



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Planning Commission Resolution No. 20183 HEARING DATE MAY 10, 2018

Project Name: Central SoMa Plan – CEQA Findings
Record No.: 2011.1356EMTZU
Staff Contact: Steve Wertheim, Principal Planner, Citywide Planning
(415) 558-6612; steve.wertheim@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 PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT, INCLUDING FINDINGS OF FACT, FINDINGS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS, EVALUATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES AND ALTERNATIVES, AND A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS RELATED TO APPROVALS FOR THE CENTRAL SOUTH OF MARKET AREA PLAN ("CENTRAL SOMA PLAN").

PREAMBLE

The San Francisco 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 Central SoMa Plan and related approval actions ("Project") and provided appropriate public hearings before the Planning Commission.

The desire for a Central SoMa Plan began during the Eastern Neighborhoods planning process. In 2008 the City adopted the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan, including new land use controls and proposed community improvements for the eastern part of the South of Market neighborhood (SoMa), as well as the Central Waterfront, Mission, and Showplace Square/Potrero Hill neighborhoods. At that time, the City determined that the development potential of the industrially zoned part of East SoMa, coupled with the improved transit to be provided by the Central Subway, necessitated a subsequent, focused planning process that took into account the city's growth needs and City and regional environmental goals. The Central SoMa Plan is the result of that subsequent process.

The Western SoMa Area Plan, adopted in 2013, also explicitly recognized the need to increase development capacity near transit in Objective 1.5, which states that the City should "Support continued evaluation of land uses near major transit infrastructure in recognition of citywide and regional sustainable growth needs." The explanatory text in Objective 1.5 concludes that "The City must continue evaluating how it can best meet citywide and regional objectives to direct growth to transit-oriented locations and whether current controls are meeting identified needs."

The Objective's implementing Policy 1.5.1 states that the City should "Continue to explore and re-examine land use controls east of 6th Street, including as part of any future evaluation along the 4th Street corridor." The Central SoMa Plan is intended to fulfill the Western SoMa Plan's Objective 1.5 and Policy 1.5.1.

The process of creating the Central SoMa Plan began in 2011. Throughout the process, the Central SoMa Plan has been developed based on robust public input, including ten public open houses; ten public hearings at the Planning Commission; two public hearings at the Board of Supervisor's Land Use & Transportation Committee; additional hearings at the Historic Preservation Commission, Arts Commission, and Youth Commission; a "technical advisory committee" consisting of multiple City and regional agencies; a "storefront charrette" (during which the Planning Department set up shop in a retail space in the neighborhood to solicit community input on the formulation of the plan); two walking tours, led by community members; two community surveys; an online discussion board; meetings with over 30 neighborhoods groups and other community stakeholders; and thousands of individual meetings, phone calls, and emails with stakeholders.

The Central SoMa Plan Area runs from 2nd Street to 6th Street, Market Street to Townsend Street, exclusive of those areas that are part of the Downtown Plan that comprise much of the area north of Folsom Street. The vision of the Central SoMa Plan is to create a sustainable neighborhood by 2040, where the needs of the present are met without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The Central SoMa Plan seeks to achieve sustainability in each of its aspects – social, economic, and environmental. The Plan's philosophy is to keep what is already successful about the neighborhood, and improve what is not. Utilizing the Plan's philosophy to achieve the Plan's vision will require implementing the following three strategies:

- Accommodate growth;
- Provide public benefits; and
- Respect and enhance neighborhood character.

Implementing the Plan's strategies will require addressing all the facets of a sustainable neighborhood. To do so, the Plan seeks to achieve eight Goals:

1. Accommodate a Substantial Amount of Jobs and Housing
2. Maintain the Diversity of Residents
3. Facilitate an Economically Diversified and Lively Jobs Center
4. Provide Safe and Convenient Transportation that Prioritizes Walking, Bicycling, and Transit
5. Offer an Abundance of Parks and Recreational Opportunities
6. Create an Environmentally Sustainable and Resilient Neighborhood
7. Preserve and Celebrate the Neighborhood's Cultural Heritage
8. Ensure that New Buildings Enhance the Character of the Neighborhood and the City.

The Plan would implement its vision, philosophy, and goals by:

- Accommodating development capacity for up to 33,000 jobs and 8,300 housing units by removing much of the area's industrially-protective zoning and increasing height limits on many of the area's parcels;
- Maintaining the diversity of residents by requiring that over 33% of new housing units are affordable to low- and moderate-income households and requiring that these new units are built in SoMa;
- Facilitating an economically diversified and lively jobs center by requiring most large sites to be jobs-oriented, by requiring production, distribution, and repair uses in many projects, and by allowing retail, hotels, and entertainment uses in much of the Plan Area;
- Providing safe and convenient transportation by funding capital projects that would improve conditions for people walking, bicycling, and taking transit;
- Offering an abundance of parks and recreational opportunities by funding the construction and improvement of parks and recreation centers in the area and requiring large non-residential projects to provide publicly-accessible open space;
- Creating an environmentally sustainable and resilient neighborhood by requiring green roofs and use of non-greenhouse gas energy sources, while funding projects to improve air quality, provide biodiversity, and help manage stormwater;
- Preserving and celebrating the neighborhood's cultural heritage by helping fund the rehabilitation and maintenance of historic buildings and funding social programs for the neighborhood's existing residents and organizations; and
- Ensuring that new buildings enhance the character of the neighborhood and the city by implementing design controls that would generally help protect the neighborhood's mid-rise character and street fabric, create a strong street wall, and facilitate innovative yet contextual architecture.

These core policies and supporting discussion have been incorporated into the Central SoMa Plan, which is proposed to be added as an Area Plan in the General Plan. The Central SoMa Plan and conforming amendments to the General Plan, together with proposed Planning Code, Administrative Code, and Zoning Map Amendments and an Implementation Document, provide a comprehensive set of policies and implementation programming to realize the vision of the Plan. The Implementation Document describes how the Plan's policies will be implemented, outlines public improvements, funding mechanisms, and interagency coordination that the City must pursue to implement the Plan, and provides controls for key development sites and key streets and design guidance for new development.

Since the Central SoMa Plan process began in 2011, the Planning Department has undertaken the environmental review process required by CEQA. Pursuant to and in accordance with the requirements of Section 21083.9 of the Public Resources Code and Section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, the Department, as lead agency, published and circulated a Notice of Preparation ("NOP") on April 24, 2013, which notice solicited comments regarding the scope of the environmental impact report ("EIR") for the proposed project. The NOP and its 30-day public review comment period were advertised in a newspaper of general circulation in San Francisco and mailed to governmental agencies, organizations and persons interested in the potential

impacts of the proposed project. The Department held a public scoping meeting on May 15, 2013 at The Mendelson House, located at 737 Folsom Street, San Francisco, CA 94107.

During the approximately 30-day public scoping period that ended on May 24, 2013, the Department accepted comments from agencies and interested parties that identified environmental issues that should be addressed in the EIR. Comments received during the scoping process were considered in preparation of the Draft EIR.

Pursuant to Section 15063 of the CEQA Guidelines, the Department published an Initial Study on February 12, 2014 in order to focus the scope of the EIR. The Department made the Initial Study available for a 30-day public review period beginning on February 12, 2014 and ending on March 14, 2014. The Department considered the comments received on the Initial Study when preparing the Draft EIR.

The Department prepared the Draft EIR, which describes the Draft EIR Project and the environmental setting, analyzes potential impacts, identifies mitigation measures for impacts found to be significant or potentially significant, and evaluates alternatives to the Draft EIR Project. The Draft EIR assesses the potential construction and operational impacts of the Draft EIR Project on the environment, and the potential cumulative impacts associated with the Draft EIR Project in combination with other past, present, and future actions with potential for impacts on the same resources. The analysis of potential environmental impacts in the Draft EIR utilizes significance criteria that are based on the guidance prepared by Department's Environmental Planning Division regarding the environmental effects to be considered significant. The Environmental Planning Division's guidance is, in turn, based on CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, with some modifications.

The Department published a Draft EIR on December 14, 2016, and circulated the Draft EIR to local, state, and federal agencies and to interested organizations and individuals for public review. On December 14, 2016, the Department also distributed notices of availability of the Draft EIR; published notification of its availability in a newspaper of general circulation in San Francisco; posted the notice of availability at the San Francisco County Clerk's office; and posted notices at locations within the project area. The Commission held a public hearing on January 26, 2017, to solicit testimony on the Draft EIR during the public review period. A court reporter, present at the public hearing, transcribed the oral comments verbatim, and prepared written transcripts. The Department also received written comments on the Draft EIR, which were sent through mail, fax, hand delivery, or email. The Department accepted public comment on the Draft EIR until February 13, 2017.

The Department then prepared the Comments and Responses to Comments on Draft EIR document ("RTC"). The RTC document was published on March 28, 2018, and includes copies of all of the comments received on the Draft EIR and written responses to each comment. In addition to describing and analyzing the physical, environmental impacts of the revisions to the Project, the RTC document provided additional, updated information, clarification, and modifications on issues raised by commenters, as well as Planning Department staff-initiated text changes to the Draft EIR.

The Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR"), which includes the Draft EIR, the RTC document, the errata dated May 3, 2018, the Appendices to the Draft EIR and RTC document, and all of the supporting information, has been reviewed and considered. The RTC documents and appendices and all supporting information do not add significant new information to the Draft EIR that would individually or collectively constitute significant new information within the meaning of Public Resources Code Section 21092.1 or CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 so as to require recirculation of the Final EIR (or any portion thereof) under CEQA. The RTC documents and appendices and all supporting information contain no information revealing (1) any new significant environmental impact that would result from the Project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented, (2) any substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified environmental impact, (3) any feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed that would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the Project, but that was rejected by the project sponsor, or (4) that the Draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

On May 10, 2018, by Motion No. 20182, the Commission reviewed and considered the Final EIR for the Project and found the contents of said report and the procedures through which the Final EIR was prepared, publicized, and reviewed complied with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

On May 10, 2018, by Motion No. 20182, the Commission found that the Final EIR was adequate, accurate, and objective, that it reflected the independent analysis and judgment of the Department and the Planning Commission, and that the summary of comments and responses contained no significant revisions to the Draft EIR, and certified the completion of the Final EIR for the Project in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31.

The Planning Department prepared proposed Findings, as required by CEQA, regarding the alternatives, mitigation measures, and significant impacts analyzed in the Final EIR, and overriding considerations for approving the Project and a proposed mitigation monitoring and reporting program ("MMRP"), attached as Exhibit B, which material was made available to the public and this Planning Commission for the Planning Commission's review, consideration, and actions.

The Commission, in certifying the Final EIR, found that the Project described in the Final EIR:

- A. Will result in the following significant and unavoidable project-specific environmental impacts, which cannot be mitigated to a level of insignificance:
 - a. Central SoMa Plan development, including proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating and environmental effect. Specifically, the Plan could result in traffic noise along Howard Street (under the two-way option

for Howard and Folsom streets) that exceeds the noise standards in the General Plan's Environmental Protection Element.

- b. Central SoMa Plan development would result in the demolition or substantial alteration of individually identified historic architectural resources and/or contributors to a historic district or conservation district located in the Plan area, including as-yet unidentified resources, a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5.
- c. Central SoMa Plan development, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would result in a substantial increase in transit demand that would not be accommodated by local transit capacity, and would cause a substantial increase in delays resulting in adverse impacts on local and regional transit routes.
- d. Central SoMa Plan development, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would result in crosswalk overcrowding at the following intersections:
 - i. Third/Mission
 - ii. Fourth/Mission
 - iii. Fourth/Townsend
- e. Central SoMa Plan development would result in an increased demand for on-street commercial and passenger loading and a reduction in on-street loading supply such that the loading demand during the peak hour of loading activities would not be accommodated within on-street loading supply, would impact existing passenger loading/unloading zones, and may create hazardous conditions or significant delay that may affect transit, other vehicles, bicycles, or pedestrians.
- f. Construction activities associated with Central SoMa Plan development, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would result in substantial interference with pedestrian, bicycle, or vehicle circulation and accessibility to adjoining areas, and would result in potentially hazardous conditions.
- g. Central SoMa Plan development, including the proposed street network changes, would generate noise that would result in exposure of persons to noise levels in excess of standards in the *San Francisco General Plan* or Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the *Police Code*), and would result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise above existing levels.

- h. Central SoMa Plan development, including the proposed street network changes and open space improvements, would result in construction activities in the Plan Area that could expose persons to substantial temporary or periodic increase in noise levels substantially in excess of ambient levels.
 - i. The operation of subsequent individual development projects in the Central SoMa Plan Area and the proposed street network changes (but not the proposed open space improvements) would violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, and/or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.
 - j. Central SoMa Plan development, including the proposed street network changes, would result in operational emissions of fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) and toxic air contaminants that would result in exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
 - k. Subsequent future development under the Plan could alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas.
- B. Will contribute considerably to the following cumulative environmental impacts, which cannot be mitigated to a level of insignificance:
- a. Central SoMa Plan development, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would contribute considerably to a significant cumulative land use impact. Specifically, one-way and two-way options for Folsom and Howard Streets could make a considerable contribution to cumulative traffic noise levels, which would exceed the noise standards in the General Plan's Environmental Protection Element.
 - b. Central SoMa Plan development would contribute considerably to significant cumulative historical resources impacts because the Plan could result in demolition and/or alteration of historical resources.
 - c. Central SoMa Plan development, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would contribute considerably to significant cumulative transit impacts on local and regional transit providers.
 - d. Central SoMa Plan development, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would contribute considerably to significant cumulative pedestrian impacts.
 - e. Central SoMa Plan development, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would contribute considerably to significant cumulative loading impacts.


- f. Central SoMa development, including the proposed street network changes and open space improvements, would result in cumulative noise impacts.
- g. Central SoMa development, including the proposed street network changes, but not open space improvements, would contribute considerably to criteria air pollutant impacts under cumulative 2040 conditions.
- h. Central SoMa Plan development, including the proposed street network changes but not open space improvements, would result in exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial levels of fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) and toxic air contaminants under 2040 cumulative conditions.

The Planning Commission Secretary is the custodian of records for the Planning Department materials, located in the File for Case No. 2011.1356EMTZU, at 1650 Mission Street, Fourth Floor, San Francisco, California, 94103.

On May 10, 2018, the Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting on Case No. 2011.1356EMTZU to consider the various approvals necessary to implement the Project, including approvals of General Plan, Planning Code, Administrative Code, and Zoning Map Amendments, and approval of the Implementation Program. The Commission has heard and considered the testimony presented to it at the public hearing and has further considered written materials and oral testimony presented on behalf of the Project, the Planning Department staff, expert consultants, and other interested parties.

MOVED, that the Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the Final EIR and the entire record of this proceeding, including the comments and submissions made to the Commission and the Department's responses to those comments and submissions, and, based on substantial evidence, hereby adopts these Environmental Findings required by CEQA attached hereto as Exhibit A, including a Statement of Overriding Considerations and rejecting alternatives as infeasible, and adopts the MMRP, included as Exhibit B, as a condition of approval for each and all of the approval actions described above.

I hereby certify that the Planning Commission ADOPTED the foregoing Motion on May 10, 2018.



Jonas P. Iorin
Commission Secretary

AYES: Hillis, Melgar, Fong, Johnson, Koppel, Moore, Richards
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
ADOPTED: May 10, 2018



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

ATTACHMENT A

Central SoMa Plan

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

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION

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

SECTION I

Introduction

This document is organized as follows:

- **Section I** provides a description of the Project, the environmental review process for the Project, the Planning Commission actions to be taken, and the location of records;
- **Section II** identifies the impacts found not to be significant that do not require mitigation;
- **Section III** identifies potentially significant impacts that can be avoided or reduced to less-than-significant levels through mitigation;
- **Section IV** identifies significant impacts that cannot be avoided or reduced to less-than significant levels;

- **Section V** discusses why a subsequent or supplemental environmental impact report is not required, including to address changes to the Plan that have evolved during the environmental review process and any issues that were raised during the public comment period;
- **Section VI** discusses and evaluates the different project alternatives and the economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations that support the rejection as infeasible of the alternatives analyzed; and
- **Section VII** presents a statement of overriding considerations setting forth specific reasons in support of the actions for the Project and the rejection as infeasible of the alternatives not incorporated into the Project.
- **Section VIII** contains a statement of incorporation by reference to incorporate the Final EIR into these Findings.

Attached to these findings as Exhibit B is the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the mitigation measures that have been proposed for adoption. The MMRP is required by Public Resources Code 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 B also specifies the agency responsible for implementation of each measure and establishes monitoring actions and a monitoring schedule.

These findings are based upon substantial evidence in the entire record before the Planning Commission. The references set forth in these findings to certain pages or sections of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) or Responses to Comments Document (RTC) are for ease of reference and are not intended to provide an exhaustive list of the evidence relied upon for these findings.

I.A Project Description

The Central SoMa Plan is a comprehensive plan for the area surrounding much of southern portion of the Central Subway transit line, a 1.7-mile extension of the Third Street light rail line that will link the Caltrain Depot at Fourth and King Streets to Chinatown and provide service within the South of Market (SoMa) area. The Plan Area includes roughly 230 acres that comprise 17 city blocks, as well as the streets and thoroughfares that connect SoMa to its adjacent neighborhoods: Downtown, Mission Bay, Rincon Hill, and the Mission District.

The Plan Area is bounded by Second Street on the east, Sixth Street on the west, Townsend Street on the south, and by an irregular border that generally jogs along Folsom, Howard and Stevenson Streets to the north that represents the border of the Downtown Plan Area. The project analyzed in the EIR includes street network changes throughout the Plan Area, including specific designs within, and in some cases beyond, the Plan Area for the following streets: Howard, Folsom, Harrison, Bryant, Brannan, Third, and Fourth Streets. In addition, open space improvements would also occur within and outside of the Plan Area.

The Plan envisions Central SoMa becoming a sustainable neighborhood, one in which the needs of the present may be met without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The Plan's sponsor, the City and County of San Francisco (the City), endeavors to address the social, economic, and environmental aspects of sustainability through a planning strategy that accommodates anticipated population and job growth, provides public benefits, and respects and enhances neighborhood character. That

strategy has informed the current draft of the Central SoMa Plan, which comprehensively addresses a wide range of topics that include: land use; transportation infrastructure; parks, open space and recreation facilities; ecological sustainability; historic preservation; urban design and urban form; and financial programs and implementation mechanisms to fund public improvements.

The Plan seeks to encourage and accommodate housing and employment growth by (1) removing land use restrictions to support a greater mix of uses while also emphasizing office uses in portions of the Plan Area; (2) amending height and bulk districts to allow for taller buildings; (3) modifying the system of streets and circulation within and adjacent to the Plan Area to meet the needs and goals of a dense, transit-oriented, mix-use district; and (4) creating new, and improving existing, open spaces.

The Plan also proposes project-level changes to certain individual streets analyzed in this EIR, including Howard, Folsom, Harrison, Bryant, Brannan, Third, and Fourth Streets. The EIR analyzes two different options for the couplet of Howard Street and Folsom Street. Under the One-Way Option, both streets would retain a one-way configuration (except Folsom Street east of Second Street, which would retain its existing two-way operation). Under the Two-Way Option, both streets would be converted into two-way operation, and some modifications to Harrison Street would also occur.

Plan policies include a call for public realm improvements, including planning for new open spaces; changes to the street and circulation system; policies to preserve neighborhood character and historic structures; and strategies that aim to improve public amenities and make the neighborhood more sustainable. The Plan also includes financial programs to support its public improvements through the implementation of one or more new fees, in addition to taxes or assessments on subsequent development projects.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15124, an EIR must present a statement of objectives sought by the proposed project. Objectives define the project's intent, explain the project's underlying purpose, and facilitate the formation of project alternatives. In this EIR, the Plan's eight goals are used as the project objectives. The eight goals are:

1. Accommodate a substantial amount of jobs and housing;
2. Maintain the diversity of residents;
3. Facilitate an economically diversified and lively jobs center;
4. Provide safe and convenient transportation that prioritizes walking, bicycling, and transit;
5. Offer an abundance of parks and recreational opportunities;
6. Create an environmentally sustainable and resilient neighborhood;
7. Preserve and celebrate the neighborhood's cultural heritage; and
8. Ensure that new buildings enhance the character of the neighborhood and the city.

