delays in development could reduce impact fees in real dollars to the community facilities, and services proposed for the Visitacion Valley neighborhood, and remediation activities may be slowed considerably without redevelopment activities.

Reduced Revenues – Under the No Redevelopment Alternative, the Agency will receive no tax increment revenues, which would result in very few resources being invested back into the neighborhood and its revitalization. Consequently, the Reduced Housing Alternative would not achieve the Project Objectives of stimulating economic revitalization or eliminating conditions of blight in the Project Area.

Reduced Housing – The No Redevelopment Alternative would provide substantially less affordable housing than with the Redevelopment Plan.

Reduced Economic and Business Vitality – The No Redevelopment Alternative will provide very few resources for economic revitalization efforts such as façade improvements, catalyst development programs, business improvement programs, or neighborhood promotional opportunities.

Reduced Community Enhancement Opportunities – The No Redevelopment Alternative and would make infeasible the plans for community enhancements, such as improvements to open space, expanded public facilities, construction of streetscape enhancement, and improved access to public transportation.

The Planning Code Changes But No Redevelopment Plan alternative is rejected as infeasible as it would not provide for the facilitation of affordable housing programs and units, the promotion of existing businesses as well as the attraction of new businesses and private sector investment in the Visitacion Valley community, the lack of area rejuvenation and blight elimination, and the remediation of hazardous materials. This alternative would also have a reduced effect on achieving better citywide balance of jobs and housing concentrated near commercial uses, transit, and services, negatively impact the preservation and rehabilitation of the Schlage Lock Office Building, and would be less effective in obtaining the Project's goals and objectives. This alternative does not present any benefits over the Project regarding identified environmental impacts. Therefore, it is infeasible for the economic, legal, cultural, environmental, technological, and social considerations set forth here and in the FEIR. This Alternative is rejected.

ARTICLE 4. FINDINGS REGARDING MITIGATION MEASURES

CEQA requires agencies to adopt mitigation measures that would avoid or substantially lessen a project's identified significant impacts or potential significant impacts if such measures are feasible.

The findings in this section concern mitigation measures set forth in the FEIR. These findings discuss mitigation measures as proposed in the FEIR and recommended for adoption by the Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Commission, which can be implemented by the Agency and City agencies or departments, including, but not limited to, the Department of City Planning ("Planning Department"), the Department of Public Works ("DPW"), the Municipal Transportation Agency ("MTA"), the Department of Building Inspection ("DBI"), and the Department of Public Health ("DPH").

Primary responsibility for implementation and monitoring of mitigation measures will be shared by the Agency and Planning Department. The Redevelopment Plan provides that the Agency may enter into a cooperation and delegation agreement with the Planning Department outlining shared responsibilities for design and site permit review. A proposed Visitacion Valley Cooperation and Delegation Agreement (–Cooperation Agreement”) is under consideration by both Commissions. The Agency expects to retain final approval authority as to design and site permit review, after consulting with the

Planning Department, in Zone 1 through the entitlement provisions of a Master OPA. The Agency will delegate to the Planning Department, in consultation with Agency staff, approval authority of development in Zone 2. Therefore, the Planning Department would be responsible for implementing mitigation measures for development to be approved by the Planning Department under the authority delegated by the Agency in Zone 2 and the Agency would be responsible for implementing mitigation measures as to development where the Agency retains final approval authority in Zone 1. As the precise responsibility for mitigation measure implementation will be dictated by the Cooperation Agreement between the Planning Department and the Agency, the findings provide that both the Agency and the Planning Department, would implement mitigation measures that will apply during the design and site permit review stages.

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

The Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Commission find that, based on the record before it, the mitigation measures proposed for adoption in the FEIR are feasible, as explained further below, and that they can and should be carried out by the identified agencies at the designated time. The Planning Commission urges other agencies to adopt and implement applicable mitigation measures set forth in the FEIR that are within the jurisdiction and responsibility of such entities. The Planning Commission and Redevelopment Commission acknowledge that if such measures are not adopted and implemented, the Project may result in additional significant unavoidable impacts. Additionally, the Final EIR identified some potential significant and unavoidable impacts with no possible mitigation to reduce the impact to a less than significant level. For these reason, and as discussed in Article 5, the Planning Commission and Redevelopment Commission are adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations as set forth in Article 6.

The Findings in this section concern mitigation measures set forth in the FEIR. Most of the mitigation measures identified in the FEIR that will reduce or avoid significant adverse environmental impacts are proposed for adoption and are set forth in Exhibit 1, in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. However, some of the mitigation measures set forth in the FEIR that are needed to reduce or avoid significant adverse environmental impacts are rejected because of secondary impacts identified in the FEIR or are modified to reduce those secondary impacts. The Draft EIR has listed these impacts as significant and unavoidable because of secondary impacts or uncertainty regarding the implementation of necessary mitigations. A handful of the transportation improvements found to be infeasible or found to have significant secondary impacts in the FEIR are proposed in Exhibit 1 to be considered as options for further study and design as conditions change in the area, and their potential for implementation changes. The recommended and modified mitigations are described below in Section 4.1. Those

mitigations rejected because of secondary impacts are described in Section 4.2 along with the reason for rejecting those mitigations as identified in the FEIR.

The measures listed in the FEIR as improvement measures that the Agency or City Agencies may take to reduce a less-than-significant impact associated with the Project have been included in Exhibit 1. These measures are listed in Exhibit 1 as Improvement Measures. For projects in which the Agency retains final approval authority, as explained above, the Agency will incorporate the Improvement Measures into its project approval actions, as appropriate.

Section 4.1 Mitigation Measures Recommended by the Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Commission for Adoption As Proposed For Implementation by City Departments and the Agency.

The Planning Commission finds that the following measures presented in the FEIR will mitigate, reduce, or avoid the significant environmental effects of the Project. They are recommended for adoption and joint implementation by the Agency and City Departments with applicable jurisdiction in the approval of specific developments that implement the Project, as set forth below.

Land Use.

Mitigation

No significant environmental impact has been identified; no mitigation is required.

Population and Housing.

Mitigation

No significant environmental impact has been identified; no mitigation is required.

Visual Quality.

Mitigation Measure 7.1

As discussed in the FEIR in Section 7.3.5, the proposed building height increase from 40 ft. to 55 ft. could have potentially significant impacts on existing “finer grained” residential properties along the west edge of Zone 2. This mitigation measure will add to the Design for Development additional building bulk and/or building articulation controls specifically tailored to reduce the potential visual effects of greater building height and mass on the west edge of Zone 2 to a level of less than significant. Such amended controls include setbacks and relational height limitations. The Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Commission adopt this measure and recommends that the Agency, Planning Department and DBI implement this measure.

Mitigation Measure 7.2

Nighttime lighting affiliated with Project facilitated development in Zone 1 could have adverse effects on nighttime views of and within the Project Area from the surrounding and internal neighborhood vantage points. This mitigation measure will add to the Design Development a set of Development Controls and Design Guidelines for lighting, focusing on nighttime internal and exterior lighting of multi-story buildings and nighttime lighting of new outdoor spaces, including the following or similar measures: prohibit exterior illumination above 40 feet, require tinting of outward oriented glazing above 40 feet sufficient to reduce the nighttime visual impacts of internal lighting, and require adequate shielding of light sources, use of fixtures that direct light downward, light sources that provide more natural color rendition, possible use of multiple light level switching, non reflective hardscapes, and avoidance of light source reflection off surrounding exterior walls. This measure will reduce the identified significant impacts to a level of less-than-significant. The Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Commission adopt this measure and recommends that the Agency, Planning Department and DBI implement this measure.

Transportation.

Projected intersection turning movement volumes under Existing plus Project conditions would cause significant deterioration in levels of service at the following local intersections during typical weekday peak hours:

Weekday A.M. peak hour:

- Bayshore Boulevard/Blanken Avenue (LOS B to LOS F),
- Bayshore Boulevard/Leland Avenue (LOS C to LOS F),
- Bayshore Boulevard/Visitacion Avenue (LOS C to LOS F),
- Bayshore Boulevard/Sunnydale Avenue (LOS C to LOS F), and
- Tunnel Avenue/Blanken Avenue (LOS B to LOS F).

Weekday P.M. peak hour:

- Bayshore Boulevard/Arleta Avenue/San Bruno (LOS C to LOS F), and
- Bayshore Boulevard/Leland Avenue (LOS C to LOS F).

Mitigation Measure 8-1A

This mitigation measure will incorporate intersection improvements at the following intersections: Bayshore Boulevard/Blanken Avenue, Bayshore/Arleta/San Bruno, and Tunnel Avenue/Blanken Avenue.

At **Bayshore and Blanken** the mitigation measure would restripe the westbound approached to create exclusive lanes for left-turns and right-turns.

At the complex **Bayshore/Arleta/San Bruno** intersection, the mitigation measure will modify the signal timing of the traffic light to shift 6 seconds from the northbound left

turn green time to the southbound through movement. The intersection signals would also be modified to provide transit priority for the various Route 9 buses utilizing the left hand turn signal, and thus overriding the green time shift when buses are present.

At the intersection of **Tunnel and Blanken** a new traffic signal will be installed replacing the existing four-way stop control. The intersection will be restriped to provide two lanes in every direction to facilitate turning movements.

The Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Commission adopt this mitigation measure and the modifications to these intersections.

Mitigation Measure 8-1 B

For the intersection of **Bayshore and Leland**, the FEIR identified an alternative mitigation measure 8.1B, which proposed eliminating the planned left turn from southbound Bayshore into the Schlage Lock site. This mitigation does create secondary impacts to left hand turning movements at the intersections of Bayshore and Visitacion and Bayshore and Sunnydale, described below in Mitigation 8-3. The Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Commission adopt this mitigation measure and remove the left hand turn from the proposed Revised Project.

Mitigation Measure 8-1 C

Mitigation 8-1C requires the preparation and implementation of a Transportation Management Plan (‘TMP’) for the Zone 1 development. This TMP would include the following elements: Identification of a transportation coordinator, Establishment of a resident website, Carpool match services, Carshare hubs, Real-time transit information, Reduced fee transit pass program, Provision of bike facilities for residents, Parking supply reductions, Unbundled parking supply, and/or Metered/paid parking. See Mitigation Measures 8-1C and 9-2 in the EIR for complete details.

Implementation of the mitigation measures 8-1 A, B and C, listed above, would only reduce two of the seven listed weekday peak hour Project impacts on intersection operations to less-than-significant levels (Tunnel Avenue/Blanken Avenue and Bayshore and Leland). The following three intersections would remain at LOS F:

- Bayshore Boulevard/Blanken Avenue (weekday A.M. peak hour),
- Bayshore Boulevard/Visitacion Avenue (weekday A.M. peak hour), and
- Bayshore Boulevard/Sunnydale Avenue (weekday A.M. peak hour).

Mitigation 8-1 B resolves the operational impacts of the Bayshore Boulevard/Leland Avenue intersection however this results in secondary impacts to left hand turning movements and thus the impact of the Project to this intersection remains significant.

The Project is considered to have a significant unavoidable impact at these four Bayshore Boulevard intersections. These mitigation measures (8-1 A, B, and C) will reduce the

level of impacts of the Project on these intersections but not to a less-than-significant level. Only the Project impact at the intersections of Tunnel Avenue/Blanken Avenue would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of the associated mitigation described above. The Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Commission adopt these mitigation measure and recommends that the Agency, DPW and MTA implement the various elements of this measure.

Mitigation Measure 8-2

Projected Existing plus Project traffic volume increases in the peak hours would result in significant deterioration in levels of service on U.S. 101 between I-280 and Third/Bayshore, and U.S. 101 between Sierra Point Parkway and I-380 as detailed below:

Weekday A.M. peak hour:

- U.S. 101 between I-280 and Third/Bayshore -- northbound (LOS D to LOS E);
- U.S. 101 between I-280 and Third/Bayshore southbound (LOS E to LOS E); and
- U.S. 101 between Sierra Point Parkway and I-380 -- northbound (LOS D to LOS E).

Weekday P.M. peak hour:

- U.S. 101 between I-280 and Third/Bayshore -- northbound (LOS D to LOS E).

Due to freeway geometry and space constraints at these two locations, there are no feasible mitigation measures that could be implemented to reduce the Project's LOS impacts to less-than-significant levels. Implementation of Mitigation 8-1C (individual project Transportation Management Plans) would decrease the number of vehicle trips generated by the Project and reduce the impacts to the study freeway segments, but not to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Project would have a significant unavoidable impact on these two freeway segments.

Mitigation Measure 8-3

Project A.M. peak hour maximum queue length conditions and P.M. peak hour average and maximum queue length conditions, queues waiting to turn left might not be fully contained within the existing and proposed left-turn pockets from Bayshore Boulevard via the three intersections at Leland Avenue, Visitacion Avenue, and Sunnydale Avenue.

The proposed mitigation measure would reduce impacts by extending the southbound left-turn pocket lengths by 80 feet at Visitacion Avenue, subject to MTA identifying an appropriate relocation placement for the bus stop on Bayshore Boulevard south of Leland Avenue. This mitigation measure, however would still not be sufficient to accommodate maximum queues in the weekday P.M. peak hour and thus would not reduce impacts to a level of less than significant.

The left hand turn pocket at Leland is eliminated from the proposal by Mitigation Measure 8-1B above.

The mitigation option to increase the access from Bayshore Boulevard by extending the southbound left-turn pocket lengths by 100 feet at Sunnydale Avenue and 80 feet at Visitacion Avenue was found to be infeasible in the FEIR due to secondary impacts to transit, parking, and bicycle routes.

Exhibit 1 also includes an improvement measure to work with the City of Brisbane and UPC toward the establishment of an internal connection from Zone 1 to the east side of the Bayshore Boulevard/ Geneva Avenue intersection. This would provide an alternative access point into the site from Bayshore Boulevard south of the constraints imposed by the track rights-of-way of the light rail line, allowing additional turn pockets to be developed within the median.

Although the Project's Bayshore Boulevard southbound access queuing impacts are considered to be significant and unavoidable, the Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Commission adopt these mitigation and improvement measures and recommends that DPW and MTA implement this measure including relocation of the west-side Bayshore/Leland bus stop, and the Agency and MTA coordinate with the City of Brisbane regarding the additional connection route south of the Project.

Mitigation Measure 8-4

In the analysis of the 2025 Cumulative Scenario, the FEIR found that without the benefit of Regional Transportation Improvements, the Project contributes traffic volumes to intersection turning movement volumes that would cause significant deterioration of Levels of Service at the following intersections:

Weekday A.M. peak hour-

- Bayshore Boulevard/Tunnel Avenue (LOS B to LOS E).

Weekday PM peak hour:

- Bayshore Boulevard/Blanken Avenue (LOS B to LOS F);
- Bayshore Boulevard/Arleta Avenue/San Bruno (LOS C to LOS F);
- Bayshore Boulevard/Leland Avenue (LOS C to LOS F);
- Bayshore Boulevard/Visitacion Avenue (LOS B to LOS F);
- Bayshore Boulevard/Sunnydale Avenue (LOS C to LOS F);
- Tunnel Avenue/Blanken Avenue (LOS A to LOS F), and
- Alana Way/Beatty Avenue (LOS B to LOS F).

This mitigation measure will modify signal timing at **Bayshore Boulevard/Tunnel Avenue**, and signalize the intersection and restriping southbound Alana Way at **Alana Way/Beatty Avenue**. These two study intersections would continue to operate with unacceptable conditions (LOS E or F) during the weekday A.M. peak hour with these

mitigations. Implementation of Mitigation 8-1C (Transportation Management Plan) would decrease the number of vehicle trips generated by the Project and reduce the magnitude of the Project's significant contribution at these locations, but not to a less than-significant level.

No feasible additional mitigation measures have been identified that would sufficiently improve 2025 Cumulative intersection operating conditions to LOS D or better conditions, except implementation of the Bi-County Regional Transportation Improvements discussed further in the FEIR and in Mitigation 8-6 below. If these improvements are undertaken the Alana Way/Beatty Avenue intersection would likely be removed and this portion of the mitigation would not be implemented. Establishing a fair share contribution to the implementation of the future transportation improvements would serve as a replacement mitigation measures for future impacts of the Project.

Therefore, the Revised Project contributions to this cumulative effect would be considered significant and unavoidable impact. The Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Commission adopt this mitigation and recommends that DPW, MTA, the Planning Department, the Agency and the Transportation Authority coordinate with the City of Brisbane and implement this measure.

Mitigation Measure 8-5

Levels of Service would significantly deteriorate at the following freeway segments:

Weekday A.M. peak hour:

- U.S. 101 between 1-280 and Third/Bayshore -- northbound (LOS D to LOS F);
- U.S. 101 between 1-280 and Third/Bayshore southbound (LOS E to LOS F);
- U.S. 101 between Sierra Point Parkway and 1-380 -- northbound (LOS D to LOS F); and
- U.S. 101 between Sierra Point Parkway and 1-380 southbound (LOS F to LOS F).

Weekday P.M. peak hour:

- U.S. 101 between 1-280 and Third/Bayshore -- northbound (LOS E to LOS F);
- U.S. 101 between 1-280 and Third/Bayshore southbound (LOS D to LOS F);
- U.S. 101 between Sierra Point Parkway and 1-380 -- northbound (LOS F to LOS F); and
- U.S. 101 between Sierra Point Parkway and 1-380 southbound (LOS E to LOS F).

To improve the affected freeway segment conditions, additional mainline capacity would be needed, which would require land acquisition by another agency with jurisdiction to make such acquisition and involve substantial costs, jurisdictional issues, and in some areas physical geographic constraints of natural features. With limited transportation funding resources, such freeway investments are not considered of highest priority over regional transit investments; consistent with the City's Transit First Policy, and regional planning efforts of the Association of Bay Area Governments or the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. More specifically:

- Freeway mainline widening to provide acceptable operating conditions would require substantial right-of-way acquisition, and substantial reconstruction of the affected freeway links and associated existing over-crossings, the cost of which far exceed the reasonable capacity and responsibility of the Project, and for which no inter-jurisdictional fair share funding mechanism has been established;
- The co-lead Agencies (Planning Department and Redevelopment Agency) do not have jurisdiction over the affected freeway right-of-way; the necessary right-of-way acquisition would necessarily involve Caltrans use of its eminent domain powers;
- Expansion of portions of the affected freeway segment rights-of-way is constrained by existing topography; and
- Acquisition of portions of the necessary additional freeway mainline and associated under- and over-crossing right-of-way, and subsequent construction of the necessary freeway mainline widening and associated under- and overcrossings, could not be achieved without the displacement of existing households and businesses and demolition of existing residential and commercial structures. Such displacement of existing households and businesses is contrary to current Agency policy and City policy.

Mitigation of this impact is therefore considered to be infeasible and the Project-related contribution to 2025 cumulative freeway segment congestion represents a significant unavoidable impact. Implementation of Mitigation 8-1C, in the EIR however, would decrease the number of vehicle trips generated by the Project and reduce the magnitude of the Project's significant contribution at these locations, but not to a less than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure 8-6

The Levels of Service at the following freeway on-ramps would be unacceptable:

Weekday A.M. peak hour:

- U.S. 101 northbound on-ramp from Bayshore Boulevard/Third Street (LOS C to LOS F); and
- U.S. 101 southbound on-ramp from Beatty Avenue/Alana Way (LOS F to LOS F).

Weekday P.M. peak hour:

- U.S. 101 northbound on-ramp from Harney Way (LOS D to LOS F); and
- U.S. 101 southbound on-ramp from Beatty Avenue/Alana Way (LOS C to LOS F).

This mitigation measure would reduce the impact to less than significant through the construction of the proposed new on-ramps at Geneva Avenue. This facility will be constructed through a joint effort of the Cities of Brisbane and San Francisco and the project sponsors of the Baylands and Candlestick developments. Other developments

including the Project will be required to provide a fair share contribution to planned regional improvements. The Bi-County Transportation Project will provide the mechanism for this funding analysis. The mitigation requires the Agency, the master developer of Zone 1, and significant projects in Zone 2 to participate and contribute to the Bi-County program.

The Planning Department and the Agency will continue to participate in the current Bi-County Transportation Planning Study, will continue to advocate and participate in similar interjurisdictional study, planning and fair share funding efforts, and will continue to advocate alternative travel modes and habits, including, but not limited to, measures to incentivize increased Muni and Caltrain transit ridership, establish freeway onramp metering in the area, and to establish HOV lanes in the area. The Planning Department and Redevelopment Agency are equally committed to requiring participation in any additional intra-jurisdictional projects that would mitigate the impacts identified in the FEIR.

The Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Commission adopt this mitigation and recommends that DPW, MTA, the Planning Department, the Agency and the Transportation Authority coordinate with the City of Brisbane and implement this measure.

Mitigation Measure 8-7

Assuming implementation of the planned future regional roadway network changes, as described in the FEIR, unacceptable operating conditions would remain at the following intersections:

Weekday A.M. peak hour only:

- Bayshore Boulevard/Leland Avenue (LOS F);
- Bayshore Boulevard/Visitacion Avenue (LOS E);
- Bayshore Boulevard/Sunnydale Avenue (LOS F); and
- Tunnel Avenue/Blanken Avenue (LOS E).

Weekday P.M. peak hour only:

- Bayshore Boulevard/Arleta Avenue/San Bruno (LOS E); and
- Bayshore Boulevard/Leland Avenue (LOS E).

At **Bayshore Boulevard/Leland Avenue**, modify signal timing by shifting 6 seconds from the northbound left-turn movements to the through movements and modify the westbound approaches to create two lanes at the intersection: a left-through lane and an exclusive right-turn lane.

Implementation of this proposed signal timing modification mitigation measure would be dependent upon an assessment of transit and traffic coordination along Bayshore Boulevard to ensure that the changes would not substantially affect Muni transit operations, signal progressions, pedestrian minimum green time requirements, and

programming limitations of signals. Because this finding regarding signal capacity and pedestrian movements cannot be assured by MUNI and because the mitigation could potentially impact transit operations, the 2025 cumulative intersection impact is considered by the FEIR to be significant and unavoidable.

At **Bayshore Boulevard/Sunnydale Avenue**: modify signal timing by shifting 4 seconds from the northbound/southbound left-turn movements to the eastbound/westbound movements and stripe the westbound approaches to create two lanes at the intersection: a shared left-through lane and exclusive right-turn lane. Implementation of this proposed signal timing modification mitigation measure would be dependent upon an assessment of transit and traffic coordination along Bayshore Boulevard to ensure that the changes would not substantially affect Muni transit operations, signal progressions, pedestrian minimum green time requirements, and programming limitations of signals. Because this finding cannot be assured, and because the mitigation could potentially impact transit operations this 2025 cumulative intersection impact is considered by the FEIR to be significant and unavoidable.

At **Tunnel Avenue/Blanken Avenue** the mitigation called for signaling the intersection as described in Mitigation 8-1A. This intersection meets the criteria for peak hour signal warrant. It would be possible to modify this intersection from an all-way stop to a signalized intersection under the 2025 Cumulative condition. Implementation of this measure would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Although portions of this mitigation measure cannot be assured for the reasons described above, the Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Commission adopt this mitigation measure and recommend that DPW, MTA, the Planning Department, the Agency and the Transportation Authority implement these intersection modifications to the extent possible.

Mitigation Measure 8-8

Assuming implementation of the planned future regional roadway network changes, listed under Impact 8-7 above, the projected 2025 Cumulative impacts on study freeway segments identified under Impact 8-5 above would still occur. Mitigation of this impact, however, is infeasible as the projected poor 2025 cumulative conditions on these freeway segments could only be improved by creating additional mainline capacity, which, as discussed above, under Mitigation Measure 8-5, is not feasible. Implementation of Mitigation 8-1C (Transportation Management Plan) would help decrease the number of vehicle trips generated by the Project and reduce the magnitude of the Project's significant contribution at these locations, but not to a less than-significant level.

Improvement measures have been suggested in Exhibit 1 to shift additional vehicles trips off of the Highway One Corridor, including promoting regional rail transit by local residents if and when Caltrain introduces more frequent service at the Bayshore Station, promoting the use of shuttle linkages and future Bus Rapid Transit facilities to BART, facilitating enhances SamTrans transit service between the Project and employment

centers in San Mateo County, and assisting Caltrans toward the implementation of HOV lanes and ramp metering along the US 101 corridor.

The Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Commission adopt these mitigation and improvements measures and recommends that DPW, MTA, the Planning Department, the Agency and the Transportation Authority implement these measures.

Mitigation Measure 8-9

The new vehicle-trips generated by the Project would result in long delays at several Bayshore Boulevard intersections, as indicated above under Impacts 8-1, 8-3 and 8-4. Related intersection improvement and left-turn pocket extension measures have been identified under Mitigations 8-1, 8-3 and 8-4 to mitigate these traffic impacts. Because these measures would not fully mitigate the associated traffic impacts, and could result in additional impacts associated with the relocation of a Muni bus stop, this Project-related local transit service delay impact would be considered significant and unavoidable. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 8-1C (Transit Management Plan), would reduce the number of vehicle trips but not to a number less than significant.

In addition, to encourage additional transit riders (thereby further reducing the amount of vehicular activity), the Project could implement the following measures: Consistent with the Design for Development, implement building design features that promote the primary access to new Project Area buildings from transit stops and pedestrian areas, and discourage the location of primary access points to new Project Area buildings through parking lots and other auto-oriented entryways; implement recommendations of the San Francisco Better Streets Plan in the Project Area, which are designed to make the pedestrian environment safer and more comfortable for pedestrians, including traffic calming strategies, sidewalk corner bulbs, and other features. Provide transit amenities at key light rail and bus stops in the Project Area, including "Next Bus" passenger information, accurate and usable passenger information and maps, and adequate light, shelter, and sitting areas.

Because of the impact on bus movements of the 2025 cumulative intersection impacts along Bayshore, and despite the measures above, the Project still is considered by the FEIR to have a potentially significant and unavoidable impact on transit operations. The Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Commission adopt this mitigation and recommend that the Planning Department, the Agency DPW, and MTA implement this measure.