Consistent with its goal to increase the capacity for jobs and housing (Goal 1), the Plan includes the objective of increasing the area where space for jobs and housing can be built (Objective 1.1). The Plan would accomplish this by retaining existing zoning that supports capacity for new jobs and housing, and replacing existing zoning that restricts the capacity for office and residential development with zoning that enables office and residential development.

The Plan would result in the following land use zoning changes (as shown in Figures 1A and 1B of the legislative packet's Exhibit IV.1 – Zoning Map Amendments Case Report):

- North of Harrison Street, the Mixed Use, Residential (MUR) use district west of Fifth Street would be converted to Mixed Use General (MUG). The MUR, Western SoMa-Mixed Use General (WS-MUG), and Light Industrial (M-1) use districts east of Fifth Street would be converted to Central SoMa Mixed Use Office (CMUO). The existing zoning districts either limit or do not permit office uses, whereas the MUG and CMUO zoning designations would allow for greater flexibility in the mix of land uses, including office development as well as new all-commercial buildings in the CMUO use district.
- The parcels in the block bounded by Third, Folsom, Hawthorne, and Harrison Streets currently designated C-3-O (Downtown Office) would retain this designation.
- South of Harrison Street, existing use districts would all be converted to CMUO, except for parcels currently designated South Park District (SPD) and the West SoMa Service, Arts, Light Industrial (WS-SALI) area west of Fourth Street between Harrison and Bryant Streets, which would retain their current zoning designations. Use districts in this area that would be converted to CMUO include Residential Enclave (RED), Service/Light Industrial (SLI), M-1, Public (P), West SoMa Mixed Use Office (WS-MUO), and Service Secondary Office (SSO), as well as the area south of Bryant Street currently designated WS-SALI. These existing use districts either limit or restrict office uses or, when office uses are allowed, restrict other uses, such as entertainment or residential uses. Converting these use districts to CMUO would permit a mix of land uses that allow for greater flexibility, as the CMUO district generally allows office, residential, and most other uses without limitation.

Changes to height limits under the Plan would include the following (as shown in Figures 2A and 2B of the legislative packet's Exhibit IV.1 – Zoning Map Amendments Case Report)::

- Within the Plan Area north of Harrison Street, height limits on most parcels would remain between 45 and 85 feet, though there would be several adjustments, both higher and lower, within this range.
- The Plan would substantially increase the height limit for the north side of Harrison Street between Second and Third Streets, from the current range of 85–130 feet to a range of 130–200 feet.
- Other substantial height increases north of Harrison Street would include the southwest corner of Fourth and Clementina Streets, which would increase from the current range of 55–130 feet to 180 feet; and the southwest corner of Fifth and Howard Streets, which would increase from the current range of 45–85 feet to 180–300 feet.
- South of Harrison Street, proposed amendments to permitted height limits are concentrated on the south side of Harrison Street between Second and Fourth Streets, where current height limits would be increased from 40–85 feet to 130–350 feet.
- Substantial height increases would also be concentrated south of Bryant Street, from east of Fourth Street to Sixth Street. Many sites within this area would increase from the current height limit of 30-85 feet to 130-400 feet.
- Lower height limits would be maintained around South Park, along the west side of Fourth Street between Bryant and Brannan Streets, along most of the neighborhood's alleys, and along the south side of the I-80 freeway between Fourth and Sixth Streets.

Based on the change in zoning and height limits, the Plan includes capacity for approximately 16 million square feet of new development within the Plan Area. This includes nearly capacity for 8,300 units and approximately 33,000 new jobs.

To ensure that the proposed zoning changes foster the development of a neighborhood that is consistent with the Plan's other goals, the Plan contains numerous objectives, policies, and implementation measures that limit and condition development. In particular, these relate to Goal 2, maintain the diversity of residents; Goal 3, facilitate an economically diversified and lively jobs center; Goal 7, preserve and celebrate the neighborhood's cultural heritage; and Goal 8, ensure that new buildings enhance the character of the neighborhood and the city.

To ensure that removal of protective zoning proposed by the Plan does not result in a loss of Production, Distribution, and Repair (PDR) uses in the Plan Area (Plan Objective 3.3), the Plan would maintain a portion of the current SALI use district. The Plan also contains policies and implementation measures that would limit conversion of PDR space in former industrial districts, require PDR space as part of large commercial developments, and provide incentives to fund, build, and protect PDR uses. The result would be the protection of approximately 3 million square feet of PDR space.

To implement the circulation and streetscape principles in the Plan, the EIR studied changes in the street network to support an attractive pedestrian and cycling environment and to lessen the impact of traffic on transit performance, while accommodating regional and through traffic on a limited number of streets where necessary. Specific proposals have been developed for Folsom, Harrison, Third, Fourth, Bryant, and Brannan Streets, extending as far west as Eleventh Street (in the case of Howard and Folsom Streets) and east to The Embarcadero (Folsom Street only). The proposals include widening sidewalks on all of the neighborhood's major thoroughfares, increasing the number of and safety of street crossings by facilitating signalized mid-block crossings and sidewalk bulbouts that shorten the length of crosswalks, creating protected bicycle on Howard, Folsom, Brannan, Townsend, and 5th Streets, and transit-only lanes on Folsom, Brannan, 3rd, and 4th Streets. Under the two-way option, Howard and Folsom Streets would be converted from one-way traffic to two-way operations.

The Plan also includes proposals to upgrade existing parks and create new parks and open spaces, including a new one-acre park in the block bounded by 4th, 5th, Bryant, and Brannan Streets, and a new ½ acre linear park on Bluxome Street between 4th and 5th Streets, and new recreational amenities (such as skate ramps and basketball courts) underneath the I-80 freeway between 4th and 6th Streets. The Plan also helps fund construction of a new recreation center, and up to four acres of privately-owned public open space.

The Plan also includes proposals to create a more sustainable and resilient neighborhood (through such strategies as requiring living roofs and use of 100% renewable electricity), preserve important historical and cultural features (such as landmarking important individual resources and districts), and promote high-quality urban design (through the Plan's architectural requirements and the Central SoMa Guide to Urban Design, as shown in the legislative packet Exhibit V.3C).

In addition, pursuant to Assembly Bill 73, which took effect January 1, 2018, the City is analyzing the possibility of including a Housing Sustainability District (HSD) in the Plan Area. The Final EIR analyzes the potential creation of an HSD based on the assumption that all or part of the Plan Area could be included in an HSD.

I.B Environmental Review

The Planning Department determined that an EIR was required for the Project. The Planning Department published the Draft EIR and provided public notice of the availability of the Draft EIR for public review and comment on December 14, 2016.

On December 14, 2016, a Notice of Completion and copies of the Draft EIR were distributed to the State Clearinghouse. Notices of availability for the Draft EIR of the date and time of the public hearings were posted on the Planning Department's website on December 14, 2016.

The Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing on the Draft EIR on January 26, 2017. At this hearing, public comment was received on the Draft EIR. The Planning Department accepted public comments on the Draft EIR from December 14, 2016, to February 13, 2017.

The Planning Department published the Response to Comments on the Draft EIR on March 28, 2018. This document includes responses to environmental comments on the Draft EIR made at the public hearing on January 26, 2017, as well as written comments submitted on the Draft EIR from December 14, 2016, to February 13, 2017. The Response to Comments document also contains text changes to the Draft EIR made by EIR preparers to correct or clarify information presented in the Draft EIR, including changes to the Draft EIR text made in response to comments. The Response to Comments document was distributed to the Planning Commission and to all parties who commented on the Draft EIR, was posted on the Planning Department's website, and was available to others upon request at the Planning Department's office.

A Final EIR has been prepared by the Planning Department consisting of the Draft EIR, background studies and materials, all comments received during the review process, the Responses to Comments document and all errata memoranda. The Draft EIR, the Responses to Comments document, and all appendices thereto comprise the EIR referenced in these findings.

In certifying the EIR, the Planning Commission found that none of the information added after the publication of the Draft EIR, including an analysis of the Plan refinements, triggered the need for recirculation of the EIR under CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. Nor does the adoption of the Plan with the revisions of the Final EIR trigger the need for a supplemental or subsequent EIR under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, as discussed in Section VI.

I.C Approval Actions

Implementation of the Plan would require the following approvals and other action:

- Amendments to the General Plan (various elements and figures) to conform to the concepts of the Central SoMa Plan. *Planning Commission recommendation; Board of Supervisors Approval;*
- Determination of consistency of the proposed General Plan amendments and rezoning with the General Plan and Planning Code Section 101.1 Priority Policies. *Planning Commission;*
- Amendment of the Planning Code to conform to the concepts of the Central SoMa Plan. *Planning Commission recommendation; Board of Supervisors Approval;*

- Amendment of the Planning Code and Zoning Maps to change mapped use districts and height limits throughout the Plan Area. *Planning Commission recommendation; Board of Supervisors Approval; and*
- Approval of the Implementation Program to implement the concepts in the Central SoMa Plan. *Planning Commission recommendation; Board of Supervisors Approval; and*
- Approval of alterations to street rights-of-way, including, for example, the configuration of travel lanes, sidewalk widths, and bicycle lanes, addition of crosswalks, and alley way improvements that are part of the Plan's proposals for the street network and public realm. *San Francisco Transportation Agency; Department of Public Works.*

I.D Location of Records

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

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

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

I.E Findings About Significant Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The following Sections II, III, and IV set forth the findings about the determinations of the Final EIR regarding significant environmental impacts and the mitigation measures proposed to address them. These findings provide written analysis and conclusions regarding the environmental impacts of the Project and the mitigation measures included as part of the Final EIR and adopted as part of the Project.

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

These findings do not attempt to describe the full analysis of each environmental impact contained in the Final EIR. Instead, a full explanation of these environmental findings and conclusions can be found in the Final EIR and these findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in the Final EIR supporting the determination regarding the Project impacts and mitigation measures designed to address those impacts. In making these findings, the determinations and conclusions of the Final EIR relating to environmental impacts and mitigation measures, are hereby ratified, adopted and incorporated in these findings, except to the extent any such determinations and conclusions are specifically and expressly modified by these findings.

As set forth below, the mitigation measures set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP are hereby adopted and incorporated to substantially lessen or avoid the potentially significant impacts of the Project. Accordingly, in the event a mitigation measure recommended in the Final EIR has inadvertently been omitted in these findings or the MMRP, such mitigation measure is nevertheless hereby adopted and incorporated in the findings below by reference. In addition, in the event the language describing a mitigation measure set forth in these findings or the MMRP fails to accurately reflect the mitigation measure in the Final EIR due to a clerical error, the language of the mitigation measure as set forth in the Final EIR shall control. The impact numbers and mitigation measure numbers used in these findings reflect the numbers contained in the Final EIR.

In Sections II, III, and IV below, the same findings are made for a category of environmental impacts and mitigation measures. Rather than repeat the identical finding dozens of times to address each and every significant effect and mitigation measure, the initial finding obviates the need for such repetition because in no instance are the conclusions of the Final EIR, or the mitigation measures recommended in the Final EIR for the Project, except as specifically set forth in Section VI below, being rejected.

SECTION II

Impacts Found Not to Be Significant, thus Requiring No Mitigation

Based on substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding, the Commission finds that the implementation of the Plan would not result any significant environmental impacts in the following areas: Aesthetics; Population and Housing; Greenhouse Gas Emissions; Shadow; Recreation; Utilities and Service Systems; Public Services; Geology and Soils; Hydrology and Water Quality (except sea level rise and combined sewer system); Mineral and Energy Resources; and Agricultural and Forest Resources. Each of these topics is analyzed and discussed in detail including, but not limited to, in EIR Chapters: IV.B; IV.H; IV.I; and Appendix B (the Initial Study). Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant (Pub. Res. Code § 21002; CEQA Guidelines §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091).

As more fully described in the Final EIR and based on the evidence in the whole record of this proceeding, it is hereby found that implementation of the Plan would not result in any significant impacts in the following areas and that these impact areas therefore do not require mitigation. The statements below provide a brief summary of the analyses and explanations contained in the Final EIR, and do not attempt to include all of the information that is provided in the Final EIR. Such information can be found in EIR Chapters: IV.B; IV.H; IV.I; and Appendix B (the Initial Study), which is incorporated herein by this reference and in the summaries below.

II.A Land Use and Land Use Planning

Impact LU-1: Development under the Plan, and proposed open space improvements and street network changes would not physically divide an established community.

II.B Aesthetics

Impact AE-1: Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the Plan Area or substantially damage scenic resources.

Impact AE-2: Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would alter public views of the Plan Area from short-, mid-, and long-range vantage points and alter views into the surrounding neighborhoods from within the Plan Area, but would not adversely affect public views or have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas.

Impact AE-3: Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would not create a new source of substantial light or glare in the Plan Area that would adversely affect day or nighttime views or substantially impact other people or properties.

Impact C-AE-1: Development under the Plan, including the proposed street network changes and open space improvements, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would alter the visual character and public views of and through SoMa, but would not adversely affect visual character, scenic vistas, or scenic resources or substantially increase light and glare.

II.C Cultural and Paleontological Resources

Impact CP-2: Neither the proposed open space improvements nor street network changes would adversely affect historic architectural resources in a way that would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.

Impact CP-6: Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature.

Impact CP-7: Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would not disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Impact C-CP-2: The proposed open space improvements and street network changes within the Plan Area, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to significant cumulative historical resources impacts.

Impact C-CP-4: Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature, and would not disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

II.D Transportation and Circulation

Impact TR-1: Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and the street network changes, would not cause substantial additional VMT or substantially increase automobile travel.

Impact TR-2: Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and the street network changes, would not result in traffic hazards.

Impact TR-5: Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would not result in potentially hazardous conditions for bicyclists, or otherwise substantially interfere with bicycle accessibility.

While the Plan's impacts on bicycle facilities and circulation would be less than significant, **Improvement Measure I-TR-5a: Protected Bicycle Lane Public Education Campaign**, and **Improvement Measure I-TR-5b: Protected Bicycle Lane Post-Implementation Surveys**, may be recommended for consideration by City decision makers to further reduce the less-than-significant impacts related to potential conflicts between bicyclists and pedestrians, transit, trucks, and autos.

Impact TR-7: Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and the street network changes, would not result in a substantial parking deficit that would create hazardous conditions or significant delays affecting transit, bicycles, or pedestrians, and where particular characteristics of the Plan demonstrably render use of other modes infeasible.

Impact C-TR-1: Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and the street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would not result in significant impacts related to VMT.

Impact C-TR-2: Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and the street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would not result in significant impacts related to traffic hazards.

Impact C-TR-5: Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and the street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would not result in cumulative bicycle impacts.

Impact C-TR-7: Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and the street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would not result in cumulative parking impacts.

Impact C-TR-9: Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and the street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would not result in significant cumulative construction-related transportation impacts.

II.E Air Quality

Impact AQ-1: Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and proposed street network changes, would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the *2010 Clean Air Plan*.

Impact AQ-2: The Plan would not violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard.

Impact AQ-7: Implementation of the Plan would not expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

II.F Wind

Impact C-WI-1: Development under the Plan, combined with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in cumulative significant impacts related to wind.

II.G Shadow

Impact SH-1: Development under the Plan would not create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects existing outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas.

Impact C-SH-1: Implementation of the Plan, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact on shadow conditions.

II.H Population and Housing

Impact PH-1: Development under the Plan and proposed street network changes would not induce substantial population growth, either directly or indirectly.

Impact PH-2: Development under the Plan and proposed street network changes would not generate housing demand beyond projected housing forecasts.

Impact PH-3: Development under the Plan and proposed street network changes would not displace a large number of housing units or people or necessitate the construction of replacement housing outside of the Plan Area.

Impact C-PH-1: Development under the Plan and proposed street network changes would not make a considerable contribution to any cumulative impact on population or housing.

II.I Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Impact C-GG-1: The Plan and development pursuant to the Plan would generate greenhouse gas emissions, but not at levels that would result in a significant impact on the environment or conflict with the City's GHG reduction strategy, *Plan Bay Area*, or AB 32, and would not result in cumulatively considerable GHG emissions.

Impact C-GG-2: The proposed street network changes and open space improvements would generate greenhouse gas emissions during construction, but not at levels that would result in a significant impact on the environment, and the proposed changes would be consistent with the City's GHG Reduction Strategy, *Plan Bay Area*, and the AB 32 Scoping Plan. The proposed street network changes and open spaces therefore would not result in cumulatively considerable GHG emissions.

II.J Recreation and Public Space

Impact RE-1: Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes would result in an increase in the use of existing parks and recreational facilities, but would not result in substantial deterioration or physical degradation of such facilities, and would result in the expansion of recreational facilities and enhance existing recreational resources.

Impact C-RE-1: Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes, in combination with other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable projects would not result in a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on recreational resources.

II.K Utilities and Service Systems

Impact UT-1: Development under the Plan and proposed street network changes would not require or result in the construction of substantial new water treatment facilities and the City would have sufficient water supply available from existing entitlements.

Impact UT-2: Development under the Plan could require or result in the expansion or construction of new wastewater treatment or stormwater facilities, exceed capacity of the wastewater treatment provider when combined with other commitments, or exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Impact UT-3: Development under the Plan and proposed street network changes would continue to be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate solid waste generated by subsequent development in the Plan Area and would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Impact C-UT-1: Development under the Plan and proposed street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, could contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact on wastewater facilities, but would not contribute to cumulative impacts on other utilities and services.

II.L Public Services

Impact PS-1: Development under the Plan and proposed street network changes would not increase the demand for police service or fire protection service such that new or physically altered facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, would be required in order to maintain acceptable levels of service.

Impact PS-2: Development under the Plan and proposed street network changes would not directly or indirectly generate school students and increase enrollment in public schools such that new or physically altered facilities would be required.

Impact C-PS-1: Development under the Plan and proposed street network changes, combined with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not result in a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on police, fire, and school district services such that new or physically altered facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, would be required in order to maintain acceptable levels of service.

II.M Biological Resources

Impact BI-2: Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes could interfere with the movement of migratory or native resident bird species.

Because all development in the Plan Area would be required to comply with *Planning Code* Section 139, Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings, development under the Plan would ensure that potential impacts related to

bird hazards would be less than significant. Neither the proposed street network changes nor the proposed open spaces would result in a substantial increase in the potential for bird strikes, as neither would result in the construction of large structures or structures that would constitute bird hazards. None of the proposed open spaces in the Plan area, including the potential park on SFPUC property, would be large enough to be considered an Urban Bird Refuge.

Although development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes would have a less-than-significant effect, implementation of Improvement Measure I-BI-2 would further reduce the Plan's less-than-significant impacts related to bird strikes, and the effect would be less than significant.

Impact BI-3: Development under to the Plan and the proposed street network changes, would not substantially interfere with the movement of fish or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

Impact BI-4: Development under the Plan and proposed street network changes would not conflict with the City's local tree ordinance.

Impact C-BI-1: Development under the Plan and proposed street network changes, in combination with other past, present or reasonably foreseeable projects, would not result in a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on biological resources.

II.N Geology and Soils

Impact GE-1: Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, seismic groundshaking, seismically induced ground failure, or landslides.

Impact GE-2: Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes would not result in substantial erosion or loss of top soil.

Impact GE-3: Neither development under the Plan nor the proposed street network changes would be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that could become unstable as a result of the project.

Impact GE-4: Neither development under the Plan nor the proposed street network changes would create substantial risks to life or property as a result of location on expansive soils.

Impact C-GE-1: Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts related to geologic hazards.

II.O Hydrology and Water Quality

Impact HY-1: Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes could violate water quality standards or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.

Water quality impacts related to violation of water quality standards or degradation of water quality due to discharge of construction related stormwater runoff during implementation of individual development projects pursuant to the Plan would be less than significant with implementation of erosion control measures in compliance with Article 4.1 of the San Francisco Public Works Code. Where the proposed street network changes require excavation of soil, they would be also be required to implement erosion control measures in accordance with Article 4.1 of the San Francisco Public Works Code. Therefore, water quality impacts related to violation of water quality standards or degradation of water quality due to discharge of construction related stormwater runoff would also be less than significant for the proposed street network changes and open space improvements.

Construction-Related Groundwater Dewatering

If any groundwater produced during construction dewatering required discharge to the combined sewer system, the discharge would be conducted in accordance with Article 4.1 of the Public Works Code, as supplemented by Order No. 158170, which regulates the quantity and quality of discharges to the combined sewer system. The discharge permit would contain appropriate discharge standards and may require installation of meters to measure the volume of the discharge. Although the groundwater could contain contaminants related to past site activities, as well as sediment and suspended solids, the groundwater would be treated as necessary to meet permit requirements prior to discharge. With discharge to the combined sewer system in accordance with regulatory requirements, water quality impacts related to a violation of water quality standards or degradation of water quality due to discharge of groundwater during construction of individual development projects pursuant to the Plan would be less than significant.

The proposed street network changes and open space improvements would likely require only shallow excavation and thus would not extend to the groundwater table that is generally encountered 5 feet or more below ground surface, with the possible exception of the southwestern portion of the Plan area (south of Harrison Street and west of Fourth Street). In the event that groundwater dewatering would be required, the amount of dewatering would be minimal and the groundwater would be discharged to the combined sewer system in accordance with Article 4.1 of the San Francisco Public Works Code, supplemented by Order No. 158170, as discussed above. Therefore, impacts related to discharges of groundwater during construction of the proposed street network changes and open space improvements would also be less than significant.

Long-Term Groundwater Dewatering

Likewise, if any groundwater produced during other dewatering required discharge to the combined sewer system, the discharge would be conducted in accordance with Article 4.1 of the Public Works Code, as supplemented by DPW Order No. 158170. As an alternative to discharge to the combined sewer system, the extracted groundwater could be used on-site for non-potable purposes under the City's voluntary non-potable water program, if it is of suitable quality. With reuse of the groundwater produced during permanent dewatering for individual development projects implemented pursuant to the Plan, or discharge to the combined sewer system in accordance with regulatory requirements, long-term groundwater discharges would not violate water quality standards or degrade water quality and this impact would be less than significant. Further, reuse of groundwater for non-potable purposes such as landscape irrigation, toilet and urinal flushing, and custodial uses would reduce the potable water demand of individual development projects, thereby incrementally reducing potable water use.

The proposed street network changes and open space improvements would likely require only shallow excavation and thus would not extend to the groundwater table that is generally encountered 5 feet or more below ground surface, with the possible exception of the southwestern portion of the Plan area (south of Harrison Street and west of Fourth Street). Further, the proposed street network changes would not include construction of any facilities that would require long-term dewatering to relieve hydrostatic pressure. Therefore, the proposed street network changes and open space improvements would have less-than-significant water quality impacts.

Impact HY-2: Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level.

Impact HY-3: Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the area in a manner that would result in substantial erosion, siltation, or flooding on- or off-site.

Impact HY-4: Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes would not contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

Impact HY-5: Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes would not expose people, housing, or structures, to substantial risk of loss due to existing flooding risks and would not redirect or impede flood flows.

Impact HY-6: Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would not exacerbate future flood hazards in a manner that could expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death.

Impact HY-7: Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

Impact C-HY-1: Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the site vicinity, could result in a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on hydrology and water quality.

Impact C-HY-2: Operation of individual development projects through implementation of the Plan, in combination with past, present, and foreseeable future development in San Francisco, would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the Southeast Treatment Plant (SEP); violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements; otherwise substantially degrade water quality; or result in an increase in the frequency of combined sewer discharges from the City's combined sewer system.

Impact C-HY-3: Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not exacerbate future flood hazards that could expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death.

II.P Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Impact HZ-1: Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes would not create a significant hazard through routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

Impact HZ-2: Development under the Plan and construction of the proposed street network changes could occur on site(s) identified on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to *Government Code* Section 65962.5. Excavation could also require the handling of potentially contaminated soil and groundwater, potentially exposing workers and the public to hazardous materials, or resulting in a release into the environment during construction.

Impacts related to closure of hazardous materials handling facilities (including underground storage tanks) would be less than significant due to compliance with Article 21 of the San Francisco Health Code, which specifies procedures ensure that must be followed when a hazardous materials handling facility is closed. Implementation of the requirements of the Maher Program (Article 22A of the San Francisco Health Code), Voluntary Remedial Action Program (California Health and Safety Code Sections 101480 through 101490) and the Local Oversight Program (Title 23 of the California Code of Regulations, Chapter 16) would ensure that impacts associated with construction within contaminated soil and groundwater would be less than significant. In addition, a generator of hazardous wastes would be required to follow state and federal regulations for manifesting the wastes, using licensed waste haulers, and disposing the materials at a permitted disposal or recycling facility. With implementation of these regulatory requirements, impacts related to disposal of hazardous wastes would be less than significant.

Furthermore, if any groundwater produced during construction dewatering required discharge to the combined sewer system, the discharge would be conducted in compliance with Article 4.1 of the San Francisco Public Works Code, as supplemented by Order No. 158170, which specifies conditions and criteria for discharge of groundwater. This article also prohibits discharge of hazardous wastes into the combined sewer system. The discharged water would have to be sampled during dewatering to demonstrate that discharge limitations in the ordinance are met. If the groundwater does not meet discharge requirements, on-site pretreatment may be required before discharge to the sewer system. If standards could not be met with on-site treatment, off-site disposal by a certified waste hauler would be required. Long-term dewatering could also be required to alleviate hydrostatic pressure on below-ground features such as parking garages. Much of the groundwater produced during this dewatering could be put to beneficial reuse in the buildings for nonpotable purposes (such as toilet flushing) as described in Topic 15, Hydrology and Water Quality. However, some of it could also be discharged to the combined sewer in accordance with Article 4.1 of the San Francisco Public Works Code, as supplemented by Order No. 158170. With implementation of the regulatory requirements described above, impacts related to the discharge of contaminated groundwater would be less than significant.

Impact HZ-4: Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes would not result in adverse effects related to hazardous emissions or handling of acutely hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of an existing school.

Impact HZ-5: Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

Impact HZ-6: Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires.

Impact C-HZ-1: Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the site vicinity, would not result in a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts related to hazardous materials.

II.Q Mineral and Energy Resources

Impact ME-1: Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource or locally-important mineral resource recovery.

Impact ME-2: Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes would not result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use these in a wasteful manner.

Impact C-ME-1: Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes, in combination with other past, present or reasonably foreseeable projects would result in less-than significant impacts to mineral and energy resources.

II.R Agricultural and Forest Resources

Impact AF-1: Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes would not (a) convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance; (b) conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract; (c) conflict with existing zoning for or cause rezoning of forest land or timberland; (d) result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use; or (e) involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use.

Impact C-AF-1: Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes, in combination with other past, present or reasonably foreseeable projects would not result in impacts to agricultural and forest resources.

SECTION III

Findings of Potentially Significant Impacts That Can Be Avoided or Reduced to a Less-than-Significant Level

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

The findings in this Section III and in Section IV concern mitigation measures set forth in the Final EIR. These findings discuss mitigation measures as proposed in the Final EIR and recommended for adoption by the Board of Supervisors, which can be implemented by City agencies or departments.

As explained previously, Exhibit B, attached, contains the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) required by Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091. The full text of the mitigation measures is contained in the MMRP, which also specifies the agency responsible for implementation of each measure, establishes monitoring actions and a monitoring schedule.

The Planning Commission finds that, based on the record before it, the mitigation measures proposed for adoption in the Final EIR are feasible, and that they can and should be carried out by the identified agencies at the designated time. This Planning Commission urges other agencies to adopt and implement applicable mitigation measures set forth in the Final EIR that are within the jurisdiction and responsibility of such entities. The Planning Commission acknowledges that if such measures are not adopted and implemented, the Project may result in additional significant unavoidable impacts. For this reason, and as discussed in Section VI, the Planning Commission is adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations as set forth in Section VII.

All mitigation measures set forth in the Final EIR and MMRP are agreed to and adopted by the Planning Commission.

III.A Cultural and Paleontological Resources

III.A.1 Impact CP-3

Impact CP-3: Construction activities in the Plan Area would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, through indirect construction damage to historic architectural resources.

Construction activities such as pile driving can generate vibration that could cause structural damage in nearby buildings. Pile driving, and possibly other construction activity could damage historical resources, particularly unreinforced masonry structures. Should the damage materially impair an historic resource, this effect would be considered a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource and would be a potentially significant impact under CEQA.

Based on the Final EIR and the entire administrative record, the City finds the potentially significant impact listed above would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of **Mitigation Measures M-CP-3a: Protect Historical Resources from Adjacent Construction Activities and M-CP-3b: Construction Monitoring Program for Historical Resources**, as set forth in the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

III.A.2 Impact CP-4

Impact CP-4: Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.

Significant prehistoric and historic-period archeological resources are present, or likely to be present, in the Plan Area and vicinity and currently unknown resources are also likely to be in the Plan Area and vicinity.

The entire Plan Area and vicinity is within the part of San Francisco that burned following the 1906 earthquake and is generally covered by up to 5 feet of artificial fill consisting of earthquake debris. Therefore, in general, any project-related ground disturbance deeper than 5 feet has the potential to affect archaeological resources. Earthwork, ground stabilization, or other subsurface construction activities undertaken by subsequent individual development projects allowed under the Plan (including open space and streetscape improvements) that would require deeper foundations due to poor underlying soils and/or taller structures being proposed could damage or destroy prehistoric or historic-period archeological resources. The ground-disturbing construction activities could adversely affect the significance of an archeological resource under CRHR Criterion 4 (has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California or the nation) by impairing the ability of such resources to convey important scientific and historical information. These effects would be considered a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource and would therefore be a potentially significant impact under CEQA.

Based on the Final EIR and the entire administrative record, the City finds the potentially significant impacts listed above would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of **Mitigation Measures M-CP-4a: Project-Specific Preliminary Archeological Assessments and M-CP-4b: Procedures for Accidental Discovery of Archeological Resources**, as set forth in the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

III.A.3 Impact CP-5

Impact CP-5: Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21084.3.

Earthwork, ground stabilization, or other subsurface construction activities undertaken by subsequent individual development projects allowed under the Plan (including open space and streetscape improvements) could damage or destroy tribal cultural resource sites. These effects would be considered a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource and would therefore be a potentially significant impact under CEQA.

Based on the Final EIR and the entire administrative record, the City finds the potentially significant impact listed above would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of **Mitigation Measure M-CP-5: Project-Specific Tribal Cultural Resource Assessment**, as set forth in the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

III.A.4 Impact C-CP-4

Impact C-CP-3: Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 or a tribal cultural resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21084.3.

Ground-disturbing activities of projects allowed under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future

projects in the vicinity, could encounter previously recorded and unrecorded archeological resources (which may also be considered tribal cultural resources), or human remains, resulting in a significant cumulative impact on archeological resources. These effects would be considered a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, and in the significance of a tribal cultural resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21084.3. Therefore, development under the Plan could contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact.

Based on the Final EIR and the entire administrative record, the City finds the Plan's contribution to cumulative archeological and tribal cultural resource impacts listed above would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of **Mitigation Measures M-CP-4a, M-CP-4b, and M-CP-5**, as set forth in the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

III.B Transportation and Circulation

III.B.1 Impact TR-8

Impact TR-8: Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, could result in significant impacts on emergency vehicle access.

Development under the Plan, in combination with the proposed street network changes, has the potential to impact emergency vehicle access primarily by creating conditions that would substantially affect the ability of drivers to yield the right-of-way to emergency vehicles, or preclude the ability of emergency vehicles to access streets within the transportation study area. Plans for development projects are required to undergo multidepartmental City review to ensure that proposed vehicular access and streetscape improvements do not impede emergency vehicle access to the proposed project's site or surrounding areas. The proposed street network changes would be required to undergo more detailed design and review. As part of that work, there is a preliminary review conducted by SFMTA's Transportation Advisory Staff Committee (TASC) and the San Francisco Fire Department, along with other City agencies. The TASC review ensures that any safety issues, including emergency vehicle access, are resolved prior to permit issuance.

The Plan's proposed street network changes would result in fewer mixed-flow travel lanes on a number of streets, which would reduce the available capacity for vehicles and thereby increase the number of vehicles in the remaining travel lanes, reduce the roadway width available for drivers to pull over to allow emergency vehicles to pass (e.g., due to raised buffers associated with cycle tracks), and result in additional vehicle delay on these streets. It is likely that the increased number of vehicles in the remaining travel lanes and increased levels of traffic congestion would occasionally impede emergency vehicle access in the Plan Area during periods of peak traffic volumes, and would be a significant impact on emergency vehicle access.

Based on the Final EIR and the entire administrative record, the City finds the potentially significant impact listed above would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of **Mitigation Measures M-TR-3a: Transit Enhancements, M-TR-8: Emergency Vehicle Access Consultation; M-NO-1a: Transportation Demand Management for New Development Projects, and M-AQ-5e: Central SoMa Air Quality Improvement Strategy**, as set forth in the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

III.B.2 Impact C-TR-8

Impact C-TR-8: Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, could contribute considerably to significant cumulative emergency vehicle access impacts.

Cumulative growth in housing and employment within Central SoMa and San Francisco would result in an increased demand of emergency response calls, and would also increase the number of vehicles on Central SoMa streets, and result in increased vehicle delays. The Plan's proposed street network changes, in combination with street network changes of other cumulative projects, would result in fewer mixed-flow travel lanes on a number of study area streets, which would reduce the available capacity for vehicles, and would thereby increase the number of vehicles in the remaining travel lanes and result in additional vehicle delay on these streets. This would be a significant cumulative impact on emergency vehicle access. Implementation of the Plan could contribute considerably to cumulative emergency vehicle access conditions in Central SoMa.

Based on the Final EIR and the entire administrative record, the City finds the potentially significant cumulative emergency vehicle access impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of **Mitigation Measures M-TR-3a, M-TR-8, M-NO-1a** as modified herein, and **M-AQ-5e**, as set forth in the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

III.C Noise and Vibration

III.C.1 Impact NO-3

Impact NO-3: Development under the Plan, including the proposed street network changes, would result in construction activities that could expose persons to temporary increases in vibration substantially in excess of ambient levels.

Construction activities undertaken by subsequent individual development projects allowed under the Plan (including street network changes) could potentially expose people to the impacts of excess groundborne vibration or noise levels. With the exception of pile driving, most construction activities would generate ground-borne vibration levels that would not exceed the FTA criterion of 0.5 in/sec PPV for structural damage to typical construction (reinforced concrete), a less-than-significant vibration impact. If pile driving is required, vibration levels at adjacent buildings could exceed the FTA's criterion of 0.5 in/sec PPV for structural damage, resulting in a significant vibration impact. Potential effects of groundborne vibration on historic resources is discussed in Section III.A.1, Impact CP-1.

Based on the Final EIR and the entire administrative record, the City finds the potentially significant impact listed above would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of **Mitigation Measures M-NO-2b: Noise and Vibration Control Measures during Pile Driving, M-CP-3a: Protect Historical Resources from Adjacent Construction Activities, and M-CP-3b: Construction Monitoring Program for Historical Resources**, as set forth in the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein

III.D Air Quality

III.D.1 Impact AQ-4

Impact AQ-4: Development under the Plan, but not the proposed street network changes and open space improvements, would result in construction activities that could violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard.

a) Street Network Changes and Open Space Improvements

Construction activities to implement the street network changes and open space improvements would be subject to the Construction Dust Control Ordinance. Compliance with the regulations and procedures set forth in the San Francisco Dust Control Ordinance would ensure that potential dust-related construction air quality impacts from the street network changes and open space improvements would be less than significant.

Construction activities to implement the street network changes and open space improvements would not generate emissions of criteria air pollutants that exceed criteria air pollutant significance thresholds. Therefore, construction criteria pollutant emissions from street network changes and open space improvements would be less than significant.

b) Subsequent Development

Implementation of the Plan would allow for development of new office, residential, retail, and other uses, at a greater intensity than is currently allowed under existing land use controls. Most development projects in the Plan Area would entail demolition and removal of existing structures and/or parking lots, excavation, and site preparation and construction of new buildings.

Construction Dust

Construction activities undertaken by subsequent individual development projects allowed under the Plan that generate dust include building and parking lot demolition, excavation, and equipment movement across unpaved construction sites. Subsequent development would be subject to the regulations and procedures set forth in the San Francisco Dust Control Ordinance. Therefore, potential dust-related construction air quality impacts would be less than significant.

Construction Emissions

Emissions generated during construction activities would include exhaust emissions from heavy duty construction equipment, trucks used to haul construction materials to and from sites, and worker vehicle emissions. Construction activities of the larger projects in the Plan Area could potentially generate emissions of criteria air pollutants that would exceed criteria air pollutant significance thresholds. An analysis of construction emissions using CalEEMod showed that high rise residential developments in excess of 500 units and general office developments in excess of 825,000 square feet would have the potential to result in construction-related

ROG emissions in excess of 54 pounds per day. The amount of construction period emissions would vary depending on project characteristics. For example, a project proposing less than 500 units or 825,000 square feet of non-residential use that requires substantial excavation (e.g., due to contaminated soils and/or to accommodate below-grade parking) may also exceed the construction significance criteria. Therefore, construction of subsequent individual development projects that exceed the criteria air pollutant significance thresholds would result in a significant impact. Implementation of **Mitigation Measures M-AQ-4a: Construction Emissions Analysis** and **M-AQ-4b: Construction Emissions Minimization Plan**, would reduce construction-related emissions to a less-than-significant level.

Based on the Final EIR and the entire administrative record, the City finds the potentially significant impact listed above would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of **Mitigation Measures M-AQ-4a** and **M-AQ-4b**, as set forth in the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

III.D.2 Impact AQ-6

Impact AQ-6: Development under the Plan, including proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would result in construction activities that could expose sensitive receptors to substantial levels of fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) and toxic air contaminants generated by construction equipment.

Within the APEZ, construction activities undertaken by subsequent individual development projects allowed under the Plan would adversely affect populations that are already at a higher risk for adverse long-term health risks from existing sources of air pollution. The Plan would also indirectly generate additional vehicle trips that would result in additional parcels meeting the APEZ criteria. Construction activities using off-road diesel equipment and vehicles in these areas would expose sensitive receptors to substantial levels of air pollution, and would be a significant impact.

The proposed street network changes and open space improvements would be publicly-funded projects and therefore subject to the conditions of the Clean Construction Ordinance to reduce diesel emissions, and thereby reduce related potential health risks. However, the Plan would indirectly generate additional vehicle trips that would result in additional areas meeting the APEZ health risk criteria. Construction activities on, or adjacent to, these parcels would adversely affect populations already at a higher risk for adverse long-term health risks, and would be a significant impact.

Based on the Final EIR and the entire administrative record, the City finds the potentially significant impacts listed above would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of **Mitigation Measures M-AQ-6a: Construction Emissions Minimization Plan**, and **M-AQ-6b: Implement Clean Construction Requirements**, as set forth in the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

III.E Biological Resources

III.E.1 Impact BI-1

Impact BI-1: Development under to the Plan and the proposed street network changes has the potential to adversely affect special-status species and to interfere with the movement of wildlife species.