Mitigation Measure 8-10

Implementation of the Project-proposed new southbound Bayshore Boulevard left-turn pocket into Zone 1 at Leland Avenue (see associated Mitigation 8-3) would necessitate the elimination of the existing southbound bicycle lane segment between Leland Avenue and Raymond Avenue. This would result in a gap in the bicycle lane network, which would result in a potentially significant impact to bicycle conditions. This mitigation measure would eliminate the impact of bicycle facilities by not constructing a new southbound left-turn into Zone 1 at Leland Avenue (also Mitigation Measure 8-1B).

The Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Commission adopt this mitigation and remove the proposed southbound left turn pocket from the Project proposal.

Air Quality.

Mitigation Measure 9.1A – 9.1D

Remediation, demolition, and construction activities permitted and/or facilitated by the proposed redevelopment program may generate exhaust emissions and fugitive dust that could temporarily impact air quality. This mitigation measure will require the implementation of dust control measures by demolition contractors and for:

- demolition activities;
- remediation, grading, or construction activity;
- for debris and soil stockpiles; and
- undeveloped parcels.

The mitigation also requires emission controls for all diesel powered construction equipment used by contractors. These mitigations, described in detail within Exhibit 1, will reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. The Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Commission adopt this measure and recommends that the Agency, Planning Department and DBI implement this measure.

Mitigation Measure 9.2

Development under the redevelopment program will generate traffic related regional increases in air pollutant emission. This mitigation measure established measures set forth in the Design for Development and the Planning Code to promote walking, biking, and transit use as alternative modes of transportation. Additionally, emissions control strategies will be applied to project facilitated discretionary mixed use, residential, commercial, and cultural development activities within the Project Area in order to reduce overall emissions from traffic and area sources. These strategies include: the inclusion of bicycle lanes where reasonable and feasible, use of transportation information kiosks, encouraging use of public transit, ridesharing, van pooling, use of bicycles, and walking, developing parking enforcement and fee strategies that encourage the use of mass transit, preferential parking for electric and alternative fuel source vehicles, enforcement of truck idling restrictions, the development of Transportation

Demand Management Programs for large commercial land uses, require energy efficient building designs, discouraging the use of gasoline powered landscape equipment, and requiring fireplaces to be low emitting fireplaces.

Despite these mitigations, the Project may have remaining significant impacts to cultural resources that cannot be mitigated. The Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Commission adopt this measure and recommends that the Agency and Planning Department implement this measure.

Cultural Resources.

Mitigation Measure 10.1

The Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Program may cause substantial adverse changes in the significance of one or more identified potential historic resources if future individual development projects do not incorporate measures that ensure project related changes to historic resources are performed in accordance with the following mitigation measure. Mitigation Measure 10-1 will require that proposed changes to a historic resource be performed in accordance with either: (1) Secretary of Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings; or Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings. If the proposed changes cannot be made in accordance with the aforementioned guidelines, the project applicant shall:

- (a) Have documentation of the affected historical resource and its setting prepared,
- (b) Undertake an oral history project that includes interviews with several long-time residents of Visitacion Valley and former employees of the Schlage Lock Factory,
- (c) If preservation of resource is not possible, the building shall, if feasible, be stabilized and relocated to another appropriate site,
- (d) If preservation or relocation is not feasible, the resource shall be salvaged or reused to the extent feasible, or
- (e) If the resources must be demolished, project applicant shall incorporate a display featuring historic photos of the affected resource and a description of its historical significance.
- (f) If demolition is required, project applicant is eligible to mitigate project related impacts by contributing funds to the City to be applied to future historic preservation activities or provide in-kind historic resource preservation activities in the Project Area.

The Planning Department and Planning Commission adopt this measure and recommend that the Planning Department in conjunction with the Agency, implement this measure. Despite these mitigations, the Project may have remaining significant impacts to cultural resources that cannot be mitigated. The Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Commission adopt this measure and recommends that the Agency, Planning Department and DBI implement this measure.

Mitigation Measure 10.2

New development facilitated by the redevelopment program could disturb one Native American habitation site (CA-SFR-35), the Ralston Shellmound, and remains associated with the Union Pacific Silk Manufacturing Company. This mitigation measure consists of requiring the project sponsor to retain the services of a qualified archaeological consultant having expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archaeology, to consult, test, monitor, and prepare plans and reports concerning the project and to work with the Planning Department and the City's Environmental Review Officer (ERO). The Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Commission adopt this measure and requires as any future condition of approval or development agreement that the project sponsor implement this measure.

Mitigation Measure 10.3

New development facilitated by the redevelopment program in Zone 1, could disturb unrecorded archaeological resources. This mitigation measure requires the project applicant to consult with the Planning Department prior to any development at the Schlage Lock site and, if necessary and instructed to do so by the Planning Department, undertake an Archaeological Monitoring Program, Archaeological Data Recovery Program, or Final Archaeological Resources Report. The Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Commission adopt this measure and recommends that the Agency, Planning Department and DBI implement this measure.

Mitigation Measure 10.4

New development facilitated by the redevelopment program in Zone 2, could disturb unrecorded archaeological resources. This mitigation measure requires the project applicant to consult with the Planning Department prior to any development in Redevelopment Zone 2 and, if necessary and instructed to do so by the Planning Department, distribute a San Francisco Planning Department archaeological resource "ALERT" sheet to all prime contractors and subcontractors, suspend any activities if there is any indication of an archaeological resource is encountered at site, if the ERO determines a resource may be present, obtain a archaeological consultant to recommend what action, if any, is necessary, and implement any appropriate mitigation measures required by the ERO. If required, the project archaeological consultant shall submit a Final Archaeological Resources Report to the ERO. The Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Commission adopt this measure and recommends that the Agency, Planning Department and DBI implement this measure.

Mitigation Measure 10.5

The project could potentially encounter paleontological resources. This mitigation measure requires the project applicant to halt all ground disturbances, if any paleontological resources are encountered, until the services of a qualified paleontologist

can be retained to identify and evaluate the resource and recommend any mitigation measures, if necessary. The Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Commission adopt this measure and recommends that the Agency, Planning Department and DBI implement this measure.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Mitigation Measure 11-1

There is a possibility that Project-facilitated demolition, renovation, and new construction activity in Zone 2 could encounter and expose workers to existing spilled, leaked, or otherwise discharged hazardous materials or wastes. This mitigation measure will require each developer of a site in Zone 2 to comply with all applicable existing local-, state-, and federal-mandated site assessment, remediation, and disposal requirements for soil, surface water, and/or groundwater contamination. In particular, these include the requirements of the City and County of San Francisco, the Regional Water Quality Control Board (“RWQCB”), and the Department of Toxic Substance Control (“DTSC”). The Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Commission adopt this measure and recommend that the Planning Department and DBI implement this measure.

Hydrology and Water Quality.

Runoff resulting from redevelopment program-facilitated development would contribute to existing combined sewer overflows from the City's sewer system, particularly into Candlestick Cove from the Harney Way box culvert. Although the City is currently in compliance with the NPDES CSO Control Policy, these overflows have the potential to degrade water quality within San Francisco Bay. In addition, since the redevelopment program would result in more traffic in the Project Area and vicinity, the build-up of vehicle-generated urban pollutants that could be washed into storm drains and eventually the Bay would likely increase.

Mitigation Measure 12-1 A

This mitigation measure will require the developer(s) to refine the individual development design(s) for Zone 1 as necessary to:

- (1) Provide retention storage facilities and/or detention treatment facilities as needed to ensure that at least 80 percent of total annual runoff either remains on-site or receives an approved level of water quality treatment before discharge into the combined sewer system; and
- (2) Provide a minimum of 25 percent of the surface of setbacks to be pervious.

This mitigation conforms with the recently create Stormwater Design Guidelines and will reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. The Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Commission adopt this measure and recommends that the Agency, Planning Department, the PUC and DBI implement this measure.

Mitigation Measure 12-1 B

This mitigation measure will additionally require stormwater design requirements similar to those described above for the Zone 1 development also be applied to individual infill developments in Zone 2 that meet the proposed San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (PUC) minimum size criteria. This mitigation conforms with the recently create Stormwater Design Guidelines and will reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. The Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Commission adopt this measure and recommend that the Agency, Planning Department, the PUC and DBI implement this measure.

Mitigation Measure 12-2

Excavation required for remediation and construction in the Project Area would create a potential for individual on-site soil erosion, which could lead to increased sediment accumulation in downstream sewer lines and, in the event of a combined discharge (CSO), potentially higher turbidity levels in San Francisco Bay. In addition, remediation and construction activities would introduce the potential for fuel or hazardous material spills. If these materials are washed into the sewer system, they could upset the treatment process at the SEWPCP and, if they are part of a CSO, contribute to pollution in the Bay. This mitigation measure will require, for future development within Zone 1, design requirements and implementation measures for minimizing Project-generated erosion and for controlling fuel/hazardous material spills would be set forth in the Zone 1 SWPPP, in accordance with SWRCB and RWQCB design standards. During construction, the SFDPW would monitor implementation of the approved SWPPP. This plan shall include, at a minimum, the following or similar actions:

- (1) Following demolition of existing improvements, stabilize areas not scheduled for immediate construction with planted vegetation or erosion control blankets;
- (2) Collect stormwater runoff into stable drainage channels from small drainage basins, to prevent the buildup of large, potentially erosive stormwater flows;
- (3) Direct runoff away from all areas disturbed by construction;
- (4) Use sediment ponds or siltation basins to trap eroded soils before runoff is discharged into on-site channels or the combined sewer system;
- (5) To the extent possible, schedule major site development work involving excavation and earthmoving activities during the dry season (May through September);
- (6) Develop and implement a program for the handling, storage, use, and disposal of fuels and hazardous materials. The program should also include a contingency plan covering accidental hazardous material spills;
- (7) Restrict vehicle cleaning, fueling, and maintenance to designated areas for containment and treatment of runoff; and
- (8) After construction is completed, inspect all on-site drainage facilities for accumulated sediment, and clear these facilities of debris and sediment as necessary.

This mitigation will reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. The Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Commission adopt this measure and recommend that the Agency, Planning Department, the PUC and DBI implement this measure.

Noise.

Mitigation Measure 13-1

Remediation, demolition, and construction activities facilitated by the Project (redevelopment program) could temporarily elevate noise levels at nearby residential and commercial receptors during individual, site-specific project remediation and construction periods. This mitigation measure will reduce redevelopment program-related individual project remediation-, demolition-, and construction-period noise impacts on nearby residences and businesses by incorporating conditions in project demolition and construction contract agreements that stipulate the following conventional noise abatement measures:

- (1) Prepare detailed remediation and construction plans identifying schedules and a procedure for coordination with nearby noise-sensitive facilities so that remediation and construction activities and the event schedule can be scheduled to minimize noise disturbance;
- (2) Ensure that noise-generating remediation and construction activity is limited to between the hours of 7:00 A.M. to 8:00 P.M., Monday through Friday, and noise levels generated by construction are prohibited on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays;
- (3) Limit all powered remediation and construction equipment to a noise level of 80 dBA or less when measured at a distance of 100 feet or an equivalent sound level when measured at some other convenient distance;
- (4) Equip all impact tools and equipment with intake and exhaust mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment. Equip all pavement breakers and jackhammers with acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment;
- (5) Locate stationary noise-generating equipment as far as possible from sensitive receptors when sensitive receptors adjoin or are near a remediation or construction site;
- (6) Route all remediation and construction traffic to and from the sites via designated truck routes where possible;
- (7) Prohibit remediation- and construction-related heavy truck traffic in residential areas where feasible;
- (8) Use quiet equipment, particularly air compressors, wherever possible; and
- (9) Construct solid plywood fences around remediation and construction sites adjacent to residences, operational businesses, or noise sensitive land uses.

Temporary noise control blanket barriers should be erected, if necessary, along building facades of construction sites. This mitigation component would only be necessary if

conflicts occurred which were irresolvable by proper scheduling. For Zone 1 remediation and larger individual construction projects, the City may choose to require project designation of a "Noise Disturbance Coordinator" who would be responsible for responding to any local complaints about remediation or construction noise. The Disturbance Coordinator would determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and institute reasonable measures to correct the problem.

This bundle of mitigation measures will reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. The Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Commission adopt this measure and recommend that the Agency, Planning Department, and DBI implement this measure.

Mitigation Measure 13-2

Railroad operations could introduce potential ground borne vibration issues if vibration-sensitive developments, such as residences, are proposed close to these operations. This mitigation measure will reduce potential impacts by requiring, prior to the development of habitable buildings within 110 feet of the centerline of the nearest railroad tracks, or within 55 feet of the light rail tracks, a site-specific vibration stud demonstrating that ground borne vibrations associated with rail operations either (1) would not exceed the applicable FTA ground borne vibration impact assessment criteria (see Table 13.5 of this EIR), or (2) can be reduced to below the applicable FTA criteria thresholds through building design and construction measures (e.g., stiffened floors).

This mitigation will reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. The Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Commission adopt this measure and recommend that the Agency, Planning Department and DBI implement this measure.

Mitigation Measure 13-3

Project-facilitated noise-sensitive residential, retail, open space, and cultural land use development may exceed "normally acceptable" noise threshold. This mitigation measure will require that site-specific noise studies consistent with the requirements of the State Building Code (SBC) be conducted for all new Project-facilitated residential uses within 75 feet of the Caltrain line and along the Bayshore Boulevard frontage to identify appropriate noise reduction measures to be included in project final design. Identified noise reduction measures may include: (1) site planning techniques to minimize noise in shared residential outdoor activity areas by locating such noise-sensitive areas behind buildings or in courtyards, or by orienting residential terraces to alleyways rather than streets, whenever possible; (2) incorporation of an air circulation system in all affected units so that windows can remain closed to maintain interior noise levels below 45 dBA Ldn; and (3) incorporation of sound-rated windows and construction methods in residential units proposed along streets or the Caltrain line where noise levels would exceed 70 dB. The Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Commission adopt this measure and recommend that the Agency and Planning Department implement this measure.

Public Services.

No Mitigation Measures are required for this section.

Utilities and Service Systems.

Mitigation Measure 15-1

The Project has the potential to conflict with state-mandated requirements for 50 percent solid waste diversion if residents/tenants find the locations of recycling carts to be too distant or inconvenient, which could result in a potentially significant impact. This mitigation measure will require final architectural designs for individual developments in Project Area to indicate adequate space in buildings to accommodate three bin recycling containers. Space indicated for recyclables (blue bins) and organics (green bins) shall be larger than the space provided for garbage (black bins). If a waste chute is used, it shall have three separate waste chutes, one each for recyclables, organics, and garbage. Alternatively, an automated system that effectively accommodates three waste streams in a single chute would also be acceptable. The City shall ensure these mitigation measures are included in Project facilitated building construction prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. These measures would reduce potential impacts to a level of less than significant. The Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Commission adopt this measure and recommend that the Agency and Planning Department implement this measure.

Section 4.2 Rejected Mitigations

Mitigation 8-1A

Bayshore and Leland: Restripe the existing Leland Avenue connection to the west side of Bayshore Boulevard to create three lanes – one shared left-through eastbound lane, one exclusive right-turn eastbound lane and one westbound lane. This mitigation is rejected as it has secondary impacts on transit movements and pedestrian travel. This mitigation conflicts with the Leland Avenue Streetscape Design and the traffic calming measures to be installed by this plan. The Alternative Mitigation 8-1 B, removing the southbound left-turn lane on Bayshore at Leland is adopted instead.

Bayshore and Visitacion: Restripe the existing Visitacion Avenue connection to the west side of Bayshore Boulevard to create three lanes – one shared left-through eastbound lane, one exclusive right-turn eastbound lane and one westbound lane. This mitigation is rejected as it has secondary impacts on transit bus movements, truck movements and pedestrian travel. The shifting of the westbound lane to the north will require provide a narrower turning radii for large vehicles particularly buses. Any conflicts created by this constrained turning movement could cause traffic to back up on Bayshore Boulevard. It also increasing the crossing distance for pedestrians traveling along the west-side of Bayshore Boulevard and requires removing on street parking stalls.

Bayshore and Sunnydale: Restripe the existing Sunnydale Avenue Connection to the west side of Bayshore Boulevard to create three lanes – one shared left-through eastbound lane, one exclusive right-turn eastbound lane and one westbound lane. This mitigation is rejected as it has secondary impacts on transit movements and pedestrian travel. The shifting of the westbound lane to the north will require provide a narrower turning radii for large vehicles particularly buses. Any conflicts created by this constrained turning movement could cause traffic to back up on Bayshore Boulevard. It is also increasing the crossing distance for pedestrians traveling along the west-side of Bayshore Boulevard and requires removing on street parking stalls.

As described above, no feasible mitigations were found that did not present significant secondary impacts or safety concerns for truck and transit movements for the intersections of Bayshore Boulevard/Visitacion Avenue and Bayshore Boulevard/Sunnydale Avenue. However, as described in Exhibit 1, an improvement measure to revisit the potential for future modifications of these Bayshore Boulevard intersection configurations is required after MUNI considers new bus routes and bus stop locations.

Mitigation 8-3

The FEIR discusses options to increase the access from Bayshore Boulevard by extending the southbound left-turn pocket lengths by 100 feet at Sunnydale Avenue. The left-turn pocket extension was found to be infeasible due to secondary impacts to transit, parking, and bicycle routes.

Exhibit 1 also includes an improvement measure to work with the City of Brisbane and UPC toward the establishment of an internal connection from Zone 1 to the east side of the Bayshore Boulevard/Geneva Avenue intersection. This would provide an alternative access point into the site from Bayshore Boulevard south of the constraints imposed by the track rights-of-way of the light rail line, allowing additional turn pockets to be developed within the median.

Section 4.3 Findings on Adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

The Planning Commission finds that the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program attached hereto as Exhibit 1 (the “Program”), is designed to ensure compliance during Project implementation. The Planning Commission further finds that the Program presents measures that are appropriate and feasible for adoption and the Program should be adopted and implemented as set forth herein and in Exhibit 1.

Section 4.4 Improvement Measure

In addition to the mitigation measures contained in Exhibit 1, the Exhibit also contains improvement measures for transportation, shown at the end of the Exhibit, which are not required to avoid or reduce significant adverse impact but will reduce a less than

significant impact. CEQA does not require the Agency or other implementing agencies to adopt these measures. Nevertheless, the Agency has expressed its intent to require developers in the Project Area to comply with these measures to the extent feasible when the Agency or the Commissions retains final approval authority over developments through its involvement in funding, acquisition, disposition or development of the property. Exhibit 1 explains how the Agency will ensure that these measures are implemented during the redevelopment process.

ARTICLE 5. SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

All impacts of the Project would either be less than significant or could be mitigated to less than significant levels, with the exception of the following impacts:

Impact 8-1: Existing Plus Project Impacts on Intersection Operation (see chapter 8--Transportation and Circulation--of the FEIR);

Weekday A.M. peak hour:

- Bayshore Boulevard/Blanken Avenue (LOS B to LOS F);
- Bayshore Boulevard/Visitacion Avenue (LOS C to LOS F); and
- Bayshore Boulevard/Sunnydale Avenue (LOS C to LOS F).

Weekday P.M. peak hour:

- Bayshore Boulevard/Arleta Avenue/San Bruno (LOS C to LOS F).

Although Mitigation 8-1 B resolved the intersection operations at the Bayshore/Leland Intersection, this mitigation has a significant secondary impact through its contribution to Impact 8-3 described below.

Impact 8-2: Existing Plus Project Impacts on U.S. 101 Freeway Segment Operation (see chapter 8--Transportation and Circulation--of the FEIR);

Weekday A.M. peak hour:

- U.S. 101 between 1-280 and Third/Bayshore -- northbound (LOS D to LOS E);
- U.S. 101 between 1-280 and Third/Bayshore southbound (LOS E to LOS E); and
- U.S. 101 between Sierra Point Parkway and 1-380 -- northbound (LOS D to LOS E).

Weekday P.M. peak hour:

- U.S. 101 between 1-280 and Third/Bayshore -- northbound (LOS D to LOS E).

Impact 8-3: Project Queuing Impacts at Zone 1 Access Points (see chapter 8-Transportation and Circulation--of the FEIR);

- Southbound Bayshore Boulevard turning left at Visitacion Avenue, and
- Southbound Bayshore Boulevard turning left at Sunnydale Avenue.

Impact 8-4: 2025 Cumulative Impacts on Intersection Operation (see chapter 8--Transportation and Circulation--of the FEIR);

Weekday A.M. peak hour-

- Bayshore Boulevard/Tunnel Avenue (LOS B to LOS E).

Weekday P.M. peak hour:

- Bayshore Boulevard/Blanken Avenue (LOS B to LOS F);
- Bayshore Boulevard/Arleta Avenue/San Bruno (LOS C to LOS F);
- Bayshore Boulevard/Leland Avenue (LOS C to LOS F);
- Bayshore Boulevard/Visitacion Avenue (LOS B to LOS F);
- Bayshore Boulevard/Sunnydale Avenue (LOS C to LOS F);
- Tunnel Avenue/Blanken Avenue (LOS A to LOS F), and
- Alana Way/Beatty Avenue (LOS B to LOS F).

Impact 8-5: 2025 Cumulative Impacts on U.S. 101 Freeway Segment Operation (see chapter Transportation and Circulation--of the FEIR);

Weekday A.M. peak hour:

- U.S. 101 between 1-280 and Third/Bayshore -- northbound (LOS D to LOS F);
- U.S. 101 between 1-280 and Third/Bayshore southbound (LOS E to LOS F);
- U.S. 101 between Sierra Point Parkway and 1-380 -- northbound (LOS D to LOS F); and
- U.S. 101 between Sierra Point Parkway and 1-380 southbound (LOS F to LOS F).

Weekday P.M. peak hour:

- U.S. 101 between 1-280 and Third/Bayshore -- northbound (LOS E to LOS F);
- U.S. 101 between 1-280 and Third/Bayshore southbound (LOS D to LOS F);
- U.S. 101 between Sierra Point Parkway and 1-380 -- northbound (LOS F to LOS F); and
- U.S. 101 between Sierra Point Parkway and 1-380 southbound (LOS E to LOS F).

Impact 8-7: 2025 Cumulative Impacts on Intersection Operation with Planned Regional Roadway Improvements (see chapter 8--Transportation and Circulation--of the FEIR);

Weekday A.M. peak hour only:

- Bayshore Boulevard/Leland Avenue (LOS F);
- Bayshore Boulevard/Visitacion Avenue (LOS E); and
- Bayshore Boulevard/Sunnydale Avenue (LOS F).

Weekday P.M. peak hour only:

- Bayshore Boulevard/Arleta Avenue/San Bruno (LOS E); and
- Bayshore Boulevard/Leland Avenue (LOS E).

Impact 8-8: 2025 Cumulative Impacts on U.S. 101 Freeway Segment Operation with Planned Regional Roadway Improvements (see chapter 8--Transportation and Circulation--of the FEIR);

Weekday A.M. peak hour:

- U.S. 101 between 1-280 and Third/Bayshore -- northbound (LOS D to LOS F);
- U.S. 101 between 1-280 and Third/Bayshore southbound (LOS E to LOS F);
- U.S. 101 between Sierra Point Parkway and 1-380 -- northbound (LOS D to LOS F); and
- U.S. 101 between Sierra Point Parkway and 1-380 southbound (LOS F to LOS F).

Weekday P.M. peak hour:

- U.S. 101 between 1-280 and Third/Bayshore -- northbound (LOS E to LOS F);
- U.S. 101 between 1-280 and Third/Bayshore southbound (LOS D to LOS F);
- U.S. 101 between Sierra Point Parkway and 1-380 -- northbound (LOS F to LOS F); and
- U.S. 101 between Sierra Point Parkway and 1-380 southbound (LOS E to LOS F).

Impact 8-9: Project Impacts on Transit Service (see chapter 8--Transportation and Circulation--of the FEIR);

Impact 9-2: Long-Term Regional Emissions Impacts (see chapter 9--Air Quality--of the FEIR);

Impact 10-1: Destruction or Degradation of Historical Resources (see chapter 10--Cultural and Historical Resources--of the FEIR).

ARTICLE 6. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Notwithstanding the significant effects noted above, pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(b) and the CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, the Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Agency each finds, after considering the FEIR and based on substantial

evidence in said documents, the administrative record and as set forth herein, that specific overriding economic, legal, social, and other considerations independently and collectively outweigh the identified significant effects on the environment and are overriding considerations warranting approval of the Project. Any one of the reasons for approval cited below is sufficient to justify approval of the Program. In addition, each Commission finds, in addition to the specific reasons discussed in Article 4 and Article 5 above, that the Project mitigations rejected in Article 4 and the Project Alternatives rejected in Article 5 above are not feasible because they will not achieve or promote all of the goals and objective of the Project. In addition, the approval of the Project is also appropriate for the following specific economic, social, or other considerations resulting from Project approval and implementation:

- (1) Project implementation will alleviate blight and encourage revitalization of the Project Area.
- (2) Project implementation will assist with the evaluation, clean up, and redevelopment of brownfield sites in the project area, particularly Zone 1.
- (3) Project implementation will improve residential conditions and encourage residential activity through the creation of new housing units, especially housing units affordable to very low-, low-, and moderate-income persons and/or households.
- (4) Project implementation will promote the development of commercial facilities that will lead to increased business activity and improved economic conditions in the Project Area.
- (5) Project implementation will facilitate the planning and construction of the development site in Zone 1 as well as throughout the area to leverage increase private investment in businesses and property.
- (6) Project implementation will lead to improved housing opportunities by promoting the creation of approximately 1,577 new residential units that alleviate city and regional housing needs, especially the high demand for affordable housing.
- (7) Project implementation will promote enhanced quality of life in the Project Area through improved open space, residential block revitalization programs on the Schlage Lock Site, improved neighborhood commercial corridors along Leland Avenue and Bayshore Boulevard, and public facilities.
- (8) Project implementation will enable enhanced infrastructure improvements in the Project Area including improvement to local streetscapes and regional transportation facilities.