Given the limited quality of potential habitat, neither development within the Plan area nor the proposed street network changes would interfere substantially with migratory corridors. The proposed street network changes may require the relocation or removal of trees within the existing sidewalk of these streets; and demolition or renovation of existing buildings and construction of new buildings could also result in removal of existing trees. Tree removal at the start of construction could result in impacts on nesting birds, however this impact would be less than significant with compliance with the *California Fish and Game Code* and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

The Plan area provides limited potential roosting habitat for two special- status bat species, western red bat (*Lasiurus blossevillii*) and Townsend’s big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii*). While the potential for their occurrence within the Plan area is low, it is possible that these bat species could be found in trees or underutilized buildings. Development under the Plan including the proposed street network changes and open space improvements could result in a potentially significant impact on special-status bats.

Based on the Final EIR and the entire administrative record, the City finds the potentially significant impact listed above would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of **Mitigation Measure M-BI-1: Pre-Construction Bat Surveys**, as set forth in the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

III.F Hazards and Hazardous Materials

III.F.1 Impact HZ-3

Impact HZ-3: Demolition and renovation of buildings as part of individual development projects implemented pursuant to the Plan could potentially expose workers and the public to hazardous building materials including asbestos-containing materials, lead-based paint, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP), and mercury, or result in a release of these materials into the environment during construction.

The Plan area was nearly completely rebuilt during by the first two decades of the 20th century, after the 1906 earthquake and fire. Many of the existing buildings may contain hazardous building materials, including asbestos-containing materials, lead-based paint, and electrical equipment containing PCBs. Most of the existing buildings could also include fluorescent light ballasts containing PCBs or DEHP, and fluorescent light tubes containing mercury vapors. All of these materials were commonly employed until the second half of the 20th century. If a building is demolished or renovated as part of a development project implemented pursuant to the Plan, workers and the public could be exposed to hazardous building materials if they were not abated prior to demolition. Compliance with regulatory requirements and implementation of required procedures

would ensure that potential impacts due demolition or renovation of structures with asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint would be less than significant.

Other hazardous building materials that could be present within the Plan area include electrical transformers that could contain PCBs, fluorescent light ballasts that could contain PCBs or DEHP, and fluorescent light tubes that could contain mercury vapors. Disruption of these materials could pose health threats for construction workers if not properly disposed of and would be a potentially significant impact.

Based on the Final EIR and the entire administrative record, the City finds the potentially significant impact listed above would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of **Mitigation Measure M-HZ-3: Hazardous Building Materials Abatement**, as set forth in the attached MMRP and will be implemented as provided therein.

SECTION IV

Significant Impacts That Cannot Be Avoided or Reduced to a Less-than-Significant Level

Based on substantial evidence in the whole record of these proceedings, the City finds that, where feasible, changes or alterations have been required, or incorporated into, the Plan and proposed street network changes to reduce the significant environmental impacts listed below as identified in the Final EIR. Although all of the mitigation measures set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP), attached as Exhibit B, are adopted, for some of the impacts listed below, despite the implementation of feasible mitigation measures, the effects remain significant and unavoidable.

It is further found, as described in this Section IV below, based on the analysis contained within the Final EIR, other considerations in the record, and the significance criteria identified in the Final EIR, that because some aspects of the Project could cause potentially significant impacts for which feasible mitigation measures are not available to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level, those impacts remain significant and unavoidable. It is also recognized that although mitigation measures are identified in the Final EIR that would reduce some significant impacts, certain measures, as described in this Section IV below, are uncertain or infeasible for reasons set forth below, and therefore those impacts remain significant and unavoidable or potentially significant and unavoidable.

Thus, the following significant impacts on the environment, as reflected in the Final EIR, are unavoidable. As more fully explained in Section VII, below, under Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(3) and (b), and CEQA Guidelines 15091(a)(3), 15092(b)(2)(B), and 15093, it is found and determined that legal, environmental, economic, social, technological and other benefits of the Project override any remaining significant adverse impacts of the Project for each of the significant and unavoidable impacts described below. This finding is supported by substantial evidence in the record of this proceeding. This finding is supported by substantial evidence in the record of this proceeding.

IV.A Land Use and Land Use Planning

IV.A.1 Impact LU-2

Impact LU-2: Development under the Plan, including proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Specifically, the Plan could result in traffic noise along Howard Street (under the two-way option for Howard and Folsom Streets) that exceeds the noise standards in the General Plan's Environmental Protection Element.

The Plan would not conflict substantially with the great majority of policies in the *General Plan, Planning Code, Plan Bay Area, Climate Action Plan, Bicycle Plan, Better Streets Plan, or Transit First Policy*, and other regulations that were adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Implementation of the Plan could result in siting sensitive receptors in close proximity to noise sources by changing zoning to allow uses that may generate high noise levels, such as PDR and Places of Entertainment, in proximity to new and existing residences. This may conflict with the *General Plan's* Environmental Protection Element, Policy 11.1: Discourage new uses in areas in which the noise level exceeds the noise compatibility guidelines for that use.

Implementation of the Plan could result in increased traffic noise levels, which could conflict with the *General Plan's* Environmental Protection Element Policy 9.6: Discourage changes in streets which will result in greater traffic noise in noise-sensitive areas. This impact relates specifically to the potential for implementation of the Plan to result in increased traffic noise levels on Howard Street under the two-way option for Howard and Folsom Streets.

The EIR identifies and analyzes **Mitigation Measures M-NO-1a: Transportation Demand Management for New Development Projects** and **M-NO-1b: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses** to address this impact. The EIR finds that implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-1b would reduce noise from noise-generating uses to less-than-significant levels. However, while implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a would reduce traffic noise on Howard Street under the two-way option for Howard and Folsom Streets, it may not be sufficient to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the potential for a significant conflict with the General Plan's Environmental Protection Element Policy 9.6 would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

IV.A.2 Impact C-LU-1

Impact C-LU-1: Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would contribute considerably to a significant cumulative land use impact. Specifically, the Plan, under both the one-way and two-way options for Folsom and Howard Streets, could make a considerable contribution to cumulative traffic noise levels which would exceed the noise standards in the General Plan's Environmental Protection Element.

In general, the Plan, and particularly the proposed street network changes and open space improvements, would improve linkages within the Plan Area and serve to enhance the physical connection between and through various parts of the Plan Area. None of the individual projects in the Plan Area is expected to preclude or interfere with proposed public realm improvements, and many would contribute positively to pedestrian connections, new infrastructure, and/or include open space enhancements. Therefore, the Plan would not combine with these projects and plans and so as to result in significant cumulative impacts related to dividing established communities.

However, implementation of the Plan could result in a significant unavoidable impact with respect to increased traffic noise, which would conflict with a General Plan policy adopted for the purpose of mitigating or avoiding an environmental effect. The Plan, including both the one-way and two-way operation of Folsom and Howard Streets would make a considerable contribution to cumulative traffic noise levels. The EIR identifies and analyzes **Mitigation Measures M-NO-1a: Transportation Demand Management for New Development Projects** to address this impact, and concludes that no additional mitigation measures for new development projects have been identified to reduce this impact to less than significant. Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative traffic noise impacts would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

IV.B Cultural and Paleontological Resources

IV.B.1 Impact CP-1

Impact CP-1: Development under the Plan would result in the demolition or substantial alteration of individually identified historic architectural resources and/or contributors to a historic district or conservation district located in the Plan Area, including as-yet unidentified resources, a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.

The EIR finds that development under the Plan would result in the demolition or substantial alteration of individually identified historic architectural resources and/or contributors to a historic district or conservation district located in the Plan Area, including as-yet unidentified resources, causing a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. The EIR concludes that such impacts could occur as a result of individual development projects under the Plan. The EIR also concludes that development under the Plan in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity could result in the demolition and/or alteration of historical resources, thereby contributing considerably to a cumulative historical resources impact.

The EIR identifies and analyzes **Mitigation Measures M-CP-1a: Mandatory Consultation Regarding Avoidance or Minimization of Effects on Historical Resources; M-CP-1b: Documentation of Historical Resource(s); M-CP-1c: Oral Histories; M-CP-1d: Interpretive Program; and M-CP-1e: Video Recordation** to address this impact. The EIR finds that, while the foregoing mitigation measures would reduce the adverse impacts of the Plan on historical resources, they would not reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level because it cannot be stated with certainty that no historical resources would be demolished or otherwise

adversely affected in the Plan Area with implementation of the Plan. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

IV.B.2 Impact C-CP-1

Impact C-CP-1: Development under the Plan, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, could result in demolition and/or alteration of historic resources, thereby contributing considerably to significant cumulative historical resources impacts.

The EIR finds that development under the Plan may contribute to the loss of individual historic resources and contributors to historic districts by encouraging demolition and alteration of such resources in the Plan Area. These impacts could combine with similar impacts in areas outside the Plan Area to result in significant cumulative impacts in the number of individually eligible historic resources within the SoMa neighborhood and cumulative effects to historic districts that overlap within the Plan Area and adjacent areas. The proposed Plan could contribute considerably to this impact, and several mitigation measures have been identified and analyzed that could mitigate this impact to less than significant, including **Mitigation Measures M-CP-1a** through **M-CP-1e**, as noted above. However, because it is uncertain whether or not these mitigation measures could reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

IV.C Transportation and Circulation

IV.C.1 Impact TR-3

Impact TR-3: Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would result in a substantial increase in transit demand that would not be accommodated by local transit capacity, and would cause a substantial increase in delays resulting in adverse impacts on local and regional transit routes.

Development associated with the Plan would generate 4,160 transit trips during the a.m. peak hour, and 4,430 transit trips during the p.m. peak hour. The EIR finds that development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would result in significant adverse transit impacts on Muni capacity and East Bay regional transit screenlines, and would result in transit delays for Muni, Golden Gate Transit, and SamTrans buses. The EIR identifies and analyzes **Mitigation Measures M-TR-3a: Transit Enhancements, M-TR-3b: Boarding Improvements, and M-TR-3c, Signalization and Intersection Restriping at Townsend/Fifth Streets** to address this impact. The EIR finds that even with implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts would not be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measures M-TR-3a, M-TR-3b, and M-TR-3c would reduce the effect of increased ridership and could reduce the travel time impacts or mitigate them to less-than-significant levels. However, because it is not known how much additional funding would be generated for transit service as part of these mitigation measures, or whether SFMTA would provide additional service on the impacted routes to fully mitigate the Plan's impacts, the impacts remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

IV.C.2 Impact TR-4

Impact TR-4: Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would not result in pedestrian safety hazards nor result in a substantial overcrowding on sidewalks or at corner locations, but would result in overcrowding at crosswalks.

Development associated with the Plan would generate about 10,550 pedestrian trips (4,430 transit and 6,120 walk and other modes trips) during the p.m. peak hour. New development under the Plan would result in a substantial increase in pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicle trips in Central SoMa, which could increase the potential for conflicts between modes. However, some of the development projects would include pedestrian improvements, as required under the *Better Streets Plan*, and ongoing City projects such as the Vision Zero effort focused on eliminating traffic deaths by 2024. The proposed street network changes include numerous improvements to the pedestrian network including sidewalk widening to meet the standards in the *Better Streets Plan* where possible, corner sidewalk extensions, pedestrian signal timing upgrades, signalized midblock pedestrian crossings, and opening currently closed crosswalks. Impacts of the Plan related to pedestrian safety hazards would be less than significant.

Implementation of the street network changes, in combination with the additional pedestrians generated by development under the Plan, would result in significant pedestrian LOS impacts at the west and east crosswalks at the intersections of Third/Mission and Fourth/Mission, and at the west crosswalks at the intersections of Fourth/Townsend and Fourth/King during the midday and/or p.m. peak hours. The EIR identifies and analyzes **Mitigation Measure M-TR-4: Upgrade Central SoMa Area Crosswalks**, to address this impact. The EIR finds that even with implementation of this mitigation measure, because the feasibility of the crosswalk widening beyond the current width is uncertain due to roadway or other physical constraints (e.g., presence of bus stops or platforms), the pedestrian impact at the crosswalks due to implementation of the Plan would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

IV.C.3 Impact TR-6

Impact TR-6: Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would result in an increased demand of on-street commercial and passenger loading and a reduction in on-street commercial loading supply such that the loading demand during the peak hour of loading activities would not be accommodated within on-street loading supply, would impact existing passenger loading/unloading zones, and may create hazardous conditions or significant delay that may affect transit, other vehicles, bicycles, or pedestrians.

Implementation of the street network changes associated with the Plan would remove on-street commercial loading spaces and passenger loading/unloading zones on a number of streets either permanently or during peak periods. The EIR finds that development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would result in significant impacts on commercial vehicle loading/unloading activities and passenger loading/unloading activities.

The EIR identifies and analyzes **Mitigation Measures M-TR-6a: Driveway and Loading Operations Plan (DLOP)** and **M-TR-6b: Accommodation of On-Street Commercial Loading Spaces and Passenger Loading/Unloading Zones** to address this impact.

The EIR finds that these mitigation measures would reduce the potential for disruption to traffic and transit circulation, and impacts on pedestrians and bicycles in the Plan Area as a result of commercial loading activities. However, replacement of on-street loading and passenger loading/unloading zones may not always be possible due to conditions such as existing parking prohibitions or availability of general on-street spaces that could be converted to commercial loading spaces, or pedestrian circulation area on adjacent sidewalks. Thus, the feasibility of providing replacement commercial loading spaces of similar length on the same block and side of the street or within 250 feet on adjacent side streets cannot be assured in every situation where loading spaces are removed as a result of the street network changes. Locations adjacent to transit-only lanes would also not be ideal for loading spaces because they may introduce new conflicts between trucks and transit vehicles. Given these considerations, the potential locations for replacing all on-street commercial loading spaces on streets where circulation changes are proposed (i.e., Folsom, Howard, Harrison, Bryant, Brannan, Third and Fourth Streets) are limited, and it is unlikely that a sufficient amount of spaces could be provided to offset the net loss in supply and ensure that conflicts between trucks, bicyclists, and other vehicles do not occur. Similarly, for passenger loading/unloading zones, replacement may not always be possible due to conditions such as existing parking prohibitions or lack of general on-street spaces that could be converted to passenger loading spaces. As such, the feasibility of providing replacement passenger loading/unloading zones of similar length that would serve the affected properties, particularly the Moscone Center, hotels, and the Bessie Carmichael School/Filipino Education Center, cannot be assured. For these reasons, loading impacts, particularly during peak hour of loading activities, would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

IV.C.4 Impact TR-9

Impact TR-9: Construction activities associated with development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would result in substantial interference with pedestrian, bicycle, or vehicle circulation and accessibility to adjoining areas, and would result in potentially hazardous conditions.

In general, the analysis of construction impacts is specific to individual projects, and includes a discussion of temporary roadway and sidewalk closures, relocation of bus stops, effects on roadway circulation due to construction trucks, and the increase in vehicle trips, transit trips and parking demand associated with construction workers. Construction-related transportation impacts associated with individual development, open space, or transportation projects are temporary and generally of short-term duration (e.g., typically between two and three years), and are conducted in accordance with City requirements to ensure that they do not substantially affect transit, pedestrian, or bicycle conditions or circulation in the area. However, given the magnitude of projected development anticipated to occur, and the uncertainty concerning construction schedules, construction activities associated with multiple overlapping projects under the Plan could result in multiple travel lane closures, high volumes of trucks in the local vicinity, and travel lane and sidewalk closures. These in turn could disrupt or delay transit, pedestrians, or bicyclists, or result in potentially hazardous

conditions (e.g., high volumes of trucks turning at intersections). As such, the EIR finds that construction-related transportation impacts would be significant.

The EIR identifies and analyzes **Mitigation Measure M-TR-9: Construction Management Plan and Construction Coordination** to address this impact. The EIR finds that implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-9 would minimize, but would not eliminate, the significant impacts related to conflicts between construction activities and pedestrians, transit, bicyclists, and vehicles. Other measures, such as imposing sequential (i.e., non-overlapping) construction schedules for all projects in the vicinity, were considered but deemed infeasible due to potentially lengthy delays in implementation of subsequent projects. As such, construction-related transportation impacts would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

IV.C.5 Impact C-TR-3

Impact C-TR-3: Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would contribute considerably to significant cumulative transit impacts on local and regional transit providers.

Implementation of the Plan would result in significant cumulative impacts, or contribute considerably to cumulative impacts, on capacity utilization on multiple Muni downtown screenlines and corridors, and Central SoMa cordons and corridors. Under 2040 cumulative conditions, development under the Plan would contribute considerably to BART ridership for travel from the East Bay during the a.m. peak hour and to the East Bay during the p.m. peak hours, and the BART East Bay screenlines would operate at more than the 100 percent capacity utilization standard. All other regional screenlines and transit providers were not projected to exceed the capacity utilization standard under 2040 cumulative conditions. Implementation of the Plan would contribute considerably to significant cumulative impacts, as a result of increased congestion and transit delay on Muni, Golden Gate Transit, and SamTrans routes that operate within the Central SoMa transportation study area.

The EIR identifies and analyzes **Mitigation Measures M-TR-3a: Transit Enhancements, M-TR-3b: Boarding Improvements, and M-TR-3c: Signalization and Intersection Restriping at Townsend/Fifth Streets)** to address this impact. The EIR finds that the feasibility of identified mitigation measures is uncertain and may not be adequate to mitigate cumulative impacts to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, implementation of the Plan, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would contribute considerably to the significant and unavoidable with mitigation cumulative local and regional transit impacts.

IV.C.6 Impact C-TR-4

Impact C-TR-4: Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would contribute considerably to significant cumulative pedestrian impacts.

The Plan's proposed street network changes, in combination with other cumulative projects would improve the pedestrian network in Central SoMa and enhance pedestrian safety, including for seniors and persons with

disabilities. Under 2040 cumulative conditions, impacts related to cumulative pedestrian safety hazards would be less than significant.

Under year 2040 cumulative conditions, the Plan would contribute considerably to significant cumulative pedestrian impacts at one or more crosswalks at the intersections of Third/Mission, Third/Howard, Fourth/Mission, Fourth/Howard, Fourth/Folsom, Fourth/Harrison, Fourth/Bryant, Fourth/Brannan, Fourth/Townsend, and Fourth/King during the midday and/or p.m. peak hours. The EIR identifies and analyzes **Mitigation Measure M-TR-4: Upgrade Central SoMa Area Crosswalks**, to address this impact. The EIR finds that because the feasibility of the crosswalk widening beyond the current width is uncertain due to roadway or other physical constraints (e.g., presence of bus stops or platforms), the pedestrian impact at the crosswalks due to implementation of the Plan would remain significant and unavoidable. Therefore, implementation of the Plan, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would contribute considerably to the significant and unavoidable with mitigation cumulative pedestrian impacts.

IV.C.7 Impact C-TR-6

Impact C-TR-6: Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, and the associated increased demand of on-street loading in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would contribute considerably to significant cumulative loading impacts.

Implementation of the street network changes associated with the Plan would remove on-street commercial loading spaces and passenger loading/unloading zones on a number of streets either permanently or during peak periods. These conditions would worsen with cumulative projects that also remove on-street commercial loading spaces and passenger loading/unloading zones, resulting in significant cumulative impacts. The EIR identifies and analyzes **Mitigation Measures M-TR-6a: Driveway and Loading Operations Plan (DLOP)** and **M-TR-6b: Accommodation of On-Street Commercial Loading Spaces and Passenger Loading/Unloading Zones** to address this impact. The EIR finds that because the feasibility of providing replacement commercial loading spaces and passenger loading/unloading zones of similar lengths is uncertain, loading impacts due to implementation of the Plan would remain significant and unavoidable. Therefore, implementation of the Plan, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would contribute considerably to the significant and unavoidable with mitigation cumulative loading impacts.