- (9) Project implementation will facilitate transit-oriented development along Bayshore Boulevard and its connection to the Third Street Corridor as well as the Caltrain Station in support of the City's Transit First Policy.
- (10) Project implementation will assist with coordinated land use planning and revitalization strategies between the existing redevelopment project areas and the Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Project Area.
- (11) Project implementation will assist with the rehabilitation of certain historic resources within the Project Area.
- (12) Project implementation will assist in the development of new retail uses including, but not limited to, a grocery store in Zone 1.

Having considered these Project benefits, including the benefits and considerations discussed in Article 2 above, the Agency finds that the Project's benefits outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, and that the adverse environmental effects are therefore acceptable.

**EXHIBIT 1
VISITACION VALLEY REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Schedule
<i>VISUAL FACTORS</i>				
<p>Mitigation 7-1 Building Scale Compatibility. Add to the Design for Development additional building bulk and/or building articulation controls specifically tailored to reduce the potential visual effects of permitted greater building height and mass on the west edge of Zone 2 on abutting residential properties to the west. The amended controls could include, for example, a 10-to-15-foot building "stepback" and or "relational height limit" requirement at the third or fourth story along the west edges of Zone 2 that abut existing residential properties, for purposes of avoiding incongruous building height and scale relationships and associated light and shadow impacts. Formulation of these or similar measures into the Design for Development would reduce this potential for building scale and mass compatibility impacts to a <i>less-than-significant level</i>.</p>	Project Applicant	The Design for Development has been revised to incorporate this measure	Planning Department, SFRA, DBI	Planning, DBI to review designs and specifications as part of the Project-level plan review and site permit processing

Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/ Schedule
<p>Mitigation 7-2 Lighting and Glare: Add to the Design for Development a set of Development Controls and Design Guidelines for "Lighting," focusing on nighttime internal and exterior lighting of multi-story buildings and nighttime lighting of new outdoor spaces, including the following or similar measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ limit exterior illumination of any new building elements above 40 feet; ▪ require tinting of outward-oriented glazing above 40 feet sufficient to reduce the nighttime visual impacts of internal lighting; and ▪ to minimize glare and "sky glow" from new outdoor area lighting, require adequate shielding of light sources, use of fixtures that direct light downward, light sources that provide more natural color rendition, possible use of multiple light level switching (for reducing light intensity after 10 P.M.), non-reflective hardscapes, and avoidance of light source reflection off surrounding exterior walls. 	Project Applicant	The Design for Development has been revised to incorporate this measure	SFRA, DBI	SFRA and DBI to review designs and specifications as part of Project level plan review and site permit processes
<p>Formulation of these or similar measures by a qualified urban design professional and their incorporation into the Design for Development would reduce this potential for light and glare impacts to a <i>less-than-significant level</i>.</p>				

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/Schedule
TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC				
<p>Mitigation 8-1A:</p> <p><i>Bayshore Boulevard/Blanken Avenue:</i> Restripe the westbound approach to create two additional lanes: an added exclusive left-turn and an added right-turn lane. Implementation of this mitigation would reduce the significant impacts in the P.M. peak hour, but weekday A.M. peak hour impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.</p> <p><i>Bayshore Boulevard/Arleta Avenue/San Bruno Avenue:</i> Modify signal timing by shifting 6 seconds of green time from the northbound left-turn movement to the southbound through movement as the delays associated with the southbound through movement are considerably higher than the delay associated with northbound left turn movement. Add bus signal prioritization to avoid delays to the San Bruno bus lines. The Project impacts at this intersection will remain significant and unavoidable.</p> <p><i>Tunnel Avenue/Blanken Avenue:</i> Signalize intersection. The Project impacts at this intersection will remain significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p>Planning Department, MTA, DPW or owner/developer</p> <p>Same as above</p>	<p>First Major Phase</p> <p>Second Major Phase</p>	<p>MTA, DPW</p> <p>MTA, DPW</p>	<p>Approval of infrastructure plans with major phase</p> <p>Same as above</p>
<p>Mitigation 8-1B Intersection Operation:</p> <p><i>Bayshore Boulevard/Leland Avenue southbound left-turn:</i> Eliminate the proposed left-turn from southbound Bayshore Boulevard into Redevelopment Zone 1 at Leland Avenue. Removal of this left-turn location would have a significant secondary impact, forcing Project vehicular traffic to utilize the left-turn locations at Visitacion and Sunnydale Avenues, which would exacerbate anticipated queuing impacts at these two remaining left-turn locations. This mitigation would reduce the Project impact at this location to a less than significant level.</p>	<p>MTA, DPW</p>	<p>First Major Phase</p>	<p>MTA, DPW</p>	<p>Approval of infrastructure plans with major phase</p>
<p>Mitigation 8-1C Transportation Management Plan:</p> <p><i>Implement a Transportation Management Plan for Redevelopment Zone 1.</i> To reduce the amount of auto use and auto ownership rates, and thereby</p>	<p>SFRA/MTA/Project Applicant</p>	<p>Element of each major phase</p>	<p>SFRA/MTA</p>	<p>Confirm establishment as part of first Major Phase</p>

Mitigation Measure**Responsibility for Implementation****Mitigation Schedule****Monitoring Responsibility****Monitoring Actions/Schedule**

reduce the traffic impacts of Zone 1 development, future applicants for developments in Zone 1 shall prepare, fund, and implement project-specific Transportation Management Plans (TMP). The TMPs could include the following elements:

- Identification of a transportation coordinator,
- Establishment of a resident website,
- Carpool match services,
- Carshare hubs,
- Real-time transit information,
- Reduced fee transit pass program,
- Parking supply reductions,
- Unbundled parking supply, and/or
- Metered/paid parking.

Also see similar measures in *Mitigation 9-2* (chapter 9, Air Quality) of this EIR.

After the first phase of Zone 1 development of 450 residential units, the Project will conduct a follow-up analysis of the Bayshore Boulevard corridor and the Tunnel/Blanken intersection. This analysis will revisit the status of neighboring projects, account for any shifts in travel patterns, mode share, and transit service (as described in subsection 8.2.4) within the Project Area, and reconsider the range of mitigations available for travel on Bayshore Boulevard, Tunnel Avenue, Blanken Avenue, and affected intersections--including revised signal phasing, pedestrian improvements, and/or traffic calming measures. This future study may provide opportunities to revise TMP elements and explore additional mitigation options based on revised information regarding Cumulative conditions. This study shall also study pedestrian volumes in Zone 1 and along Bayshore Boulevard. While implementation of this measure would reduce impacts on the adjacent intersections and roadways to an unspecified but limited degree, the Project impacts would still remain *significant and unavoidable*.

Mitigation 8-3 Project Queuing Impacts at Redevelopment Zone 1 Access Points

MTA, DPW and/or SFRA, and

Major phase and subject to relocation

MTA, DPW and/or SFRA

Major Phase Application

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/Schedule
<p><i>Visitacion/Bayshore Boulevard:</i> extend the left turn pocket by an additional 80 feet by relocating the MUNI bus stop currently located at the southside of the Bayshore Boulevard/Leland Avenue. Implementation will improve queuing impacts at one southbound Project site access intersection, but overall impacts at AM and PM peaks are considered to be significant and unavoidable.</p>	individual development applicants	of MUNI bus stops.		
<p>Mitigation 8-4: 2025 Cumulative Impacts on Intersection Operation.</p> <p><i>Bayshore Boulevard/Tunnel Avenue:</i> Modify signal timing by shifting one second from the southbound left-turn movement to the northbound/southbound through movements. Prior to implementation of this mitigation measure, assess transit and traffic coordination along Bayshore Boulevard to ensure that the changes would not substantially affect MUNI transit operations, signal progressions, pedestrian minimum green time requirements, and programming limitations of signals. <i>Implementation of this mitigation would still result in a cumulative effect that is significant and unavoidable for weekday AM/PM peak hours.</i></p> <p><i>Alana Way/Beatty Avenue:</i> Signalize the intersection, restripe the southbound Alana Way approach to create exclusive left- through and right turn approach to create exclusive left-, through and right-turn lanes; and restripe the eastbound Beatty Avenue approach to create two lanes. If this intersection is reconfigured as part of the Brisbane Baylands the developer will pay an in lieu fee for other transportation improvements. <i>Implementation of this mitigation would still result in a cumulative effect that is significant and unavoidable for weekday AM/PM peak hours.</i></p>	MTA, DPW and/or SFRA, and individual development applicants	Second phase of development	MTA, DPW and/or SFRA, and individual development applicants	Major Phase Application
<p>on 8-6: 2025 Cumulative Impacts on Freeway On-Ramp Operation: These projected 2025 cumulative freeway on-ramp operating condition impacts are anticipated to be resolved by the construction of the proposed new ramps at Geneva Avenue, a planned regional transportation improvement measure. Project fair contribution to these improvements to these planned improvements would be required. Currently there are no</p>	Planning Department/ SFRA, and individual development applicants of significant projects	Second phase of development	SFRA/Planning Department	Zone 1: Major phase approval Zone 2: approval of significant project

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/Schedule
--------------------	-----------------------------------	---------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------

interjurisdiction formulated improvement projects or associated funding programs for the affected freeway segments towards which the Project Developer could be required to make a fair share contribution. The ongoing Bi-County Transportation Study is currently investigating inter-regional cumulative transportation network improvement needs and priorities, and is intended to identify an associated interjurisdictional fair share calculation procedure. The Planning Department and Redevelopment Agency will continue to participate in the current Bi-County Transportation Planning Study, and will continue to advocate and participate in similar interjurisdictional study, planning and fair share funding efforts. Project fair-share contribution to the planned regional improvements would reduce the anticipated 2025 cumulative freeway on-ramp impacts to a *less-than-significant level*.

Mitigation 8-7: 2025 Cumulative Impacts on Intersection Operation with Planned Regional Roadway Improvements: To mitigate 2025 cumulative unacceptable operating conditions (LOS E or F) implement *Mitigation 8-1* plus the following additional measures:

- *Bayshore Boulevard/Leland Avenue:* Modify signal timing by shifting 6 seconds from the northbound/southbound left-turn movements to the through movements. Implementation of this mitigation could potentially impact transit operations; this 2025 cumulative intersection impact is considered to be *significant and unavoidable*.
- *Bayshore Boulevard/Sunnydale Avenue:* Modify signal timing by shifting 4 seconds from the northbound/southbound left-turn movements to the eastbound/westbound movements and restripe the eastbound and westbound approaches to create two lanes at the intersection: a shared left-through lane and exclusive right-turn lane. Implementation of this mitigation could potentially impact transit operations; this 2025 cumulative intersection impact is considered to be *significant and unavoidable*.
- *Tunnel Avenue/Blanken Avenue:* Signalize the intersection. It would be possible to modify this intersection from an all-way stop to a

MTA, DPW and/or SFRA, and individual development applicants

Second phase of development

Second phase of development

Major phase approval

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/Schedule
--------------------	-----------------------------------	---------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------

signalized intersection under the 2025 Cumulative condition. Implementation of this mitigation would reduce measure would reduce this impact to a *less-than significant* level.

Mitigation 8-9: The addition of Project-related transit trips would not result in a significant impact to transit capacity (existing transit services currently have capacity to accommodate the new trips). As a result, no transit service capacity mitigation measures would be required. However, the new vehicle-trips generated by the Project would result in long delays at several Bayshore Boulevard intersections, as indicated above under Impacts 8-1, 8-3 and 8-4. Related intersection improvement and left-turn pocket extension measures have been identified under Mitigations 8-1, 8-3 and 8-4 to mitigate these traffic impacts. Because these measures would not fully mitigate the associated traffic impacts, and could result in additional impacts associated with the relocation of a Muni bus stop, this Project-related local transit service delay impact would be considered *significant and unavoidable*.

MTA, DPW SFRA, and individual development applicants

Element at each phase

MTA, DPW and/or SFRA

Include in applicable major phase application plans

Implementation of *Mitigation 8-1C (Transportation Management Plan)* would help decrease the number of vehicle trips generated by the Project and reduce the magnitude of the Project’s impact on transit operations at these locations, but not to a less-than-significant level.

MTA, DPW SFRA, and individual development applicants

Element at each phase

MTA, DPW or SFRA

Include in applicable major phase application plans

In addition, to encourage additional transit riders (thereby further reducing the amount of vehicular activity), the Project could implement the following measures:

- Consistent with the Design for Development, implement building design features that promote the primary access to new Project Area buildings from transit stops and pedestrian areas, and discourage the location of primary access points to new Project Area buildings through parking lots and other auto-oriented entryways.
- Implement recommendations of the *San Francisco Better Streets Plan* in the Project Area, which are designed to make the pedestrian environment safer and more comfortable for pedestrians, including traffic calming strategies, sidewalk corner bulbs, and other features.