IV.D Noise and Vibration

IV.D.1 Impact NO-1

Impact NO-1: Development under the Plan, including the proposed street network changes, would generate noise that would result in exposure of persons to noise levels in excess of standards in the *San Francisco*

General Plan or Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the Police Code), and would result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise above existing levels.

Traffic Noise Impacts

Noise modeling was undertaken for 149 street segments to evaluate changes in traffic noise between existing conditions and each of the three development scenarios: (1) Existing + Growth Attributed to the Plan; (2) Existing + Growth Attributed to the Plan with Street Improvements (Folsom/Howard one-way); and (3) Existing + Growth Attributed to the Plan with Street Improvements (Folsom/Howard two-way). The results of the traffic noise modeling revealed that effects of Plan-generated growth on the existing noise environment would be relatively limited.

Under the Existing + Growth Attributed to the Plan scenario, traffic increases would result in noise increases of 2.5 dBA or less. Therefore, traffic generated by anticipated Plan Area development alone would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels, and would not expose persons to noise levels in excess of standards in the *San Francisco General Plan*. When compared to the three dBA perceptibility threshold, a 2.5 dBA noise increase would have a less-than-significant impact on existing residential and other noise-sensitive uses. The proposed open space improvements would generate little, if any, new vehicular traffic and, accordingly, would result in little or no increase in indirect traffic-generated noise.

Under the Existing + Growth Attributed to the Plan with Street Improvements (Folsom/Howard one-way) scenario, traffic increases would result in noise increases of 2.4 dBA or less along study segments; these increases of less than three dBA would not be noticeable and would be less than significant.

Under the Existing + Growth Attributed to the Plan with Street Improvements (Folsom/Howard two-way) scenario, two street segments would experience an increase in traffic noise of three dBA or more. The two-way Folsom and Howard Street network changes would result in noise increases of 3.1 dBA and 5.2 dBA along Howard Street between 10th and 11th Streets and Howard Street west of 11th Street, respectively. This would be a significant impact. At all other locations under this scenario, traffic noise increases would be less than three dBA and thus would be less than significant.

The EIR identifies and analyzes **Mitigation Measures M-NO-1a: Transportation Demand Management for New Development Projects** to reduce this impact. The EIR finds that while implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a would reduce traffic noise on Howard Street under the two-way option for Howard and Folsom Streets, it may not be sufficient to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, noise impacts associated with implementation of the Plan and the two-way option for Howard and Folsom Streets would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a requires project sponsors to develop and implement a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan pursuant to the Planning Department's TDM Program. One of the benefits of the TDM Program is to provide more certainty to project sponsors in the development review process. Under the TDM program, because a project sponsor knows its TDM requirements before submitting a development application, it can take those requirements into account when designing and financing the project. However, the TDM requirements proposed in the Central SoMa Plan legislation are substantially greater than those originally adopted in Planning Code Section 169. As a result, many development projects that submitted a development application prior to the introduction of the Central SoMa legislation were designed and financed

in ways that make it infeasible for those projects to meet the Central SoMa TDM requirements. Construction of these projects is integral to achieving the goals of the Central SoMa Plan.

For these reasons, the Commission hereby finds that Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a is infeasible to the extent it applies to projects with completed development applications or environmental evaluation applications on file with the Planning Department before January 1, 2018.

The Commission hereby adopts Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a as modified below. With these modifications, the Commission finds that Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a is feasible.

Mitigation Measure M NO 1a: Transportation Demand Management for New Development Projects. To reduce vehicle noise from subsequent development projects in the Plan Area, the project sponsor and subsequent property owners (excluding 100 percent affordable housing projects) shall develop and implement a TDM Plan for a proposed project's net new uses (including net new accessory parking spaces) as part of project approval. The scope and number of TDM measures included in the TDM Plan shall be in accordance with Planning Department's TDM Program Standards for the type of development proposed, and accompanying appendices, except that projects with complete development applications or Environmental Evaluation Applications (EEAs) on file with the Planning Department before January 1, 2018 shall meet a minimum of 75% of the TDM requirements in the Planning Department's TDM Program Standards. The TDM Program Standards and accompanying appendices are expected to be refined as planning for the proposed TDM Ordinance continues. Each subsequent development project's TDM Plan for proposed net new uses shall conform to the most recent version of the TDM Program Standards and accompanying appendices available at the time of the project Approval Action, as Approval Action is defined in Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code. The Planning Department shall review and approve the TDM Plan, as well as any subsequent revisions to the TDM Plan. The TDM Plan shall target a reduction in the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) rate (i.e., VMT per capita), monitor and evaluate project performance (actual VMT), and adjust TDM measures over time to attempt to meet VMT target reduction. This measure is applicable to all projects within the Plan Area that do not otherwise qualify for an exemption under Article 19 of the CEQA Guidelines. This measure is superseded for those projects that are already required to fully comply with the TDM Program Standards (i.e., without reductions in target requirements) in the Plan Area. The TDM Plan shall be developed in consultation with the Planning Department and rely generally on implementation of measures listed in the Planning Department TDM Program Standards and accompanying appendices in effect at the time of the Project Approval Action. The TDM program may include, but is not limited to the types of measures, which are summarized below for explanatory example purposes. Actual development project TDM measures shall be applied from the TDM Program Standards and accompanying appendices, which describe the scope and applicability of candidate measures in detail:

1. Active Transportation: Provision of streetscape improvements to encourage walking, secure bicycle parking, shower and locker facilities for cyclists, subsidized bike share memberships for project occupants, bicycle repair and maintenance services, and other bicycle-related services;
2. Car-Share: Provision of car-share parking spaces and subsidized memberships for project occupants;
3. Delivery: Provision of amenities and services to support delivery of goods to project occupants;

4. Family-Oriented Measures: Provision of on-site childcare and other amenities to support the use of sustainable transportation modes by families;
5. High-Occupancy Vehicles: Provision of carpooling/vanpooling incentives and shuttle bus service;
6. Information: Provision of multimodal wayfinding signage, transportation information displays, and tailored transportation marketing services;
7. Land Use: Provision of on-site affordable housing and healthy food retail services in underserved areas; and
8. Parking: Provision of unbundled parking, short-term daily parking provision, parking cash out offers, and reduced off-street parking supply.

Noise Generating Sources

Development of certain commercial uses in proximity to existing residential uses would increase the potential for noise disturbance or conflicts. Depending on the type of commercial activities, noise generated from the sources such as loading/unloading activities, delivery trucks, garbage trucks, PDR and light industrial uses, could result in a substantial permanent, temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels, creating noise conflicts between residential and commercial uses. The EIR identifies and analyzes **Mitigation Measure M-NO-1b: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses** to address this impact. The EIR finds that implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-1b and compliance with the Section 2909 of the Noise Ordinance would render impacts less than significant with respect to potential conflicts between new noise-generating uses and noise-sensitive land uses.

Noise Compatibility of Future Uses

The Plan proposes to permit nighttime entertainment uses within a limited area, south of Harrison Street between Fourth and Sixth Streets, where the Plan would establish a new Central SoMa SUD. Because entertainment uses typically generate nighttime noise and residential uses require quieter nighttime noise levels, noise conflicts could result where these land uses are in proximity to one another and where buildings may not be sufficiently insulated to prevent the intrusion of excessive noise. The EIR identifies and analyzes **Mitigation Measure M-NO-1b: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses** to address this impact. The EIR finds that implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-1b and compliance with the San Francisco Building Code, Administrative Code, Planning Code, and Police Code, and Regulation of Noise from Places of Entertainment would reduce noise impacts to the maximum extent feasible, consistent with the General Plan, and would reduce the potential for noise conflicts between new entertainment and residential uses to a less-than-significant level.

IV.D.2 Impact NO-2

Impact NO-2: Development under the Plan, including the proposed street network changes and open space improvements, would result in construction activities in the Plan Area that could expose persons to substantial temporary or periodic increases in noise levels substantially in excess of ambient levels.

Development that could result from implementation of the Plan would result in construction of new buildings, demolition, or retrofitting (if applicable) near existing residential or other noise-sensitive uses. The noise levels associated with construction equipment such as pile driving and concrete saws would exceed the ambient noise levels of approximately 70 to 75 dBA, and, absent noise controls, would exceed the limit specified in the *Police Code* of 80 dBA at 100 feet. This would be a significant impact. Similar noise levels could be reached with operation of multiple pieces of construction equipment, on the same site or on multiple sites, depending on their distance from sensitive receptors. Similarly, the duration of noise experienced by receptors may be increased due to overlapping construction projects. The EIR identifies and analyzes **Mitigation Measures M-NO-2a: General Construction Noise Control Measures and M-NO-2b: Noise and Vibration Control Measures during Pile Driving** to address this impact.

The EIR finds implementation of Mitigation Measures M-NO-2a and M-NO-2b would reduce the noise impact from future construction throughout the Plan Area to a less-than-significant level from individual construction sites. However, a number of projects have environmental applications on file and are dependent upon the Central SoMa Plan's proposed zoning. It is possible that such projects, some of which are located in close proximity to each other, could be under construction at the same time. The combined effect of these noise impacts may result in noise levels for which available feasible mitigation measures may not be sufficient to reduce the impact to less than significant. Therefore, this impact remains significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

IV.D.3 Impact C-NO-1

Impact C-NO-1: Development under the Plan, including the proposed street network changes and open space improvements, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would result in cumulative noise impacts.

Noise modeling was undertaken for 149 street segments to evaluate changes in traffic noise between 2040 conditions and each of the three development scenarios: (1) 2040 Cumulative + Growth Attributed to the Plan; (2) 2040 Cumulative + Growth Attributed to the Plan with Street Improvements (Folsom/Howard one-way); and (3) 2040 Cumulative + Growth Attributed to the Plan with Street Improvements (Folsom/Howard two-way). The results of the traffic noise modeling revealed that effects of Plan-generated and cumulative traffic growth would be relatively minimal overall.

Under the 2040 Cumulative + Growth Attributed to the Plan scenario, traffic noise increases would generally be less than three dBA. One street segment on Fifth Street between Bryant and Brannan Streets would experience a noise increase greater than three dBA; this would be a significant cumulative impact. However, the Plan contribution would be minimal (less than 0.5 dBA) and thus not a considerable contribution to the significant cumulative impact.

Under the 2040 Cumulative + Growth Attributed to the Plan with Street Improvements (Folsom/Howard one-way) scenario, a significant cumulative impact would occur on Fourth Street between Bryant and Brannan Streets and on Bryant Street east of Fourth Street. Under the 2040 Cumulative + Growth Attributed to the Plan with Street Improvements (Folsom/Howard two-way) scenario, significant cumulative impacts would occur on Howard Street west of Fifth Street, Fourth Street between Bryant and Brannan Streets, and on Bryant Street east of Fourth Street. Therefore, the Plan growth plus the street network changes with both one-way and two-

way options for Folsom and Howard Streets would make a considerable contribution to cumulative significant traffic noise impacts. Therefore, this impact remains significant and unavoidable.

IV.E Air Quality

Impact AQ-3: Operation of subsequent individual development projects in the Plan Area and street network changes, but not proposed open space improvements, would violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, and/or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard.

Development of individual development projects within the Plan Area could generate vehicle trips and other operational emissions, such as emissions from natural gas combustion, landscape maintenance activities, and painting that would result in a significant increase in criteria air pollutants. With regard to proposed street network changes, these projects would include conversion of Howard and Folsom Streets to accommodate additional travel modes including bicycles and transit, reduction in travel lanes and installation of transit only lanes and bicycle facilities on Third Street and Fourth Street, creation of transit only lanes on Bryant Street and Harrison Street and minor reconfiguration to Brannan Street. Given the number of proposed street network changes, it is conservatively judged that the street network changes would result in significant criteria air pollutant emissions as a result of slower moving vehicle speeds, which would result in an increase in vehicle emissions. The EIR identifies and analyzes **Mitigation Measures M-NO-1a: Transportation Demand Management for New Development Projects, M-AQ-3a: Education for Residential and Commercial Tenants Concerning Low-VOC Consumer Products, and M-AQ-3b: Reduce Operational Emissions**, to address this impact.

The EIR finds that implementation of these mitigation measures is required for future individual development projects in the Plan Area that would exceed BAAQMD screening criteria. However, without specific detail on the size and extent of these projects, it is not possible to estimate emissions or the effectiveness or feasibility of the mitigation measures. Additionally, local government has no authority over vehicle emissions standards, which are established by federal and state law. Existing emissions laws and regulations, including the federal Corporate Average Fuel Economy requirements and California's Clean Car (Pavley) Standards to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, would result in declining vehicle emissions over time. However, no feasible mitigation exists for criteria air pollutant emissions resulting from slower vehicle speeds (and increased idling times) that may occur as a result of the proposed street network changes. Therefore, this impact remains significant and unavoidable with mitigation. It should be noted that the identification of this significant impact does not preclude the finding of future less-than-significant impacts for subsequent projects that comply with applicable screening criteria or meet applicable thresholds of significance.

Impact AQ-5: Development under the Plan, including proposed street network changes, would result in operational emissions of fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) and toxic air contaminants that would result in exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

The EIR finds that Plan traffic would incrementally expand the geographic extent of the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone (APEZ), adding to the APEZ all of the approximately 40 parcels north of the I-80 freeway that are currently outside the zone (these parcels are largely concentrated near Second and Folsom Streets and along Shipley Street

between Fifth and Sixth Streets), and also adding to the APEZ a large number of parcels south of the freeway, including South Park. As a result of Plan-generated traffic, including the proposed street network changes, excess cancer risk within the APEZ would increase by as much as 226 in a million and PM_{2.5} concentrations would increase by up to 4.54 µg/m³ at individual receptor points, which substantially exceeded the thresholds identified in the EIR. The EIR also finds that both existing and new stationary sources, as well as other non-permitted sources in the Plan Area, could result in potential health risks (primarily lifetime cancer risk) to sensitive receptors, which would be expected to consist mostly of persons living in residential projects developed in the Plan Area, particularly if these projects were to include sources of TACs. Among these sources would be diesel-powered emergency generators, which are generally required to be installed in buildings with occupiable floors above 75 feet in height. Finally, the EIR finds that indirect traffic generated by the Plan, as well as the reconfiguration of the street network in the Plan Area, would add and relocate vehicle emissions that would change the geographic extent and severity of the APEZ, significantly exacerbating existing localized air quality conditions. With Plan traffic, the additional parcels that would be added to the APEZ are not currently subject to *Health Code* Article 38; therefore, new sensitive use projects proposed on these lots would be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations resulting from Plan-generated traffic, which would result in a significant impact. The EIR identifies and analyzes **Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a: Transportation Demand Management for New Development Projects**, to address the impact associated with Plan-generated traffic. Additionally, the EIR identifies and analyzes **Mitigation Measures M-AQ-5a: Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Generators and Fire Pumps; M-AQ-5b: Siting of Uses that Emit Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5}), Diesel Particulate Matter, or Other Toxic Air Contaminants; M-AQ-5c: Update Air Pollution Exposure Zone for San Francisco Health Code Article 38; M-AQ-5d: Land Use Buffers around Active Loading Docks; and M-AQ-5e: Central SoMa Air Quality Improvement Strategy**, to address these impacts.

The EIR notes that Mitigation Measures M-AQ-5a and M-AQ-5b would reduce emissions of PM_{2.5} and other TACs from new stationary sources to less-than-significant levels. Mitigation Measure M-AQ-5c and M-AQ-5d would protect new sensitive land uses from emissions associated with truck activity areas and on sites not currently subject to Article 38, thereby reducing exposure of new sensitive land uses from Plan-generated traffic emissions to less than significant. Mitigation Measure M-AQ-5e would establish a strategy to reduce the exposure of residents and other sensitive land uses to TACs generated by the Plan. However, mobile sources generated by the Plan would significantly affect the geography and severity of the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone. Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a would reduce the number of vehicle trips generated by the Plan, but because the degree to which trips (and thereby emissions) could be reduced by these measures cannot be reliably estimated. In addition, vehicle emissions are regulated at the state and federal level, and local jurisdictions are preempted from imposing stricter emissions standards for vehicles. For this reason, and because no other feasible mitigations are available, the impact of traffic-generated TACs on existing sensitive receptors remains significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

Impact C-AQ-1: Development under the Plan, including proposed street network changes, but not open space improvements, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, under cumulative 2040 conditions, would contribute considerably to criteria air pollutant impacts.

BAAQMD considers criteria air pollutant impacts to be cumulative by nature. Operational criteria air pollutant emissions of the Plan (assessed using the Plan-level thresholds from the BAAQMD), addressed

individually and cumulatively in the EIR, would not make a considerable contribution to regional emissions of criteria air pollutants, given the Plan's consistency with the *Clean Air Plan* and the modest growth in VMT compared to population growth, and would not result in intersection volumes that would trigger a concern with regard to localized CO concentrations. However, as discussed above, subsequent individual development projects and proposed street network changes could emit criteria air pollutants or result in increased vehicle delays, thereby increasing vehicle emissions in excess of the project-level significance criteria, resulting in a considerable contribution to cumulative air quality impacts. Potential open space improvements in the Plan Area would be considerably smaller in size and less than 20 acres, and would therefore not make a considerable contribution to criteria pollutant emissions. Therefore, cumulative operational criteria air pollutant impacts from open space improvements would be less than significant.

The EIR identifies and analyzes **Mitigation Measures M-NO-1a: Transportation Demand Management for New Development Projects, M-AQ-3a: Education for Residential and Commercial Tenants Concerning Low-VOC Consumer Products, M-AQ-3b: Reduce Operational Emissions, M-AQ-5a: Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Generators and Fire Pumps, Mitigation Measure M-AQ-5e: Central SoMa Air Quality Improvement Strategy, M-AQ-4a: Construction Emissions Analysis, and M-AQ-4b: Construction Emissions Minimization Plan** to address this impact.

The EIR finds that even with implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts with respect to subsequent development projects in the Plan Area and the proposed street network changes under 2040 cumulative conditions would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation. However, the identification of this significant impact does not preclude the finding of future less-than-significant impacts for subsequent projects that comply with applicable screening criteria or meet applicable thresholds of significance.

Impact C-AQ-2: Development under the Plan, including proposed street network changes, but not open space improvements, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, under cumulative 2040 conditions, would contribute considerably to criteria air pollutant impacts. (Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)

The EIR finds that the Plan would indirectly result in traffic emissions and emissions from stationary sources that would have a significant effect on sensitive receptors. These emissions would contribute considerably to cumulative health risk effects within the Plan Area and vicinity. Therefore, the Plan would result in a significant cumulative impact with respect to PM 2.5 and TAC emissions. In addition, the results of the cumulative health risk assessment indicate that Plan-generated traffic would increase the geographic extent of the APEZ under 2040 cumulative conditions, as compared to existing conditions. Within the APEZ, Plan-generated traffic would increase excess cancer risk by more than seven per one million persons exposed, while PM_{2.5} concentrations would increase by up to 0.17 µg/m³ at individual receptor points. Therefore, Plan-generated traffic would significantly affect both the geography and severity of health risks within the Plan Area under 2040 cumulative conditions, resulting in a considerable contribution to cumulative health risk impacts. The proposed street network changes would not generate new vehicle trips but would relocate vehicle trips, thereby potentially exacerbating this impact. The proposed open space improvements would not be of sufficient magnitude to draw large numbers of users from outside the immediate neighborhood and would be expected to generate little, if any, motor vehicle travel. Therefore, the proposed open space improvements would not make a considerable contribution to cumulative health risk impacts.

The EIR identifies and analyzes **Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a: Transportation Demand Management for New Development Projects**, and **Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4a: Construction Emissions Analysis**, to address this impact. The EIR also identifies and analyzes **Mitigation Measures M-AQ-5a: Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Generators and Fire Pumps; M-AQ-5b: Siting of Uses that Emit Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5}), Diesel Particulate Matter, or Other Toxic Air Contaminants; and M-AQ-5c: Update Air Pollution Exposure Zone for San Francisco Health Code Article 38**, to address this impact as well. Finally, the EIR identifies and analyzes **Mitigation Measure M-AQ-6b: Implement Clean Construction Requirements**, to address this impact.