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/Schedule
Provide transit amenities at key light rail and bus stops in the Project Area, including “Next Bus” passenger information, accurate and usable passenger information and maps, and adequate light, shelter, and sitting areas.				
Mitigation 8-10: Impacts on Bicycle Conditions. To mitigate this potential impact to the Bayshore Boulevard bicycle lane, do not provide the proposed new southbound left-turn into Redevelopment Zone 1 at Leland Avenue. To mitigate additional bicycle impacts establish an internal connection from Redevelopment Zone 1 to the east side of Bayshore Boulevard/Geneva intersection. This mitigation would reduce the Project’s impact on bicycle conditions to <i>a less-than-significant</i> level.	MTA, DPW and/or SFRA, and individual development applicants	Second Phase of Development	MTA, DPW and/or SFRA	Include in applicable major phase application plans

AIR QUALITY

Mitigation 9-1A: Remediation- and Construction-Related Air Quality Impacts. For all <i>demolition</i> activity in the Project Area, require implementation of the following dust control measures by demolition contractors, where applicable:	Project Applicant	Continuous throughout demolition activity	DBI, BAAQMD, DTSC	Continuous throughout demolition activity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Water active demolition areas to control dust generation during demolition of structures and break-up of pavement. ▪ Cover all trucks hauling demolition debris from the site. ▪ Use dust-proof chutes to load debris into trucks whenever feasible. ▪ Apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers demolition areas after completion of demolition activities. <p>Implementation of these measures would reduce the demolition-related air quality impacts to a <i>less-than-significant level</i>.</p>				
Mitigation 9-1B. For all <i>remediation, grading, or construction</i> activity in the Project Area, require implementation of the following dust control measures by construction (also remediation) contractors, where applicable:	Project Applicant	Continuous throughout demolition activity	DBI, BAAQMD, DTSC	Continuous throughout demolition activity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Water all active remediation and construction areas at least twice daily, or as needed to prevent visible dust plumes from blowing off-site. ▪ Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials. 				

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/Schedule
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites. ▪ Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites. ▪ Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets. ▪ Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more). ▪ Limit the area subject to excavation, grading, and other construction activity at any one time. 				

The above measures may be revised or supplemented over time by new BAAQMD regulations. Implementation of these measures would reduce the impacts to a ***less-than-significant level***.

Mitigation 9-1C. The following are measures to control emissions by diesel-powered construction (including remediation and demolition) equipment used by contractors, where applicable:

- Ensure that emissions from all on-site, diesel-powered construction equipment do not exceed 40 percent opacity for more than three minutes in any one hour. Any equipment found to exceed 40 percent opacity (or Ringelmann 2.0) shall be repaired or replaced immediately.
- The contractor shall install temporary electrical service whenever possible to avoid the need for independently powered equipment (e.g., compressors).
- Diesel equipment standing idle for more than three minutes shall be turned off. This would include trucks waiting to deliver or receive soil, aggregate or other bulk materials. Rotating drum concrete trucks could keep their engines running continuously as long as they were on-site and away from residences.
- Properly tune and maintain equipment for low emissions.
- Use late model heavy-duty diesel-powered equipment at each construction site to the extent that the equipment is readily available in the San Francisco Bay Area.
- Use diesel-powered equipment that has been retrofitted with after-treatment products (e.g., engine catalyts) to the extent

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/Schedule
<p>that it is readily available in the San Francisco Bay Area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible. ▪ Install wheel washers for all exiting trucks, or wash off the tires or tracks of all trucks and equipment leaving the site. ▪ Install wind breaks, or plant trees/vegetation wind breaks at windward side(s) of construction sites. ▪ Suspend excavation and grading where winds (instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 miles per hour. ▪ Use low-emission diesel fuel and/or biodiesel for all heavy-duty diesel-powered equipment operating and refueling at each construction site to the extent that the fuel is readily available and cost effective in the San Francisco Bay Area (this does not apply to diesel-powered trucks traveling to and from the site). ▪ Utilize alternative fuel construction equipment (i.e., compressed natural gas, liquid petroleum gas, and unleaded gasoline) to the extent that the equipment is readily available and cost-effective in the San Francisco Bay Area. 	Project Applicant	Continuous throughout demolition activity	MTA, SFRA, BAAQMD, DTSC	Continuous throughout demolition activity
<p>Mitigation 9-2. Apply the following emissions control strategies where applicable to Project-facilitated discretionary mixed use, residential, commercial, and cultural development activities within the Project Area in order to reduce overall emissions from traffic and area sources.</p> <p><i>Transportation Emissions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New or modified roadways should include bicycle lanes where reasonable and feasible. ▪ Provide transit information kiosks. ▪ Where practical, employment-intensive development proposals (e.g., retail) shall include measures to encourage use of public transit, ridesharing, van pooling, use of bicycles, and walking, as well as to minimize single passenger motor vehicle use. ▪ Develop parking enforcement and fee strategies that encourage alternative modes of transportation. ▪ Parking lots or facilities should provide preferential parking for electric or alternatively fueled vehicles. ▪ Implement and enforce truck idling restrictions of three minutes. ▪ Require large commercial land uses (e.g., 10,000 square feet or 25 employees) that would generate home-to-work commute trips to implement Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs. Components of these programs should include the 	Project Applicant	Continuous throughout demolition activity	MTA, SFRA, BAAQMD, DTSC	Continuous throughout demolition activity

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/Schedule
<p>following (also see similar measures in <i>Mitigation 8-1C</i> [chapter 8, Transportation and Circulation] of this EIR):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a carpool/vanpool program, e.g., carpool ride-matching for employees, assistance with vanpool formation, provision of vanpool vehicles, etc.; - a transit use incentive program for employees, such as on-site distribution of passes and/or subsidized transit passes for local transit systems; - a guaranteed ride home program; and/or - a parking cash-out program for employees (where non-driving employees receive transportation allowance equivalent to the value of subsidized parking). 				

Building Emissions:

- Require energy efficient building designs that exceed State Title 24 building code requirements.
- Discourage use of gasoline-powered landscape equipment, especially two-stroke engines and motors (which burn and leak oil), for public park maintenance.
- Allow only low-emitting fireplaces for residential uses, such as those that burn only natural gas (standard City requirement for multi-family residences).

The above measures may be revised or supplemented over time by new BAAQMD regulations. Implementation of these measures would reduce the remediation-, demolition-, and construction-related air quality impacts of diesel-powered equipment to a *less-than-significant level*.

CULTURAL AND HISTORICAL RESOURCES

<p>Mitigation 10-1 Destruction or Degradation of Historical Resources. The following mitigation measures should be considered if proposed changes to a historical resource are not in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior’s standards.</p> <p><i>a) Documentation.</i> In consultation with a Planning Department Preservation Technical Specialist, the individual project applicant shall have documentation of the affected historical resource and its setting</p>	Development Applicant	Initiate before demolition	Planning Department	Initiate before demolition
---	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------	----------------------------

Mitigation Measure**Responsibility for Implementation****Mitigation Schedule****Monitoring Responsibility****Monitoring Actions/Schedule**

prepared. Generally, this documentation shall be in accordance with one of three documentation levels associated with the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) or Historic American Engineering Record (HAER). The Specialist, possibly in consultation with the National Park Service Regional Office, can decide the most appropriate form of documentation, depending on the significance of the affected resource. The three possible documentation level protocols are described under this mitigation in chapter 10 of this EIR.

The agreed-upon documentation shall be filed with the San Francisco History Center at the Main Library, as well as with other local libraries and historical societies, as appropriate.

(b) Oral Histories. The individual project applicant shall undertake an oral history project that includes interviews of several long-time residents of Visitacion Valley and former employees of the Schlage Lock Factory. This program shall be conducted by a professional historian in conformance with the Oral History Association's *Principles and Standards* (http://alpha.dickinson.edu/oha/pub_eg.html). In addition to transcripts of the interviews, the oral history project shall include a narrative project summary report containing an introduction to the project, a methodology description, and brief summaries of each conducted interview. Copies of the completed oral history project shall be submitted to the San Francisco History Room of the Main Library.

Project Applicant

Initiate before demolition permit and ongoing after demolition

Planning Department

Initiate before demolition and ongoing after demolition

(c) Relocation. Study the feasibility of reacting historical resources aster nearby site appropriate to its historic setting and general environment. A moved building or structure that is otherwise eligible may be listed in the California Register if it was moved to prevent its demolition at its former location and if the new location is compatible with the original character and use of the historical resource. After relocation, the building's preservation, rehabilitation, and restoration, as appropriate, shall follow the Secretary of the Interior's standards to ensure that the building retains its integrity and historical significance.

Project Applicant

Before demolition permit for applicable building

Planning Department

Initiate before demolition and ongoing after demolition

(d) Salvage. If the affected historical resource can neither be preserved at its current site nor moved to an alternative site and is to be demolished, the

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/Schedule
individual project applicant shall consult with a San Francisco Planning Department Preservation Technical Specialist and other local historical societies regarding salvage of materials from the affected historic resource for public information or reuse in other locations. Demolition may proceed only after any significant historic features or materials have been identified and their removal completed.	Project Applicant	Before demolition permit for applicable building	Planning Department	Initiate before demolition and ongoing after demolition
<i>(e) Commemoration.</i> If the affected historical resource can neither be preserved at its current site nor moved to an alternative site and is to be demolished, the individual project applicant shall, with the assistance of a Planning Department Preservation Technical Specialist or other professionals experienced in creating historical exhibits, incorporate a display featuring historic photos of the affected resource and a description of its historical significance into the publicly accessible portion of any subsequent development on the site. In addition, the factory machinery in Schlage Plants 1 and 2 should be cleaned and moved to a public space (such as a park or plaza on-site) for public viewing.	Project Applicant	Condition for demolition permit for applicable building; ongoing implementation as required by measure	SFRA, Planning Department	Initiate before demolition and ongoing after demolition
<i>(f) Contribution to a Historic Preservation Fund.</i> If an affected historical resource can neither be reserved at its current site nor moved to an alternative site and is demolished, the project applicant may be eligible to mitigate project- related impacts by contributing funds to the City to be applied to future historic preservation activities, including survey work, research and evaluation, and rehabilitation of historical resources within Visitacion Valley in accordance with the Secretary’s Standards. Contribution to the preservation fund would be made only after the documentation, oral history, salvage, and commemoration mitigations specified above had been completed. The details of such an arrangement would be formulated on a case-by-case basis, and could also include in-kind implementation of historic resource preservation. As part of any such arrangement, the project applicant shall clearly demonstrate the economic infeasibility of other mitigation measures that would mitigate impacts to historical resources, including preservation, relocation, and project modification.	Project Applicant	Ongoing implementation as required by measure	SFRA, Planning Department	Initiate before demolition and ongoing after demolition
While implementation of these measures would reduce impacts on historical resources, the impact would remain <i>significant and unavoidable</i> .				

Mitigation Measure**Responsibility for Implementation****Mitigation Schedule****Monitoring Responsibility****Monitoring Actions/Schedule**

Mitigation 10-2: Disturbance of Known Archaeological Resources.

The project sponsor shall retain the services of a qualified archaeological consultant having expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archeology. The archaeological consultant shall consult with the Major Environmental Analysis archaeologist at the San Francisco Planning Department to determine project locations and activities that may affect archaeological deposits/features associated with known archaeological resource sites. Project activities determined to potentially affect these resources shall be subject to an archaeological testing program (ATP) as specified under this mitigation heading in chapter 10 of this EIR. In addition, the consultant shall be available to conduct an archaeological monitoring program (AMP) and/or archaeological data recovery program (ADRP) and, if necessary, a human remains treatment program and final archaeological resources report (FARR) as specific under this mitigation heading in Chapter 10 of this EIR. The archaeological consultant's work shall be conducted in accordance with this measure at the direction of the City's Environmental Review Officer (ERO).

Project Applicant,
SFRA, Project
ArchaeologistPrior to preparation
of the ATP
&project soils
disturbance
(including
demolition and
excavation)

SFRA, ERO

Sufficiently in
advance of project
for preparation &
ERO review &
approval of ATP

All plans and reports prepared by the consultant as specified herein shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment, shall be considered draft reports, subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Archaeological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction of the project for up to a maximum of four weeks. At the direction of the ERO suspension of construction can be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce to a less-than-significant level potential effects on a significant archaeological resource as defined in CEQA.

Archaeological Testing Program. The archaeological consultant shall prepare and submit to the ERO for review and approval an archaeological testing plan (ATP). An archaeological testing program shall be conducted in accordance with the approved ATP. The ATP shall identify the property types of the expected archaeological resource(s) that potentially could be adversely affected by the project, the testing method to be used, and the locations recommended for

Project
ArchaeologistPrior to preparation
of the ATP
&project soils

SFRA, ERO

Sufficiently in
advance of project
for preparation &

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/Schedule
<p>testing.</p> <p>The purpose of the archaeological testing program will be to determine to the extent possible the presence or absence of archaeological resources to identify and to evaluate whether any archaeological resource encountered on the site constitutes a historical resource under CEQA.</p>	Project Archaeologist	disturbance (including demolition and excavation). NAHC and Native American consultation prior to preparation of the ATP	SFRA, ERO	ERO review & approval of ATP
<p>At the completion of the archaeological testing program, the archaeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings to the ERO. If based on the archaeological testing program the archaeological consultant finds that significant archaeological resources may be present the ERO in consultation with archaeological consultant shall determine if additional measures are warranted. Additional measures that may be undertaken include notification of designated members of the community as appropriate, archaeological data recovery program.</p>		Following completion of archaeological testing		Prior to project construction demolition and remediation
<p>If the ERO determines that a significant archaeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the project, at the discretion of the project sponsor either:</p> <p>A. The project shall be re-designed so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archaeological resource; or</p> <p>B. A data recovery program shall be implemented, unless the ERO determines that the archaeological resource is of greater interpretive than research significance and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible.</p>	Project Archaeologist	Determination as data recovery requirement	ERO	Prior to project Construction, demolition and remediation and archaeological data recovery
<p><u>Archaeological Monitoring Program (AMP)</u>. If the ERO in consultation with the archaeological consultant determines that an archaeological consultant determines that an archaeological monitoring program (AMP) shall be implemented, the AMP shall minimally include the following provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The archaeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the AMP reasonably prior to any project-related soils disturbing activities commencing. The ERO in consultation with the archaeological consultant shall determine what 		ERO, Project Archaeologist		Determination of activities to be archaeologically monitored

Mitigation Measure

Responsibility for Implementation

Mitigation Schedule

Monitoring Responsibility

Monitoring Actions/Schedule

project activities shall be archaeological monitored. In most cases, any soils disturbing activities, such as demolition, foundation removal, excavation, grading, utilities and installation, foundation work, driving of piles (foundation, shoring etc.), site remediation, etc., shall require archaeological monitoring because of the risk these activities pose to potential archaeological resources and to their depositional context.