The EIR finds that even with implementation of these mitigation measures, cumulative impacts with respect to subsequent development projects and proposed street network changes, and emissions of TACs generated by development occurring pursuant to the Plan under 2040 cumulative conditions would result in significant cumulative impacts to existing sensitive receptors; therefore, this impact remains significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

IV.F Wind

IV.F.1 Impact WI-1

Impact WI-1: Subsequent future development anticipated under the Plan could alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas.

Wind tunnel testing was performed to generally define the pedestrian wind environment that currently exists, and would exist with Plan implementation, on sidewalks and open spaces around the Plan Area. For this program-level wind testing, wind tunnel models did not include detailed landscape features in open areas or specific building articulation beyond basic setbacks. The results indicate that the Plan could result in four new exceedances of the 26 mph hazard criterion, resulting in a significant impact. Because building designs, large street trees, and street furniture were not included in the wind tunnel model, the test results reported are conservative and likely to indicate higher wind speeds than would actually occur. It is expected that the landscaping features and building articulation would be expected to eliminate the five hazard criterion exceedances that were identified in the Plan model.

The EIR identifies and analyzes **Mitigation Measure M-WI-1: Wind Hazard Criterion for the Plan Area** to address this impact. The EIR finds that implementation of Mitigation Measure M-WI-1 would reduce the potential for a net increase in wind hazard exceedances and the hours of wind hazard exceedances. However, it cannot be stated with certainty that each subsequent development project would be able to meet the one-hour wind hazard criterion of 26 miles per hour equivalent wind speed performance standard without substantial modifications to the project's design and program such that the project would not be able to be developed to allowable building heights proposed by the Plan. Therefore, this impact remains significant and unavoidable with mitigation. This determination does not preclude the finding that specific development projects would result in less-than-significant wind impacts depending on the design and site conditions.

SECTION V

Why Subsequent Environmental Analysis or Recirculation Is Not Required

For the reasons set forth below and elsewhere in the Administrative Record, none of the factors are present that would necessitate recirculation of the Final EIR under CEQA Guideline Section 15088.5 or the preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR under CEQA Guideline Section 15162. The Response to Comments document thoroughly addressed all public comments that the Planning Department received on the Draft EIR. In response to these comments, the Department added new and clarifying text to the EIR and modified some mitigation measures.

The Response to Comments document, which combined with the Draft EIR and the Errata comprise the Final EIR, analyzed all of these changes, including the Project, and determined that these changes did not constitute new information of significance that would alter any of the conclusions of the EIR. Further, additional changes to the Project have been incorporated into the project after publication of the Response to Comments document. These changes have been addressed orally by staff or in staff reports, which statements and reports are incorporated herein by reference, and based on this information, the Planning Department has determined that these additional changes do not constitute new information of significance that would alter any of the conclusions of the EIR.

Based on the information set forth above and other substantial evidence in light of the whole record on the Final EIR, the Commission determines that (1) the Project is within the scope of the project description analyzed in the Final EIR; (2) approval of Project will not require important revisions to the Final EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; (3) taking into account the Project and other changes analyzed in the Final EIR, no substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the Project are undertaken which would require major revisions to the Final EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects, or a substantial increase in the severity of effects identified in the Final EIR; and (4) no new information of substantial importance to the Project has become available which would indicate (a) the Project or the approval actions will have significant effects not discussed in the Final EIR, (b) significant environmental effects will be substantially more severe; (c) mitigation measures or alternatives found not feasible which would reduce one or more significant effects have become feasible; or (d) mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those in the Final EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment. Consequently, there is no need to recirculate the Final EIR under CEQA Guideline 15088.5 or to prepare a subsequent or supplemental EIR under CEQA Guideline Section 15162.

SECTION VI

Evaluation of Project Alternatives

This section describes the EIR alternatives and the reasons for rejecting the Alternatives as infeasible. This Article also outlines the Project's purposes and provides the rationale for selecting or rejecting alternatives, and describes the Project alternative components analyzed in the EIR.

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

CEQA requires that every EIR evaluate a "No Project" alternative as part of the range of alternatives analyzed in the EIR. The Central SoMa Plan EIR's No Project analysis was prepared in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15126.6(e)(3)(A) and (C).

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

VI.A Alternatives Rejected and Reasons for Rejection

The Alternatives set forth in the Final EIR and listed below are hereby rejected as infeasible based upon substantial evidence in the record, including evidence of economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations described in this Section, in addition to those described in Section VII below, which are hereby incorporated by reference, that make these alternatives infeasible. These determinations are made with the awareness 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, legal, social, and technological factors." (CEQA Guidelines § 15364.) Under CEQA case law, the concept of "feasibility" encompasses (i) the question of whether a particular alternative promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project; and (ii) the question of whether an alternative is "desirable" from a policy standpoint to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors.

VI.A.1 No Project Alternative (Alternative 1)

Under the No Project Alternative, development within the Plan area would proceed consistent with existing land use controls, including the East SoMa Area Plan and existing use and height and bulk districts. The No Project Alternative would not include implementation of the Plan's proposed street network changes, nor would the open spaces or open space improvements set forth in the Plan be expected to be implemented. Although both the East SoMa Plan and the Western SoMa Plan call for increasing the amount of open space in their respective plan areas, neither adopted area plan identifies specific park sites or open space improvements to facilitate these plans' respective policy objectives. Therefore, no specific open space or street network

improvements are assumed under the No Project Alternative other than efforts currently under way or recently completed, such as the proposed Sixth Street Improvement Project along the western boundary of the Plan Area (which would include widened sidewalks and street tree planting), and the new Annie Alley Plaza (off of Mission Street between Second and Third Streets) and portions of San Francisco Public Works' SoMa Alleyway Improvement Project that are located in the western portion of the Plan Area, along Minna, Natoma, Tehama, Clementina, Shipley, and Clara Streets. Individual development projects under the No Project Alternative are assumed to meet Better Streets Plan requirements. The No Project Alternative has been identified as the environmentally superior alternative.

If the No Project Alternative were implemented, in the area of Land Use and Land Use Planning, changes in land use would be expected to occur more slowly under the No Project Alternative, compared to those with implementation of the Plan because, without changes in use districts (e.g., SLI to CMUO) and increased height limits, there would be less incentive to redevelop many of the parcels in the Plan Area. Moreover, as shown in Table VI-1, less overall development would occur in the Plan Area, compared with that forecast under the Plan. This alternative would not involve any construction within, or alter the physical or operational characteristics of, current public rights of way or open space areas. Consequently, the No Project Alternative would not include new mid-block crosswalks or other improvements that would improve connectivity within and adjacent to the Plan Area.

Under this alternative, impacts would be the same in the topic area of Cultural and Paleontological Resources, although less than significant construction-related impacts on architectural historical resources and impacts to human remains and tribal cultural resources would be lessened, and significant but mitigable impacts to archeological resources would be avoided.

Transportation and Circulation impacts would differ somewhat from the Plan. VMT and traffic hazard impacts would be the same as under the Plan, while regional transit capacity utilization under this alternative would be less than significant and transit capacity impacts would be significant and unavoidable. Pedestrian impacts under this alternative would remain significant and bicycle impacts would remain less than significant, as under the Plan. Loading impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level under this alternative; parking impacts would remain less than significant; and emergency vehicle access impacts would be less than significant as compared to the less than significant with mitigation under the Plan. Construction impacts to transit would be expected to be less than significant with project-specific mitigation.

Noise and Vibration impacts from traffic would be lessened, but overall cumulative traffic noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable, as with the Plan. It is anticipated that construction noise and vibration impacts would be less than significant with project-specific mitigation, similar to the Plan.

In the area of Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions, this alternative would have similar impacts to the Plan, including significant and unavoidable impacts related to traffic-generated toxic air contaminants. Furthermore, to the extent that development under this alternative that is precluded in the Plan Area occurs in less dense areas and areas less well-served by transit, this development could generate substantially greater air quality and greenhouse gas impacts than under the Plan.

This alternative would avoid the Plan's impacts in the topic areas of Aesthetics (less than significant under the Plan) and Wind (significant and unavoidable under the Plan). The Plan's less than significant Shadow impacts would also be reduced. Hydrology and Water Quality (sea level rise and combined sewer system) impacts would remain less than significant, as under the Plan.

The No Project Alternative is hereby rejected as infeasible because, although it would eliminate some of the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts, it would fail to meet most of the basic objectives of the Project. The No Project Alternative would not accommodate a substantial amount of growth, allowing up to approximately 2,400 residential units, and thus would not alleviate the demand for housing or pressure on rents. Nor would this alternative allow the Plan Area to accommodate a substantial amount of new jobs. Increasing housing and jobs capacity is necessary to accommodate some of the City and region's substantial demand for growth in a transit-rich, walkable, and bike-able location. While any development under the current zoning would still pay the City's applicable development impact fees for any new development, the reduced development would pay lower total fees, which would not be enough to support the same level of improvements for the neighborhood. Under the No Project Alternative, the City would generate only a small percentage of the funding necessary to improve conditions for people walking, bicycling, and taking transit. As a result, the City would be unable to improve pedestrian conditions by widening sidewalks, creating new crosswalks, and improving existing crossings as envisioned by the Plan. Nor would the No Project Alternative allow the City to fund protected bicycle lanes on many of the neighborhood's streets, as envisioned by the Plan. Nor would it allow the City to fund transit improvements to serve this neighborhood to the same extent. Under the No Project Alternative the City would generate much less funding necessary to offer parks and recreational opportunities in this neighborhood compared to the Plan. And under the No Project Alternative, reduced development in this transit-rich location would result in a lesser reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from driving as well as a lesser reduction of pressure on undeveloped greenfield locations that have high environmental benefit. Furthermore, under the No Project Alternative, existing historic buildings would not be able to sell Transferable Development Rights to fund their rehabilitation and maintenance, which could result in less preservation of historic resources. Nor would the No Project Alternative support the designation of historically significant and contributory buildings under *Planning Code* Articles 10 and 11. Under the No Project Alternative there would be no funding to build new facilities for community services such as health care clinics and job training centers. For these reasons, the No Project Alternative is not a feasible alternative.

A proposal to include a Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD) in the Central SoMa Plan is also under consideration. This CFD would provide funding towards regional transit; funding for maintenance and operations of parks and open space; funding for environmental sustainability and resilience strategies such as neighborhood greening, air quality improvements, and stormwater management; funding to help preserve the Old Mint; and funding for cultural and social programming. The No Project Alternative would not include this CFD, and thus not provide for these public services and quality of life improvements. For this additional reason, the No Project Alternative is hereby rejected as infeasible economically, socially and from an urban planning perspective because it does not meet the City's goals to create an economically diversified and lively jobs center, provide safe and convenient transportation that prioritizes walking, bicycling, and transit, offer an abundance of parks and recreational opportunities, create an environmentally sustainable and resilient neighborhood, and accommodate a substantial amount of jobs and housing.

VI.A.2 Reduced Heights Alternative (Alternative 2)

The Reduced Heights Alternative would result in implementation of the same land use districts and General Plan amendments as under the Plan, except for text and height amendments that relate to maximum permitted building heights as well as building bulk (regulated through the use of floor-plate size restrictions and required setbacks) within Plan Area height districts. The Reduced Heights Alternative would permit

fewer tall buildings south of the elevated Interstate 80 freeway than would be allowable under the Plan. Both the Reduced Heights Alternative and the Project would increase height limits along much of Fourth, Harrison, and Bryant Streets from 65 feet to 85 feet. However, the Reduced Heights Alternative would allow for four towers of 160 feet or more in height south of the freeway, whereas the Plan would allow up to 10 towers in this area. Also, on the south side of Harrison Street between Second and Fourth Streets, the Reduced Heights Alternative would allow future buildings at heights no greater than 130 feet, whereas the Plan would allow for four towers 160 feet tall and greater. The Reduced Heights Alternative would include the same street network changes and open space improvements that are proposed under the Plan. This alternative assumes that most of the same sites would be developed as under the Plan, although the reduced heights make some development infeasible, and on other sites the development would occur at a lower intensity, resulting in less development than that assumed under the Plan. Overall, the Reduced Heights Alternative would result in a decrease of development potential of approximately 25% within the Plan Area.¹

If the Reduced Heights Alternative were implemented, it would not reduce to a less-than-significant level any of the significant impacts of the Project. Land use and land use planning impacts would be similar to the Plan, including a significant and unavoidable conflict with General Plan policy regarding traffic noise. The alternative's impacts on would be the same as under the Plan. Although the Reduced Heights Alternative would have a somewhat lesser impact than the Plan in the topic area of Transportation and Circulation, none of the significant impacts would be reduced to less-than significant levels. Shadow impacts, which were less than significant under the Plan, would be substantially lessened under this alternative. The Reduced Heights Alternative would have the same impacts as the Plan in the topic areas of Aesthetics, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, Noise and Vibration, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Wind and Hydrology and Water Quality (combined sewer system and sea level rise).

The Reduced Heights Alternative is hereby rejected as infeasible because it would not eliminate any of the significant and unavoidable effects associated with the Plan, and it would not meet several of the basic project objectives to the same extent that the Project would. Under the Reduced Heights Alternative, the capacity of the Plan Area to accommodate jobs and housing would be increased from the current capacity, but would be approximately 75% of the amount allowed by the Plan. Therefore, this alternative would not alleviate the demand for housing or pressure on rents to the same degree as the Plan. Nor would this alternative allow the Plan Area to support the creation of as many jobs as the Plan would. Increasing housing and jobs capacity is necessary to accommodate some of the City and region's substantial demand for growth in a transit-rich, walkable, and bike-able location. Under the Reduced Heights Alternative, while new development would still pay the City's applicable development impact fees, the reduced development would pay a lower total amount of fees, which would not be enough to support the same level of improvements for the neighborhood. The City would not generate the funding necessary to improve conditions for people walking, bicycling, and taking transit to the same extent as the Plan. As a result, the City would be unable to improve pedestrian conditions by widening sidewalks, creating new crosswalks, and improving existing crossings to the extent

¹ Calculation based on the Planning Department's *Buildout Analysis for Central SoMa* (accessed January 25, 2018, on file and available for public review as part of Case File No. 2011.1356E at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA, 94103), which includes a parcel-level analysis of development potential in the Plan Area that was utilized for the EIR. For purposes of this analysis, the parcel-level development potential of the proposed Reduced Heights Alternative was compared against the proposed project.

that the Plan would. Nor would it allow the City to fund transit improvements to serve this neighborhood to the same extent. Under the Reduced Heights Alternative the City would not be able to generate funding necessary to offer parks and recreational opportunities in this neighborhood in the same abundance as the Plan. And under the Reduced Heights Alternative, reduced development in this transit-rich location would result in a lesser reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from driving as well as a lesser reduction of pressure on undeveloped greenfield locations that have high environmental benefit. Furthermore, under the Reduced Heights Alternative there would be reduced funding to build new facilities for community services such as health care clinics and job training centers. For these reasons, the No Project Alternative is not a feasible alternative.

A proposal to include a Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD) in the Central SoMa Plan is also under consideration. This CFD would provide funding towards regional transit; funding for maintenance and operations of parks and open space; funding for environmental sustainability and resilience strategies such as neighborhood greening, air quality improvements, and stormwater management; funding to help preserve the Old Mint; and funding for cultural and social programming. As the CFD would be expected to apply to the tallest buildings, which will be particularly limited under the Reduced Heights Alternative, it can be expected that under the Reduced Height alternative, the CFD would provide substantially less funding compared to the Plan for these public services and quality of life improvements. For this additional reason, the Reduced Heights Alternative is hereby rejected as infeasible.

VI.A. 3 Modified TODCO Plan (Alternative 3)

The Modified TODCO Plan Alternative would result in a substantial amount of zoning that would not allow housing south of the freeway, as well reduced heights in some areas where housing would be anticipated.

Of the total of 15 million square feet of office development that this alternative assumes would occur in San Francisco over the next 20 years, the Modified TODCO Plan proposes that up to about five million square feet be accommodated in the southern portion of the Plan Area (from the north side of Harrison Street south), with the remainder foreseen to be developed in the Financial District, including the Transit Center District east of the Plan Area and the existing C-3 use districts northeast of the Plan Area; Mission Bay and the Central Waterfront, including Pier 70 and the Seawall Lot 337/Pier 48 site where large mixed-use developments are proposed; and, to a lesser extent, in the Civic Center/Mid-Market area. Thus, assuming these other neighborhoods could accommodate this level of growth, the Modified TODCO Plan envisions that the Plan Area would be anticipated to accommodate less growth in office employment, but citywide office job growth would likely be comparable to city and regional forecasts.

The Modified TODCO Plan would have a somewhat different boundary than the Plan. In particular, the Modified TODCO Plan would exclude the SoMa Neighborhood Commercial Transit (NCT) parcels within the Plan Area fronting along the east side of Sixth Street between Stevenson Street and just north of Folsom Street and would include certain additional parcels outside the Plan Area south of Mission Street, east of Sixth Street, and west of Third Street, including, but not limited to, the 5M development site, Moscone Center, and Yerba Buena Gardens.

In addition, the Modified TODCO Plan proposes a number of use district changes within its plan boundary. The primary difference would be that the Modified TODCO Plan would extend the Western SoMa Plan's Folsom Street Neighborhood Commercial Transit (F-NCT) district two blocks east to Fourth Street. The

Modified TODCO Plan would also slightly vary the distribution of CMUO and MUG use districts between Folsom and Harrison Streets and Fourth and Sixth Streets. Between Harrison and Bryant Streets, south of where the elevated I-80 freeway passes, the Modified TODCO Plan would designate the blocks between Second and Fourth Streets as Western SoMa MUO (WMUO), rather than the Central SoMa Plan's CMUO allowing office use but prohibiting residential units on parcels abutting the freeway. Between Fourth and Sixth Streets, both the Modified TODCO Plan and the Central SoMa Plan would retain the Western SoMa Plan's Service-Arts-Light Industrial (SALI) zoning.

In contrast to the Central SoMa Plan, between Bryant and Townsend Streets, the Modified TODCO Plan would retain nearly one-half of the existing SALI use district between Fourth and Sixth Streets, and retain all of the existing Residential Enclave (RED) use district parcels between Fourth and Fifth Streets. The Modified TODCO Plan would convert the remainder of the existing SALI use district between Bryant and Townsend Streets to CMUO (allowing office use and residential), with the exception of one parcel along the west side of Fifth Street between Brannan and Bluxome Streets that would be converted to WMUO, but which would permit student housing. Between Second and Fourth Streets, the Modified TODCO Plan would, like the Plan, designate most of the area CMUO (retaining the South Park District), but would also create a new Fourth Street Neighborhood Commercial (4-NCT) use district, similar to the F-NCT but allowing office and other commercial uses above the second story while requiring that second-story commercial uses be neighborhood-serving.

The Modified TODCO Plan also proposes a number of use district changes within the Modified TODCO Plan Area, but outside the Central SoMa Plan Area. North of the Central SoMa Plan Area between Fourth and Sixth Streets, the Modified TODCO Plan proposes to convert a number of parcels currently designated C-3-S to MUG. The Modified TODCO Plan also would convert the existing C-3-S portions of the two blocks of Yerba Buena Gardens and Moscone Center, bounded by Mission, Third, Folsom and Fourth Streets as a new Yerba Buena Gardens Special Use District (SUD). South of the boundary of the Central SoMa Plan Area (and the Modified TODCO Plan Area), the Modified TODCO Plan would designate a parcel located at the southeast corner of Fourth and Townsend Streets (the site of the Caltrain station) as WMUO².

In addition, the Modified TODCO Plan proposes a number of PDR/Arts protections. Specifically, the Modified TODCO Plan proposes to incorporate all the provisions of Proposition X (passed by the voters in November 2016), which will require, among other provisions, Conditional Use authorization in the Central SoMa Plan Area (among other plan areas) for conversion of at least 5,000 square feet of a PDR use, or at least 2,500 square feet of an Arts Activity use; and in addition, in SALI, SLI, CMUO and MUG districts would require replacement of the space proposed for conversion on-site as part of the new project. The Modified TODCO Plan would also extend its requirements for MUG districts to the current and future WS-MUG and CMUO districts within the Central SoMa Plan Area, as well as a number of other areas within SoMa.

Within the Modified TODCO Plan Area, including that encompassed by the Central SoMa Plan Area, the Modified TODCO Plan proposes no height limit increases for any new development above the existing height limits currently in effect, except as specified for certain major development sites within the Central SoMa Plan Area. At those major development sites, the Modified TODCO Plan would increase height limits to the same heights limits proposed at those sites under the Central SoMa Plan.

² The Caltrain station is the subject of a separate Planning Department planning process, the Fourth and King Streets Railyards Study.

Like the proposed Plan, the Modified TODCO Plan proposes a new park in the area of Fifth and Bryant Streets. While the Plan proposes evaluating park use of a mid-block property owned by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), the Modified TODCO Plan proposes a park that would occupy both sides of Fifth Street between Bryant and Brannan Streets, providing about 1.4 acres of parkland on either side of Fifth Street (2.8 acres total)—twice the size of the SFPUC parcel.

Additional components of the Modified TODCO Plan include a proposal to modify the existing SoMa Youth and Family Zone by incorporating into the zone provisions regarding senior citizens, expanding the area subject to the zone's inclusionary housing provisions, and increasing the emphasis on the provision of affordable housing (the Plan does not propose any changes to the existing SoMa Youth and Family Zone); as well as a specific proposal for affordable senior housing atop the Central Subway Moscone Center station being built at the northwest corner of Fourth and Folsom Streets.

The Modified TODCO Plan Alternative would have the same impacts as the Plan in the topic areas of Land Use and Land Use Planning, Aesthetics, Transportation and Circulation, and Noise and Vibration.

The Modified TODCO Plan Alternative would, like the Plan, have significant and unavoidable impacts on Cultural and Paleontological Resources, but unlike the Plan would not provide protection for identified historic resources under Articles 10 and 11. This alternative would avoid some of the Plan's construction-related impacts to architectural historic resources, which were less than significant under the Plan. The Modified TODCO Plan Alternative would have many of the same impacts as the Plan in the topic area of Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions. It would have a somewhat lesser but still significant and unavoidable impact on operational criteria air pollutants and could have a substantially greater impact on air quality and greenhouse gases due to the shift of development from the Plan Area to other parts of the Bay Area that are less dense and less well-served by transit.

The Modified TODCO Plan Alternative would avoid the Plan's significant and unavoidable Wind impacts in a majority of the Plan Area. However, wind effects at major development sites in the Plan Area would remain significant and unavoidable.

This alternative's Shadow impacts, which under the Plan would be less than significant, would be lessened near major development sites and therefore, as under the Plan, would be less than significant. The Modified TODCO Plan Alternative would also lessen the less-than-significant Hydrology and Water Quality (sea level rise and combined sewer system) effects of the Plan.

The Modified TODCO Plan Alternative is hereby rejected as infeasible because it would not avoid any of the significant and unavoidable effects associated with the Plan and would not meet several of the basic project objectives to the same extent that the Project would. Under this alternative, the capacity of the Plan Area to accommodate jobs and housing would be increased, but development capacity would be approximately 80% of the amount allowed by the Plan because of the increase in industrially-protective zoning and reduced heights, as discussed above.³ By accommodating less growth in this high-demand area, this alternative would not alleviate the demand for housing or pressure on rents to the same degree as the Plan. Nor would this alternative allow the Plan Area to support the creation of as many jobs as the Plan would. Increasing housing

³ Calculation based on the Planning Department's *Buildout Analysis for Central SoMa* (January 25, 2018), which includes a parcel-level analysis of development potential in the Plan Area that was utilized for the EIR. For purposes of this analysis, the parcel-level development potential of the proposed Modified TODCO Alternative was compared against the proposed project.

and jobs capacity is necessary to accommodate some of the City and region's substantial demand for growth in a transit-rich, walkable, and bike-able location. In addition, under the Modified TODCO Plan Alternative, while any development would still pay the City's applicable development impact fees, the reduced development would pay lower total fees, which would not support the same level of improvements for the neighborhood. The City would not generate the funding necessary to improve conditions for people walking, bicycling, and taking transit to the same extent. This lower level of funding would not allow the City to improve pedestrian conditions to the same extent by widening sidewalks, creating new crosswalks, and improving existing crossings. Nor would it allow the City to fund protected bicycle lanes on many of the neighborhood's streets. Nor would it allow the City to fund transit improvements to serve this neighborhood to the same extent. Furthermore, under the Modified TODCO Plan Alternative the City would not be able to generate funding necessary to offer parks and recreational opportunities in this neighborhood in the same abundance as the Plan. Additionally, reduced development in this transit-rich location will not result in the same benefit of reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from driving as well as reduction of pressure on undeveloped greenfield locations that have high environmental benefit. Under the Modified TODCO Alternative there would also be reduced funding to build new facilities for community services such as health care clinics and job training centers. For these reasons, the Modified TODCO Plan Alternative is not a feasible alternative.

A proposal to include a Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD) in the Central SoMa Plan is also under consideration. This CFD would provide funding towards regional transit; funding for maintenance and operations of parks and open space; funding for environmental sustainability and resilience strategies such as neighborhood greening, air quality improvements, and stormwater management; funding to help preserve the Old Mint; and funding for cultural and social programming. The Modified TODCO Alternative would provide less funding compared to the Plan for these public services and quality of life improvements. For this additional reason, the Modified TODCO Alternative is hereby rejected as infeasible.

VI.A. 4 Land Use Variant (Alternative 4)

The Land Use Variant is a variant of the Plan that would not permit residential uses in the WS-SALI and WS MUO use districts in the area roughly bounded by Bryant, Townsend, Fourth and Sixth Streets. Although this area would be zoned CMUO as proposed under the Plan, the prohibition on new housing adopted as part of the Western SoMa Plan would remain in effect. The intention of the Land Use Variant is to minimize potential land use conflicts in this approximately four-block area between new housing and existing and future commercial and entertainment uses. The Land Use Variant would allow for development at the same heights and same locations as under the Plan; only the above-described land use changes would be different within the area covered by the Land Use Variant. All other aspects of the Land Use Variant would be the same as under the Plan, including the street network changes proposed under the Plan. This would not result in a decrease of overall development potential within the Plan Area, but would reduce potential for housing by approximately 1,500 units, representing 18% of the Plan's potential.⁴

The Land Use Variant's impacts would be the same as the Plan's in the topic areas of Land Use and Land Use Planning, Aesthetics, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, Transportation and Circulation, Air Quality and

⁴ Calculation based on the Planning Department's *Buildout Analysis for Central SoMa* (January 25, 2018), which includes a parcel-level analysis of development potential in the Plan Area that was utilized for the EIR. For purposes of this analysis, the parcel-level development potential of the proposed Land Use Variant was compared against the proposed project.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Wind, Shadow, and Hydrology and Water Quality (sea level rise and combined sewer system). Noise and Vibration impacts would also be similar, although under this variant there would be less potential for conflicts between entertainment and residential uses, although that impact would remain less than significant with mitigation, as under the Plan.

The Land Use Variant is hereby rejected as infeasible for because it would not avoid any of the significant and unavoidable effects associated with the Plan and would not meet several of the basic project objectives to the same extent that the Plan would. Under this alternative, the capacity of the Plan Area to accommodate housing would be increased from the current zoning, but would be approximately 82% of the amount allowed by the Plan. By accommodating less housing in this high-demand area, this alternative would not alleviate the demand for housing or pressure on housing rents to the same degree as the Plan. Increasing housing capacity is necessary to accommodate some of the City and region's substantial demand for growth in a transit-rich, walkable, and bike-able location. By not permitting housing in a large portion of the Plan Area, this alternative would not help facilitate a fully mixed-use community that provides a diversity of amenities to fully serve the neighborhood's needs.

VI.A.5 Land Use Plan Only Alternative (Alternative 5)

The Land Use Plan Only Alternative assumes the same policies and *Planning Code* and *General Plan* amendments would be implemented as with the Plan, except that this alternative would exclude implementation of the Plan's proposed street network changes. As such, development assumptions for this alternative would be the same as those for the Plan, including the addition, by 2040 in the Plan Area, of approximately 8,300 households, 14,700 residents and approximately 33,000 jobs. Total floor area developed by 2040 in the Plan Area under this alternative would also be the same as the Plan, at 16 million square feet. Aside from the No Project Alternative, the Land Use Plan Only Alternative has been identified as the environmentally superior alternative.

The impacts of the Land Use Plan Only Alternative would be the same as under the Plan in the topic area of Hydrology and Water Quality (sea level rise and combined sewer system). This alternative would avoid the Plan's significant and unavoidable conflict with General Plan policy regarding traffic noise in the Land Use and Land Use Planning topic area. In the Cultural and Paleontological Resources topic area, this alternative would lessen the Plan's less-than-significant impacts on in the areas of archeological resources, human remains and tribal cultural resources, and would avoid the Plan's less-than-significant construction-related impacts on architectural historical resources. Other Cultural and Paleontological Resources would remain the same.

Transportation and Circulation impacts would differ somewhat from under the Plan. This alternative's impacts would be lessened compared to the Plan in that the Land Use Plan Only Alternative would avoid increased delays on some transit lines. However, this alternative would cause significant delays on other lines during both AM and PM peak hours. The Land Use Plan Only Alternative would result in significant bicycle-related impacts, as compared to the less-than-significant with mitigation impacts of the Plan. This is because the Land Use Plan Only Alternative would exclude the Plan's bicycle improvements and could result in greater potential for bicycle conflicts with vehicles and pedestrians. In addition, the Land Use Plan Only Alternative would result in a greater number of significant impacts at a number of crosswalk locations under existing plus Plan and under 2040 conditions. The Land Use Plan Only Alternative's impacts on loading would, unlike the Plan, be less than significant with mitigation, and its impacts on emergency vehicle access would be less than significant, unlike the Plan's impacts, which would be less than significant with mitigation.

The Land Use Plan Only Alternative would avoid the Plan's significant and unavoidable traffic noise impact on Howard Street west of Tenth Street under existing plus Plan conditions for the Howard and Folsom Streets two-way option. This alternative would also result in a significant cumulative increase in traffic noise on Fifth Street between Bryant and Brannan Streets that would not occur under the Plan. This alternative would avoid significant cumulative traffic noise impacts of the Plan on Howard St (west of Fifth St), on Fourth Street between Bryant and Brannan Streets, on Fifth Street between Brannan and Townsend Streets and on Bryant Street east of Fourth Street. Other noise impacts would be similar to the Plan.

In addition, the Land Use Plan Only Alternative's Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions impacts would vary somewhat from the Plan's. This alternative would reduce congestion-related omissions to a less-than-significant level, but emissions from subsequent development would remain significant and unavoidable. The overall impact of this alternative on operational criteria air pollutants would also remain significant and unavoidable, although this alternative, unlike the Plan, would not reduce the number of mixed-flow travel lanes and therefore would not have the Plan's potential to result in increased vehicle congestion. Impacts from construction emissions of criteria pollutants would be marginally less than the Plan's less than significant impacts. As under the Plan, impacts from vehicle-generated particulates and toxic air contaminants would be significant and unavoidable and construction-related toxic air contaminant impacts would be marginally less and remain less than significant with mitigation.

The Land Use Plan Only Alternative is hereby rejected as infeasible because under the Land Use Plan Only Alternative, the City would not fulfill its goal to provide safe and convenient transportation that prioritizes walking, bicycling, and transit. The City would not improve pedestrian conditions by making improvements associated with the Plan's street network changes, including widening sidewalks, creating new crosswalks, and improving existing crossings. Nor would it allow the City to provide protected bicycle lanes on many of the neighborhood's streets. Finally, the City would not facilitate transit enhancements in the neighborhood, such as transit-only lanes.

VI.A.6 Alternatives Considered but Rejected

The TODCO Group submitted its TODCO Plan to the City for consideration in October 2016 after the draft Central SoMa Plan was revised in August 2016. All aspects of the October 2016 TODCO Plan were included and analyzed as the "Modified TODCO Plan" in the Alternatives Chapter of the Draft EIR, with the exception of the TODCO Plan's proposed height limits. The October 2016 TODCO Plan proposed changes in height limits at certain major development sites within the Central SoMa Plan Area that would be greater than that proposed for those same sites in the Central SoMa Plan. Specifically, under the TODCO Plan, the proposed 250-foot height limits at the Academy of Art Student Housing site and the Fourth and Harrison Streets site would be greater than the height limit for those sites proposed under the Central SoMa Plan (160 feet, and 240 feet, respectively). In addition, at the Second and Harrison Street site, the proposed height limits of 400 feet under the TODCO Plan would be greater than the 350-foot height limit for that site proposed under the Central SoMa Plan.

The TODCO Plan alternative was not selected because it could result in greater shadow and wind impacts than the Plan, the No Project Alternative, and the Reduced Heights Alternative. Specifically, given that the TODCO Plan proposes higher height limits on two parcels on Harrison Street as compared to the Plan, shadow effects on Yerba Buena Gardens, Alice Street Community Gardens, Jessie Square, Yerba Buena Lane,

and Mint Plaza may be greater than under the Plan. These higher heights could also result in greater pedestrian-level winds.

Furthermore, this alternative would not avoid any of the significant and unavoidable effects associated with the Plan and would not meet several of the basic project objectives to the same extent that the Project would. Under this alternative, the capacity of the Plan Area to accommodate jobs and housing would be increased, but would be approximately 80% of the amount allowed by the Plan. By accommodating less growth in this high-demand area, this alternative would not alleviate the demand for housing or the pressure on rents to the same degree as the Plan. Increasing housing capacity is necessary to accommodate some of the City and region's substantial demand for growth in a transit-rich, walkable, and bike-able location.

SECTION VII

Statement of Overriding Considerations

Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, the City hereby finds, after consideration of the Final EIR and the evidence in the record, that each of the specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological and other benefits of the Project as set forth below independently and collectively outweighs these significant and unavoidable impacts and is an overriding consideration warranting approval of the Project. Any one of the reasons for approval cited below is sufficient to justify approval of the Project. Thus, even if a court were to conclude that not every reason is supported by substantial evidence, this determination is that each individual reason is sufficient. The specific reasons for this finding, based on substantial evidence in the record, constitute the following Statement of Overriding Considerations. The substantial evidence supporting the various benefits can be found in the Final EIR and the preceding findings, which are incorporated by reference into this Section, and in the documents found in the administrative record, as described in Section I.

On the basis of the above findings and the substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding, the Planning Commission specifically finds that there are significant benefits of the Project in spite of the unavoidable significant impacts. The Commission further finds that, as part of the process of obtaining project approval, all significant effects on the environment from implementation of the Project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible. The Planning Commission acknowledges that if any of the mitigation measures identified in Exhibit B herein that fall within the authority of other City agencies are not adopted and implemented, the Project may result in other significant unavoidable impacts, in addition to those identified in Section IV, above. For these reasons the Planning Commission is adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Furthermore, the Commission has determined that any remaining significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable are acceptable due to the following specific overriding economic, technical, legal, social, and other considerations:

A. Central SoMa is a 230-acre area that sits adjacent to downtown, has excellent transit access, and contains a substantial amount of developable land. As such, the neighborhood is well positioned to accommodate needed employment, housing, and visitor facilities in the core of the city and Bay Area region. It

is also a neighborhood with an incredible history and a rich, ongoing, cultural heritage. As it grows and evolves over the next 25 years, Central SoMa has the opportunity to become a complete, sustainable, and vital neighborhood without losing what makes it special and unique today. The Central SoMa Plan (the “Plan”) contains the goals, objectives, and policies to guide this growth and evolution such that the results serve the best interests of San Francisco – in the present and the future.

B. The Plan is an important evolution in the planning of this neighborhood. The desire for a Central SoMa Plan began during the Eastern Neighborhoods planning process. In 2008 the City adopted the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan, including new land use controls and proposed community improvements for the eastern part of the South of Market neighborhood (SoMa), as well as the Central Waterfront, Mission, and Showplace Square/Potrero Hill neighborhoods. At that time, the City determined that the development potential of the industrially zoned part of East SoMa, coupled with the improved transit to be provided by the Central Subway, necessitated a subsequent, focused planning process that took into account the city’s growth needs and City and regional environmental goals. The Central SoMa Plan is the result of that subsequent process, and is an important tool to guide development in the Central SoMa area.

Similarly, the Western SoMa Area Plan, adopted in 2013, explicitly recognized the need to increase development capacity near transit in Objective 1.5, which states that the City should “Support continued evaluation of land uses near major transit infrastructure in recognition of citywide and regional sustainable growth needs.” The explanatory text in Objective 1.5 concludes that “The City must continue evaluating how it can best meet citywide and regional objectives to direct growth to transit-oriented locations and whether current controls are meeting identified needs.” The Objective’s implementing Policy 1.5.1 states that the City should “Continue to explore and re-examine land use controls east of 6th Street, including as part of any future evaluation along the 4th Street corridor.” The Central SoMa Plan is intended to fulfill the Western SoMa Plan’s Objective 1.5 and Policy 1.5.1 and is important to allow development near major transit infrastructure.

C. The Plan accommodates a substantial amount of jobs and housing. Specifically, the Plan would enable up to 8,300 new housing units and approximately 30,000 new jobs. Currently, the City and region are undergoing tremendous growth pressure. Economically, there is the continuing national and regional shift from an economy based on things to one based on ideas. These knowledge sector businesses tend to cluster in regions – and the Bay Area is the world’s leading knowledge region. The result is that job growth in the Bay Area the past several years has nearly doubled that of the rest of the nation, and commensurately so has the demand for housing. Simultaneously, there is increasing demand among both younger and older generations to live in walkable, transit-oriented, amenity-rich locations. In this largely suburban and auto-dependent region, many of the accessible and dynamic urban neighborhoods are in San Francisco. This Plan facilitates this kind of development in the Central SOMA area.

D. Cumulatively, demands for urban neighborhoods have created an ongoing and strong demand for space in San Francisco – one that outstrips the supply of new space. When demand is high relative to supply, the price inevitably goes up. In 2018, prices have risen to a level that is socially unsustainable – rents for housing are the highest in the country, and greatly exceed what can be afforded by the majority of today’s San Franciscans. Rents for commercial space are similarly unaffordable, pushing out non-profit organizations, mom-and-pop businesses, artists and industrial businesses. Fortunately, Central SoMa is an appropriate location for such development. The area is served by some of the region’s best transit, including BART and Caltrain, Muni Metro and many bus lines, in addition to the Central Subway currently under construction.

Flat streets and a regular grid pattern can make destinations easy to reach for people walking and bicycling. There is already an incredibly strong cluster of technology companies that new and growing companies want to locate near. There is also a diversity of other uses, including thousands of residential units, local- and regional-serving retail, cultural and entertainment facilities, hotels, and production/distribution/repair businesses. Simultaneously, there is substantial opportunity to increase density in Central SoMa. There are numerous undeveloped or underdeveloped sites, such as surface parking lots and single-story commercial buildings. Recognizing this opportunity, the Plan facilitates approximately 16 million square feet in new development, relatively evenly split between space for housing and jobs. Such an increase in development, at this appropriate location, is an important and necessary step towards accommodating the demand for growth in San Francisco. By doing so, the Plan can help increase the upward pressure on rents for residential and non-residential uses and thereby foster a more economically and socially sustainable neighborhood, city, and region.