- The archaeological consultant shall advise all project contractors to be on alert for evidence of the presence of the expected resources(s), of how to identify the evidence of the expected resource(s), and of the appropriate protocol in the event of apparent discovery of an archaeological resource.

- The archaeological monitors shall be present on the project site according to a schedule agreed upon by the archaeological consultant and the ERO until the ERO has, in consultation with project archaeological consultant determined that project construction activities could have no effects on significant depositions.

- The archaeological monitor shall record and be authorized to collect soil samples and arti-factual/ecofactual material as warranted for analysis.

- If an intact archaeological deposit is encountered, all soils disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit shall cease. The archaeological monitor shall be 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 archaeological monitor has cause to believe that the pile driving activity shall be terminated until an appropriate evaluation of the resource has been made in consultation with the ERO. The archaeological consultant shall immediately notify the ERO of the encountered archaeological deposit. The archaeological consultant shall make a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archaeological deposit, and present the finding of this assessment to the ERO.

Project Archaeologist

During project soils disturbing activities

SFRA, Project Archaeologist

During project soil disturbing activities

Project Archaeologist, SFRA

On discovery of potentially CEQA significant archaeological deposit

SFRA

During project demolition, excavation, construction, remediation activities

Whether or not significant archaeological resources are encountered, the archaeological consultant shall submit a written report of the Finding of

Mitigation Measure

Responsibility for Implementation

Mitigation Schedule

Monitoring Responsibility

Monitoring Actions/Schedule

the monitoring program to the ERO.

Archaeological Data Recovery Program (ARDP).

The archaeological data recovery program shall be conducted in accord with an archaeological data recovery plan (ARDP). The archaeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the ARDP prior to preparation of a draft ARDP. The archaeological consultant shall submit a draft ARDP to the ERO. The ARDP shall identify how the proposed data recovery program will preserve the significant information the archaeological resource is expected to contain. That is, the ARDP will identify what scientific/historical research questions are applicable to the expected resource, what data classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions. Data recovery, in general should be limited to the portions of the historical property that could be adversely affected by the project. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be applied to portions of the archaeological resources if non destructive methods are practical.

Project Archaeologist, ERO, SFRA

On completion of archaeological data recovery

SFRA

Upon completion of archaeological monitoring program

Project Archaeologist, ERO, SFRA

Prior to Archaeological data recovery

SFRA, ERO

Prior to archaeological data recovery

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 nonintentionally damaging activities.
- *Final Report.* Description of proposed report format and distribution of results.
- *Curation.* Description of the procedures and recommendations for die 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

Mitigation Measure

Responsibility for Implementation

Mitigation Schedule

Monitoring Responsibility

Monitoring Actions/Schedule

Human Remains, Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects.

The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and Federal Laws, including immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the Coroner's determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission (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 dignity, human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects (CEQA Guidelines, Sec. 15064.5(d)). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, curation, possession, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects.

Project Archaeologist, ERO, SFRA in consultation with the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco, Native American Heritage Commission, and Most Likely

Upon identification of human remains

SFRA, ERO

On discovery of human remains

Final Archeological Resources Report. The archeological consultant shall submit a Draft Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical 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 draft final report. Copies of the Draft FARR shall be sent to the ERO for review and approval.

Project Archaeologist

Upon completion of FARR

SFRA, ERO

Upon completion of Draft FARR

Once approved by the ERO copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archeological 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. Copies of the FARR shall be sent to the Agency. The Major Environmental Analysis division of the Planning Department shall receive three copies of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest or interpretive value, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.

Submittal of

Completion of

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/Schedule
<p>Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest or interpretive value, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.</p> <p>Implementation of the measures listed above would reduce this impact to a <i>less-than-significant level</i>.</p>	<p>Project Archaeologist</p>	<p>approved FARR and site records to NWIC</p>	<p>SFRA, ERO</p>	<p>archaeological field, analysis, interpretation, recordation program</p>

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/Schedule
<p>Mitigation 10-3: Disturbance of Unknown Archaeological Resources. The project applicant shall consult with the Major Environmental Analysis archaeologist at the San Francisco Planning Department prior to any development activity on the Schlage Lock site (i.e., Redevelopment Zone 1) and, at the direction of the Planning Department, shall undertake the following measures to avoid any potentially significant adverse impact on possible buried or submerged cultural resources.</p>	Project Applicant	Prior to demolition and grading permits; ongoing implementation as required by measure	SFRA, Planning Department	SFRA to require prior to demolition as part of Project level plan review; ongoing monitoring and consultation as required by measure

The project sponsor shall retain the services of a qualified archaeological consultant having expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archaeology. The archaeological consultant shall undertake an archaeological monitoring program (AMP), and if triggered by the AMP, an archaeological data recovery program (ADRP), human remains treatment program, and/or final archaeological resources report (FARR), as specified under this mitigation heading in chapter 10 of this EIR and detailed in Mitigation 10-2. The archaeological consultants work shall be conducted in accordance with this measure at the direction of the City's Environmental Review Officer (ERO).

Implementation of this measure would reduce the impact to a *less-than-significant level*.

<p>Mitigation 10-4: Accidental Discovery. For individual development projects in Redevelopment Zone 2, the project applicant shall consult with the Major Environmental Analysis archaeologist at the San Francisco Planning Department prior to any development activity and, at the direction of the Planning Department, shall undertake the following measures to avoid any potentially significant adverse impact on possible buried or submerged cultural resources.</p>	Project Applicant	Prior to grading and demolition permits; ongoing implementation as required by measure	SFRA, Planning Department	Ongoing implementation as required by measure
---	-------------------	--	---------------------------	---

The project sponsor shall distribute the San Francisco Planning Department archaeological resource "ALERT" sheet to the project prime contractor; to any project subcontractor (including demolition, excavation, grading, foundation, pile driving, etc., firms); and utilities firm involved in soils disturbing activities within the project site. Prior to any soils disturbing activities being undertaken each contractor is responsible for ensuring that the "ALERT" sheet is circulated to all field personnel

Mitigation Measure**Responsibility for Implementation****Mitigation Schedule****Monitoring Responsibility****Monitoring Actions/Schedule**

including, machine operators, field crew, pile drivers, supervisory personnel, etc. The project sponsor shall provide the City's Environmental Review Officer (ERO) with assigned affidavit from the responsible parties (prime contractor, subcontractors, and utilities firm) to the ERO confirming that all field personnel have received copies of the "ALERT" Sheet.

Should any indication of an archaeological resource be encountered during any soils disturbing activity of the project, the project Head Foreman and/or project sponsor shall immediately notify the ERO and shall immediately suspend any soils disturbing activities in the vicinity of the discovery until the ERO has determined what additional measures should be undertaken. Notification shall also include designated members of the community as appropriate.

If the ERO determines that an archaeological resource may be present within the project site, the project sponsor shall retain the services of a qualified archaeological consultant. The archaeological consultant shall advise the ERO as to whether the discovery is an archaeological resource, retains sufficient integrity, and is of potential scientific/historical/ cultural significance. If an archaeological resource is present, the archaeological consultant shall identify and evaluate the archaeological resource. The archaeological consultant shall make a recommendation as to what action, if any, is warranted. Based on this information, the ERO may require, if warranted, specific additional measures to be implemented by the project sponsor.

Measures might include: preservation in situ (in place) of the archaeological resource; an archaeological monitoring program; or an archaeological testing program. If an archaeological monitoring program or archaeological testing program is required, it shall be consistent with the City's Major Environmental Analysis (MEA) division guidelines for such programs. The ERO may also require that the project sponsor immediately implement a site security program if the archaeological resource is at risk from vandalism, looting, or other damaging actions.

The project archaeological consultant shall submit a Final Archaeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO pursuant to the

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/Schedule
<p>FARR content and distribution requirements described under this mitigation measure in chapter 10 of this EIR.</p> <p>Implementation of this measure would reduce the impact to a <i>less-than-significant level</i>.</p>				
<p>Mitigation 10-5: Disturbance of Paleontological Resources If any paleontological resources are encountered during site grading or other construction activities, all ground disturbances shall be halted until the services of a qualified paleontologist can be retained to identify and evaluate the resource(s) and, if necessary, recommend mitigation measures to document and prevent any significant adverse effects on the resource(s), in accordance with standard professional practice. Implementation of this measure would reduce the impact to a <i>less-than-significant level</i>.</p>	Project Applicant	If triggered by 10-2;10-3 or 10-4	SFRA	Ongoing implementation as required by measure

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

<p>Mitigation 11-1: Potential Impacts Due to Exposure to Existing Soil or Groundwater Contamination--Redevelopment Zone 2. Each developer of a site in Redevelopment Zone 2 shall be required to comply with all applicable existing local-, state-, and federal-mandated site assessment, remediation, and disposal requirements for soil, surface water, and/or groundwater contamination. In particular, these include the requirements of the City and County of San Francisco, RWQCB, and DTSC. Previous subsections 11.2.2 (City of San Francisco Hazardous Materials Regulations) and 11.2.3 (Environmental Site Assessment Procedures) herein summarize these requirements. Compliance with these existing local-, state-, and federal-mandated site assessment, remediation, and disposal requirements would be accomplished through the following steps:</p>	Project Applicant	Application for development	DPH, DTSC, RWQCB	
---	-------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	--

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/Schedule
<p><i>(a) Soil Contamination.</i> In order to mitigate potential health hazards related to construction personnel or future occupant exposure to soil contamination, developers would complete the following steps for each site proposed for disturbance as part of a Project-facilitated construction activity in Redevelopment Zone 2:</p>	Project Applicant	Applicant for Development	DPH, DTSC, RWQCB	RWQCB prior to site development; DPH and depending on the improvement DBI or DWP
<p>Step 1. Investigate the site to determine whether it has a record of hazardous material discharge (Phase I environmental site assessment), and if so, characterize the site according to the nature and extent of soil contamination that is present (Phase 2) before development activities proceed at that site.</p>				
<p>Step 2. Based on the proposed activities associated with the future project proposed, determine the need for further investigation and/or remediation of the soils conditions on the contaminated site. For example, if the location is slated for commercial land use, such as a retail center, the majority of the site will be paved and there will be little or no contact with contaminated soil. Industrial clean-up levels would likely be applicable. If the slated development activity could involve human contact with soils, such as may be the case with residential use, then Step 3 should be completed. If no human contact is anticipated, then no further mitigation is necessary.</p>				
<p>Step 3. Should the Phase 2 investigation reveal high levels of hazardous materials in the site soils, mitigate health and safety risks according to City of San Francisco, RWQCB, and DTSC regulations. This would include site-specific health and safety plans prepared prior to undertaking any building or utility construction. Also, if buildings are situated over soils that are significantly contaminated, undertake measures to either remove the chemicals or prevent contaminants from entering and collecting within the building. If remediation of contaminated soil is infeasible, a deed restriction would be necessary to limit site use and eliminate unacceptable risks to health or the environment.</p>				

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/Schedule
<p><i>(b) Surface or Groundwater Contamination.</i> In order to reduce potential health hazards due to construction personnel or future occupant exposure to surface water or groundwater contamination, developers would complete the following steps for each site proposed for disturbance as part of a Project-facilitated construction activity in Redevelopment Zone 2:</p>	Project Applicant	Applicant for Development	DPH, DTSC, RWQCB	RWQCB prior to site development; DPH and depending on the improvement DBI or DWP
<p>Step 1. Investigate the site to determine whether it has a record of hazardous material discharge into surface or groundwater, and if so, characterize the site according to the nature and extent of contamination that is present before development activities proceed at that site.</p>				
<p>Step 2. Install drainage improvements in order to prevent transport and spreading of hazardous materials that may spill or accumulate on-site.</p>				
<p>Step 3. If investigations indicate evidence of chemical/environmental hazards in site surface water and/or groundwater, then mitigation measures acceptable to the RWQCB and DTSC would be required to remediate the site <u>prior</u> to development activity.</p>				
<p>Step 4. Inform construction personnel of the proximity to recognized contaminated sites and advise them of health and safety procedures to prevent exposure to hazardous chemicals in surface water/groundwater.</p>				
<p>Compliance by future, individual, site-specific developments in Redevelopment Zone 2 with established regulations (accomplished through the steps outlined above) would adequately assure that associated potential health and safety impacts due to exposure to existing soil and groundwater contamination would be <i>less-than-significant</i>.</p>				

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Mitigation 12-1A: Potential Water Quality Impact Due to Increased Project Applicant Submit as part of DPW, DBI, Review as part of

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/Schedule
<p>Stormwater Runoff. To comply with anticipated SFPUC regulations regarding stormwater runoff from Redevelopment Zone 1, the developer(s) shall refine the individual development design(s) for Zone 1 as necessary to: (1) provide retention storage facilities and/or detention treatment facilities as needed to ensure that at least 80 percent of total annual runoff either remains on-site or receives an approved level of water quality treatment before discharge into the combined sewer system; and (2) provide a minimum of 25 percent of the surface of setbacks to be pervious. Implementation of these measures would reduce the water quality impact associated with future development of Zone 1 to a <i>less-than-significant level</i>.</p>		subdivision improvement plans	SFPUC	design and construction plans
<p>Mitigation 12-1B. Stormwater design requirements similar to those described above for the Zone 1 development shall also be applied to individual infill developments in Zone 2 that meet the proposed SFPUC minimum size criteria. Implementation of these measures would reduce the water quality impact associated with future development of these parcels to a <i>less-than-significant level</i>.</p>				
<p>Mitigation 12-2: Increased Risk of Soil Erosion and Contaminant Spills During Project Remediation and Construction. For future development within Zone 1, design requirements and implementation measures for minimizing Project-generated erosion and for controlling fuel/hazardous material spills would be set forth in the Zone 1 SWPPP, in accordance with SWRCB and RWQCB design standards. During construction, the SFDPW would monitor implementation of the approved SWPPP. This plan shall include, at a minimum, the following or similar actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Following demolition of existing improvements, stabilize areas not scheduled for immediate construction with planted vegetation or erosion control blankets; ▪ Collect stormwater runoff into stable drainage channels from small drainage basins, to prevent the buildup of large, potentially erosive stormwater flows; ▪ Direct runoff away from all areas disturbed by construction; ▪ Use sediment ponds or siltation basins to trap eroded soils before runoff is discharged into on-site channels or the combined sewer system; ▪ To the extent possible, schedule major site development work 	DBI, SFPUC and or SFRA, and individual development applicants	Infrastructure plans with first major phase	SFPUC	Review as part of design and construction plans

Mitigation Measure**Responsibility for Implementation****Mitigation Schedule****Monitoring Responsibility****Monitoring Actions/Schedule**

involving excavation and earthmoving activities during the dry season (May through September);

- Develop and implement a program for the handling, storage, use, and disposal of fuels and hazardous materials. The program should also include a contingency plan covering accidental hazardous material spills;
- Restrict vehicle cleaning, fueling, and maintenance to designated areas for containment and treatment of runoff; and
- After construction is completed, inspect all on-site drainage facilities for accumulated sediment, and clear these facilities of debris and sediment as necessary.

Implementation of these measures would reduce the risk of soil erosions and contaminant spills during Project remediation and construction to a *less-than-significant level*.

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/Schedule
--------------------	-----------------------------------	---------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------

NOISE

<p>Mitigation 13-1: Project-Facilitated Remediation-, Demolition-, and Construction-Period Noise. Reduce redevelopment program-related individual project remediation-, demolition-, and construction-period noise impacts on nearby residences and businesses by incorporating conditions in project demolition and construction contract agreements that stipulate the following conventional noise abatement measures:</p>	<p>DBI, DPW and/or SFRA and individual development applicants</p>	<p>Provide information regarding compliance prior to construction</p>	<p>SFRA, DPW, DBI</p>	<p>DPW/DBI to review information prior to construction site permit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Remediation and Construction Plans.</i> For major noise generating remediation and construction activities, prepare detailed remediation and construction plans identifying schedules. The plans shall identify a procedure for coordination with nearby noise ▪ <i>Remediation and Construction Scheduling.</i> Ensure that noise generating remediation and construction activity is limited to between the hours of 7:00AM to 8:00PM, Monday through Friday, and noise levels generated by construction are prohibited on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays (San Francisco Municipal Code Section 2908) ▪ <i>Remediation and Construction Equipment Noise Limits.</i> Limit all powered remediation and construction equipment to a noise level of 80 dBA or less when measured at a distance of 100 feet or an equivalent sound level when measured at some other convenient distance (San Francisco Municipal Code Section 2907) ▪ <i>Impact Tools and Equipment.</i> Equip all impact tools and equipment with intake and exhaust mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment. Equip all pavement breakers and jackhammers with acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment (San Francisco Municipal Code Section 2907) ▪ <i>Equipment Locations.</i> Locate stationary noise-generating equipment as far as possible from sensitive receptors when sensitive receptors adjoin or are near a remediation or construction site. ▪ <i>Remediation and Construction Traffic.</i> Route all remediation and construction traffic to and from the sites via designated truck routes where possible. Prohibit remediation- and construction- 				

Mitigation Measure

Responsibility for Implementation

Mitigation Schedule

Monitoring Responsibility

Monitoring Actions/Schedule

- related heavy truck traffic in residential areas where feasible.
- *Quiet Equipment Selection.* Use quiet equipment, particularly air compressors wherever possible.
- *Temporary Barriers.* Construct solid plywood fences around remediation and construction sites adjacent to residences, operational businesses, or noise-sensitive land uses.
- *Temporary Noise Blankets.* Temporary noise control blanket barriers should be erected, if necessary, along building facades of construction sites. This mitigation would only be necessary if conflict occurred which were irresolvable by proper scheduling. (Noise control blanket barriers can be rented and quickly erected.)

Noise Disturbance Coordinator. For Zone 1 remediation and larger individual construction projects, the City may choose to require project designation of a “Noise Disturbance Coordinator” who would be responsible for responding to any local complaints about remediation or construction noise. The Disturbance Coordinator would determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g. starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and institute reasonable measures to correct the problem. Conspicuously post a telephone number for the Disturbance Coordinator at the remediation/construction schedule. (The project sponsor should be responsible for designating a Noise Disturbance Coordinator, posting the phone number, and providing schedule notices. The Noise Disturbance Coordinator would work directly with an assigned City staff member).

Implementation of these measures would reduce this intermittent, short-term, Project remediation- and construction period noise impact to a *less-than significant level*.

Mitigation 13-2: Project-Facilitated Groundborne Vibration Levels. Prior to the development of habitable buildings within 110 feet of the centerline of the nearest railroad tracks, or within 55 feet of the light rail tracks, a site-specific vibration study shall be required demonstrating that ground borne vibrations associated with rail operations either (1) would not exceed the applicable FTA ground borne vibration impact assessment criteria (see Table 13.5 of this EIR), or (2) can be reduced to below the

DBI, DPW and/or SFRA and Individual development applicants

Schematic design approval

SFRA, DPW, DBI

DPW/DBI to review information prior to issuance of construction site permit

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/Schedule
--------------------	-----------------------------------	---------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------

applicable FTA criteria thresholds through building design and construction measures (e.g., stiffened floors). Implementation of this measure would reduce this potential intermittent vibration impact to a *less than significant level*.

Mitigation 13-3: Potential Exposure of New, Project-Facilitated Noise-Sensitive Development to Ambient Noise Levels Exceeding Standards. Site-specific noise studies consistent with the requirements of the State Building Code (SBC) shall be conducted for all new Project-facilitated residential uses within 75 feet of the Caltrain line and along the Bayshore Boulevard frontage to identify appropriate noise reduction measures to be included in project final design. Each noise study must be submitted to and approved by the San Francisco Planning Department and/or the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency prior to City issuance of a residential building permit. Identified noise reduction measures may include:

Project Applicant	Schematic design approval	SFRA, Planning Department	Review in all design documents
-------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------	--------------------------------

- Site planning techniques to minimize noise in shared residential outdoor activity areas by locating such noise-sensitive areas behind buildings or in courtyards, or by orienting residential terraces to alleyways rather than streets, whenever possible;
- Incorporation of an air circulation system in all affected units, which is satisfactory to the San Francisco local building official, so that windows can remain closed to maintain interior noise levels below 45 dBA L_{dn} ; and
- Incorporation of sound-rated windows and construction methods in residential units proposed along streets or the Caltrain line where noise levels would exceed 70 dB L_{dn} ; and
- Pre-Occupancy noise testing following a methodology satisfactory to the San Francisco Department of Health shall be completed prior to occupancy to demonstrate compliance with noise mitigation objectives.

Project Applicant	Schematic design approval	SFRA, Planning Department	Review in all design documents
-------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------	--------------------------------

Noise levels at multi-family residential property lines around Project-facilitated development should be maintained at an L_{eq} not in excess of 60 dBA during the daytime hours and 50 dBA during nighttime hours (10:00 P.M. to 7:00 A.M.), unless ambient noise levels are higher. In those cases, the existing ambient noise level would be the noise level standard.

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/Schedule
Individual development applicants noise level would be the noise level standard.				
Implementation of these measures to the satisfaction of the San Francisco Planning Department and/or the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency would reduce potential Project related noise impacts on new residential uses to a <i>less-than significant level</i> .				

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Mitigation 15-1: Solid Waste Diversion Impacts. The City and/or Agency shall require that final architectural designs for individual developments permitted in the Project Area indicate adequate space in buildings to accommodate three-bin recycling containers, as detailed under this mitigation in section 15.3 (Solid Waste Disposal/Recycling) of this EIR. The City shall ensure that these provisions are included in Project-facilitated building construction prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. Implementation of this measure would reduce this impact to a <i>less-than-significant level</i> .	Department of the Environment and/or SFRA and individual development applicants	Each development or schematic design application	Department of the Environment	Review within each design document
---	---	--	-------------------------------	------------------------------------

**VISITACION VALLEY REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
IMPROVEMENT MEASURES**

Improvement Measures	Improvement Responsibility	Improvement Schedule	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/Schedule
<i>TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC</i>				
<p>Improvement Measure for Impacts 8-1 and 8-9 Add bus signal prioritization for all signal improvements along Bayshore Boulevard to improve transit and traffic flows.</p>	MTA	Second phase of development	MTA	
<p>Improvement Measure for Impacts 8-1 Bayshore Boulevard/Visitacion: The Agency will study the possibility of restriping the existing Visitacion Avenue connection to the west side of Bayshore Boulevard (now two travel lanes—one eastbound and one westbound) to create three lanes—one shared left through eastbound lane, one exclusive right-turn eastbound lane, and one westbound through lane. There are secondary impacts on traffic and bus operation associated with these striping changes. Implementation of this improvement measure is contingent upon future bus operations and parking demand.</p>	SFRA	Second phase of development	MTA	
<p>Improvement Measure for Impacts 8-1 Bayshore Boulevard/Sunnydale: The Agency will study the possibility of restriping the existing Sunnydale Avenue connection to the west side of Bayshore Boulevard (now two travel lanes—one eastbound and one westbound) to create three lanes—one shared left through eastbound lane, one exclusive right-turn eastbound lane, and one westbound through lane. There are secondary impacts on traffic and bus operation associated with these striping changes. Implementation of this improvement measure is contingent upon future bus operations and parking demand.</p>	SFRA	Second phase of development	MTA	
<p>Improvement Measure for Impacts 8-1A and 8-9 Study shared use of LRV lane by buses to alleviate transit and traffic conflicts and improve anticipated delays for bus routes.</p>	MTA	Second phase of development	MTA	

Improvement Measures	Improvement Responsibility	Improvement Schedule	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Actions/Schedule
Improvement Measure for Impact 8-3 Queuing Impacts Study new Brisbane roadway connections that will be developed south of the site to improve access and alleviate queuing congestion.	SFRA/MTA/City of Brisbane	Second phase of development	SFRA,MTA	
Improvement Measure for Impacts 8-1, 8-3 and 8-9 Study bus route configuration and bus stop relocations to minimize traffic and transit delays along Bayshore Boulevard.	MTA	First phase of development	MTA	
Improvement Measure for Impact 8.8 Study transportation incentives to promote rail travel for Visitacion Valley residents, once Caltrain electrification takes place and Bayshore station receives more trains.	MTA/Developer	First phase of development	Developer, MTA	Subject to Caltrain electrification schedule
Improvement Measure for Impact 8.8 Facilitate the construction of a temporary pathway to the Caltrain Station from Bayshore Boulevard.	SFRA/City of Brisbane	First phase of development	Developer, SFRA	
Improvement Measure for Impact 8.8 The City will work with the Bi-County Study team and CalTrans to explore the utilization of HOV lanes and ramp meters in San Mateo to reduce SOV.	MTA, SFRA	First phase of development	MTA, SFRA	
Improvement Measure for Pedestrian Safety Condition In addition to the traffic calming measures described in the Design for Development, implement Bayshore Boulevard pedestrian safety measures, such as speed radar signs on Bayshore, enhanced crosswalk marking, additional signage and motorist education for the Visitacion Valley neighborhood.	MTA	First phase of development	MTA	