E. The Plan strives to maintain the existing diversity of residents and encourage continuing diversity. SoMa already has an incredibly diverse population, in terms of race, income, unit size, and ownership status. Implementation of this Plan would maintain that diversity by ensuring that at least 33% of new units are affordable to low- and moderate-income families. In doing so, the Plan meets the City's target for provision of such units established in 2014's Proposition K. The Plan would enable production of at least 2,700 affordable units. Such units would be expected to be provided through a range of mechanisms, including direct provision by new development on-site and off-site, and provision by the City through in-lieu and Jobs-Housing Linkage Fees. Whereas typically City-funded projects could be built anywhere within the City, the Plan requires that these units would be built within SoMa, therefore supporting the diversity of residents. The Plan maintains the City's requirements that a mix of unit sizes be created in new development, thus supporting a range from smaller units to family-sized units. Finally, the Plan includes strategies meant to create a balance of rental and for-sale units.

F. The Plan facilitates an economically diversified and lively jobs center. By requiring its large sites to be commercially-oriented, the implementation of this Plan would create a jobs center in this location, expected to result in at least 30,000 new jobs. Locating jobs in this transit-rich location is a more effective use of our transit investments, given jobs are of greater density than housing, that people are more likely to walk from transit to their jobs than to their homes, and because lower-paid workers can save on not having to purchase their own vehicles. Locating jobs here can also support the economic synergies of co-location by bridging the job centers of Downtown and Mission Bay. Locating jobs in new buildings will also relieve pressure on other spaces citywide – particularly for non-profit offices and other organizations that cannot compete for rent with technology companies. It is also important to locate jobs at this location because only ten percent of San Francisco's land is zoned to allow office, whereas 90 percent can accommodate housing. While many of these jobs would be expected to be for office workers, the Plan would support the diversity of jobs by requiring Production, Distribution, and Repair uses in many new developments, requiring ground floor retail and other commercial uses on many of the major streets, and allowing hotel and entertainment uses that facilitate a 24-hour neighborhood with accompanying amenities.

G. The Plan provides safe and convenient transportation that prioritizes walking, bicycling, and transit. The neighborhood's streets were built to accommodate industrial uses and move trucks and cars through quickly by having many lanes of fast-moving traffic, narrow sidewalks, limited street crossings, and almost no

bicycle lanes and transit-protected lanes. Implementation of this Plan would redistribute the street right-of-way to better serve people walking, bicycling, and taking transit by widening sidewalks on all of the neighborhood's major thoroughfares, increasing the number of and safety of street crossings by facilitating signalized mid-block crossings and sidewalk bulbouts that shorten the length of crosswalks, creating protected bicycle on Howard, Folsom, Brannan, Townsend, and 5th Streets, and transit-only lanes on Folsom, Brannan, 3rd, and 4th Streets.

H. The Plan offers parks and recreational opportunities. Implementation of the Plan would facilitate a variety of improvements to offer additional public parks and recreational opportunities, from improving and expanding Gene Friend Recreation Center to creating multiple new parks, including a new one-acre park in the block bounded by 4th, 5th, Bryant, and Brannan Streets; a new ½ acre linear park on Bluxome Street between 4th and 5th Streets; and new recreational amenities (such as skate ramps and basketball courts) underneath the I-80 freeway between 4th and 6th Streets. The Plan also helps fund construction of a new recreation center, and up to four acres of privately-owned public open space.

I. The Plan creates an environmentally sustainable and resilient neighborhood. Implementation of this Plan will result in a substantial number of new buildings, infrastructure investment, and public benefits within the Plan Area, leading to dramatic opportunities for significant improvements to environmental quality. Given current State and City regulations, new buildings are required to be greener and more resilient than buildings from earlier eras. The Plan would further require additional cost-effective regulations for new development, such as living roofs and the use of 100 percent greenhouse gas-free electricity. Implementation of the Plan's street improvements would shift mode share away from personal vehicles. Finally, directing regional development to this central, transit-rich location will result in a reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from driving as well as reduction of pressure on undeveloped greenfield locations that have high environmental benefit.

J. The Plan ensures that new buildings enhance the character of the neighborhood and the city. The Plan's height and bulk requirements ensure that the area largely maintain the feel of a mid-rise district, where the perceived height of the building is similar to the width of the street it faces. Towers would be allowed in select locations along the edge of Downtown/Rincon Hill and around the Caltrain station, and would ensure that the overall development pattern is complementary to the overall city skyline. Where towers are permitted, they will be required to be slender and appropriately spaced from other towers. Design guidance contained in the Plan is intended to ensure that new buildings are in keeping with the best aspects of SoMa's design heritage.

K. The Plan preserves and celebrates the neighborhood's cultural heritage by supporting the designation and protection of historically significant and contributory buildings under *Planning Code* Articles 10 and 11. Pursuant to Article 10, the following buildings are under consideration for City landmark status: 228-248 Townsend Street, and 457 Bryant Street, 500-504 Fourth Street. In addition, pursuant to Article 10, creation of the Clyde and Crooks Warehouse Historic District and the designation of numerous properties in that district as contributory is being considered. Pursuant to Article 11, expansion of the boundaries of the Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter Conservation District and designation of 55 Fifth Street as a contributory building in that district are being considered; and creation of the Mint-Mission Conservation District and designation of a number of properties in that district as contributory and significant are being considered. In addition, the designation of 27 other properties as significant and contributory pursuant to Article 11 is being considered. Eligible historic

properties will be able to sell their Transferable Development Rights, which would help to fund the rehabilitation and preservation of those properties.

L. If the City decides to include a Community Facilities District, implementation of the Plan will result in a re-envisioning of the streets, sidewalks, and open spaces of the Plan Area—not only to be more vibrant and safer, but also to complement the neighborhood’s environmental health and resilience. Strategies include supporting maintenance and operations of Victoria Manalo Draves park and other new parks and recreation centers in the Plan Area and the incorporation of elements beneficial to environmental sustainability and resilience, such as trees, green infrastructure for stormwater management, and energy efficient street lights. With the CFD, the Plan would also preserve and celebrate the neighborhood’s cultural heritage. Implementation of the Plan will help preserve the neighborhood’s tangible heritage by helping fund the rehabilitation of the Old Mint. It will also help the neighborhood’s intangible resources continue to thrive by funding ongoing social and cultural programming, helping fund the rehabilitation and/or creation of new cultural facilities, and require space for industrial and arts uses.

Having considered these Project benefits and considerations, the Planning Commission finds that the Project's benefits outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, and that the adverse environmental effects that cannot be mitigated to insignificant levels are therefore acceptable.

SECTION VIII

Incorporation by Reference

The Final EIR is hereby incorporated into these Findings in its entirety. Without limitation, this incorporation is intended to elaborate on the scope and nature of the mitigation measures, the basis for determining the significance of impacts, the comparative analysis of alternatives, and the reasons for approving the Project in spite of the potential for significant and unavoidable adverse environmental effects.

**TABLE A: MITIGATION MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
 (TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)**

This table identifies Plan-level mitigation measures to be implemented by the City and County of San Francisco. Subsequent development projects within the Central SoMa Plan area, street network changes, and open space improvements would be required to comply with applicable mitigation measures listed in Table B. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
A. Land Use				
No mitigation measures required to be implemented by the City and County of San Francisco.				
B. Aesthetics				
No mitigation measures required to be implemented by the City and County of San Francisco.				
C. Cultural and Paleontological Resources				
No mitigation measures required to be implemented by the City and County of San Francisco.				
D. Transportation and Circulation				
<p>*M-TR-3a: Transit Enhancements¹. The following are City and County and sponsors of subsequent development projects actions that would reduce the transit impacts associated with implementation of the Central SoMa Plan.</p> <p><i>Enhanced Transit Funding</i>. To accommodate project transit demand, the SFMTA, and other City agencies and departments as appropriate, shall seek sufficient operating and capital funding, including through the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish fee-based sources of revenue. • Establish a congestion-charge scheme for downtown San Francisco, with all or a portion of the revenue collected going to support improved local and regional transit service on routes that serve Downtown and the Central SoMa Plan Area. • Area Plan funding for transit enhancements. <p><i>Transit Corridor Improvement Review</i>: During the design phase, the SFMTA shall review each street network project that contains portions of Muni transit routes where significant transit delay impacts have been identified (routes 8 Bayshore, 8AX Bayshore Express, 8BX Bayshore Express, 10 Townsend, 14 Mission, 14R Mission Rapid, 27 Bryant, 30 Stockton, 45 Union-Stockton, and 47 Van Ness). Through this review, SFMTA shall incorporate feasible street network modifications that would meet the performance criteria of maintaining accessible transit service,</p>				
	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA).	Ongoing	SFMTA, San Francisco County Transportation Agency, and Planning Department.	Ongoing

¹ M-TR-3a: Transit Enhancements is identified in Table A (Mitigation Measures to be implemented by City and County of San Francisco) and Table B (Mitigation Measures to be implemented by the project sponsor).

**TABLE A: MITIGATION MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
 (TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)**

This table identifies Plan-level mitigation measures to be implemented by the City and County of San Francisco. Subsequent development projects within the Central SoMa Plan area, street network changes, and open space improvements would be required to comply with applicable mitigation measures listed in Table B. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>enhancing transit service times, and offsetting transit delay. Such features could include, but shall not be limited to, transit-only lanes, transit signal priority, queue jumps, stop consolidation, limited or express service, corner or sidewalk bulbs, and transit boarding islands, as determined by the SFMTA, to enhance transit service times and offset transit delay. Any subsequent changes to the street network designs shall be subject to a similar review process.</p> <p><i>Transit Accessibility.</i> To enhance transit accessibility, the Planning Department and the SFMTA shall establish a coordinated planning process to link land use planning and development in Central SoMa to transit and other sustainable transportation mode planning. This shall be achieved through some or all of the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement recommendations of the <i>Better Streets Plan</i> that are designed to make the pedestrian environment safer and more comfortable for walk trips throughout the day, especially in areas where sidewalks and other realms of the pedestrian environment are notably unattractive and intimidating for pedestrians and discourage walking as a primary means of circulation. This includes traffic calming strategies in areas with fast-moving, one-way traffic, long blocks, narrow sidewalks and tow-away lanes, as may be found in much of the Central SoMa area. • Implement building design features that promote primary access to buildings from transit stops and pedestrian areas, and discourage the location of primary access points to buildings through parking lots and other auto-oriented entryways. • Develop Central SoMa transportation implementation programs that manage and direct resources brought in through pricing programs and development-based fee assessments, as outlined above, to further the multimodal implementation and maintenance of these transportation improvements. • Sponsors of development projects with off-street vehicular parking facilities with 20 or more vehicular parking spaces shall ensure that recurring vehicle queues do not substantially affect public transit operations on the public right-of-way near the off-street vehicular parking facility. A vehicle queue is defined as one or more vehicles (destined to the parking facility) blocking any portion of any public street, alley or sidewalk for a consecutive period 				

**TABLE A: MITIGATION MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
 (TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)**

This table identifies Plan-level mitigation measures to be implemented by the City and County of San Francisco. Subsequent development projects within the Central SoMa Plan area, street network changes, and open space improvements would be required to comply with applicable mitigation measures listed in Table B. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>of three minutes or longer on a daily or weekly basis.</p> <p>If a recurring queue occurs, the owner/operator of the parking facility shall employ abatement methods as needed to abate the queue. Appropriate abatement methods will vary depending on the characteristics and causes of the recurring queue, as well as the characteristics of the parking facility, the street(s) to which the facility connects, and the associated land uses (if applicable).</p> <p>Suggested abatement methods include but are not limited to the following: redesign of facility to improve vehicle circulation and/or onsite queue capacity; employment of parking attendants; installation of LOT FULL signs with active management by parking attendants; use of valet parking or other space-efficient parking techniques; use of off-site parking facilities or shared parking with nearby uses; use of parking occupancy sensors and signage directing drivers to available spaces; transportation demand management strategies such as those listed in the San Francisco Planning Code TDM Program.</p> <p>If the Planning Director, or his or her designee, suspects that a recurring queue is present, the Department shall notify the property owner in writing. Upon request, the owner/operator shall hire a qualified transportation consultant to evaluate the conditions at the site for no less than seven days. The consultant shall prepare a monitoring report to be submitted to the Department for review. If the Department determines that a recurring queue does exist, the facility owner/operator shall have 90 days from the date of the written determination to abate the queue.</p> <p><i>Muni Storage and Maintenance.</i> To ensure that Muni is able to service additional transit vehicles needed to serve increased demand generated by development in Central SoMa, the SFMTA shall provide maintenance and storage facilities.</p>	SFMTA	Upon submittal of a Planning entitlement application for any size project that	SFMTA and Planning Department.	Considered complete with implementation of boarding improvements.
<p>*M-TR-3b: Boarding Improvements. The SFMTA shall implement boarding improvements, such as the construction of additional bus bulbs or boarding islands where appropriate, that would reduce the boarding times to mitigate the impacts on transit travel times on routes where Plan ridership increases are greatest, such as the 8 Bayshore, 8AX/8BX Bayshore Expresses, 10 Townsend, 14 Mission, 14R Mission Rapid,</p>				

**TABLE A: MITIGATION MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
 (TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)**

This table identifies Plan-level mitigation measures to be implemented by the City and County of San Francisco. Subsequent development projects within the Central SoMa Plan area, street network changes, and open space improvements would be required to comply with applicable mitigation measures listed in Table B. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>27 Bryant, 30 Stockton, 45 Union-Stockton, and 47 Van Ness routes. These boarding improvements, which would reduce delay associated with passengers boarding and alighting, shall be made in combination with Mitigation Measure M-TR-3c, Signalization and Intersection Restriping at Townsend/Fifth Streets, which would serve to reduce delay associated with traffic congestion along the transit route.</p>		<p>would result in the approval under the Plan of a total of 75,000 square feet of residential and/or commercial development in the area bounded by Townsend, Fifth, Brannan, and Fourth Streets, SFMTA shall identify and initiate planning for boarding improvements to be made.</p>		
<p>*M-TR-3c: Signalization and Intersection Restriping at Townsend/Fifth Streets. The SFMTA shall design and construct a new traffic signal at the intersection of Townsend/Fifth Streets, and reconfigure the Townsend Street eastbound approach to provide one dedicated left-turn lane (with an exclusive left turn phase) adjacent to a through lane. This reconfiguration would require restriping of the two existing travel lanes at the eastbound approach to this intersection.</p>	<p>SFMTA</p>	<p>Upon submittal of a Planning entitlement application for any size project that would result in the approval under the Plan of a total of 75,000 square feet of residential and/or commercial development in the area bounded by Townsend, Fifth, Brannan, and</p>	<p>SFMTA and Planning Department.</p>	<p>Considered complete with the signal installation and implementation of restriping at Fifth/Townsend Streets.</p>

**TABLE A: MITIGATION MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
 (TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)**

This table identifies Plan-level mitigation measures to be implemented by the City and County of San Francisco. Subsequent development projects within the Central SoMa Plan area, street network changes, and open space improvements would be required to comply with applicable mitigation measures listed in Table B. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>*M-TR-4: Upgrade Central SoMa Area Crosswalks. As appropriate and feasible, the SFMTA shall widen and restripe the crosswalks to the continental design when there is a street network improvement that upgrades sidewalk widths.</p> <p>With either the Howard/Folsom One-Way Option or Howard/Folsom Two-Way Option street network changes, the SFMTA shall, as feasible, widen the following crosswalks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the intersection of Third/Mission widen the east and west crosswalks. • At the intersection of Fourth/Mission widen the east crosswalk, and widen the west crosswalk. 	SFMTA	<p>Fourth Streets, SFMTA shall initiate planning and signalizing and intersection restriping at Townsend/Fifth Streets. If infeasible due to construction coordination and timing for SFMTA's streetscape projects, then upon the SFMTA or Public Works completion of construction of major streetscape changes along Townsend or Fifth streets.</p>	SFMTA and Planning Department.	Considered complete with the implementation of crosswalk upgrades.

**TABLE A: MITIGATION MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
 (TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)**

This table identifies Plan-level mitigation measures to be implemented by the City and County of San Francisco. Subsequent development projects within the Central SoMa Plan area, street network changes, and open space improvements would be required to comply with applicable mitigation measures listed in Table B. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the intersection of Fourth/Townsend widen the west crosswalk. <p>*M-TR-6b: Accommodation of On-street Commercial Loading Spaces and Passenger Loading/Unloading Zones.² The SFMTA shall develop a curb management strategy (strategy) for Central SoMa or within proximity of the street network changes that articulates curb use priorities for different types of streets, while safely managing loading demands. This strategy should guide the approach to any affected commercial and passenger loading/unloading zones (loading zones) during any City agency’s development of detailed plans for each segment of the proposed street network changes. Replacement of loading zones will be considered, to the extent feasible.</p> <p>The SFMTA and the Planning Department shall develop protocols for ongoing assessment of commercial and passenger loading needs on the affected streets, and for review of new development projects along the affected street segments to identify needed changes to the street network design (e.g., when a new driveway to a development site is required), or need for additional on-street commercial and passenger loading spaces.</p> <p>Sponsors of development projects that provide more than 100,000 square feet of residential or commercial uses with frontages along a public right-of-way identified on the High Injury Network, with an existing or proposed bicycle facility, or a public right-of-way that includes public transit operations shall develop a Passenger Loading Plan. The plan shall address passenger loading activities and related queuing effects associated with for-hire services (including taxis, and Transportation Network Companies) and vanpool services, as applicable. Elements of this Passenger Loading Plan may include but would not be limited to the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordination with for-hire vehicle companies to request passenger loading zones are incorporated into companies’ mobile app device to better guide passengers and drivers where to pick up or drop off. Designated on-site and on-street loading zones that are clearly marked with adequate signage to permit passenger loading space and allow no other 	SFMTA	Prior to final design of each SFMTA street network project.	SFMTA and Planning Department.	Considered complete upon completion of plans for each segment of the street network project and following that an evaluation of any affected loading zones has occurred.

² M-TR-6b: Accommodation of On-street Commercial Loading Spaces and Passenger Loading/Unloading Zones is identified in Table A (Mitigation Measures to be implemented by City and County of San Francisco) and Table B (Mitigation Measures to be implemented by the project sponsor).

**TABLE A: MITIGATION MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
 (TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)**

This table identifies Plan-level mitigation measures to be implemented by the City and County of San Francisco. Subsequent development projects within the Central SoMa Plan area, street network changes, and open space improvements would be required to comply with applicable mitigation measures listed in Table B. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>vehicles to stop/park for any duration of time. For these zones, set specific time limits restricting vehicles to stopped/parked over a certain period of time (e.g., three minutes) and alert passengers that their driver will depart/arrive within the allotted timeframe.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notifications and information to visitors and employees about passenger loading activities and operations, including detailed information on vanpool services and locations of pick-up/drop-off of for-hire services. • Detailed roles and responsibilities for managing and monitoring the passenger loading zone(s) and properly enforcing any passenger vehicles that are in violation (e.g., blocking bicycle lane, blocking a driveway, etc.). <p>The plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Environmental Review Officer or designee of the Planning Department and the Sustainable Streets Director or designee of the SFMTA. The plan shall be evaluated by a qualified transportation professional, retained by the Project Sponsor after a building(s) reaches 50% occupancy and once a year going forward until such time that the SFMTA determines that the evaluation is no longer necessary or could be done at less frequent intervals. The content of the evaluation report shall be determined by SFMTA staff, in consultation with the Planning Department, and generally shall include an assessment of on-street loading conditions, including actual loading demand, loading operation observations, and an assessment of how the project meets this mitigation measure. The evaluation report may be folded into other mitigation measure reporting obligations. If ongoing conflicts are occurring based on the assessment, the evaluation report shall put forth additional measures to address ongoing conflicts associated with loading operations. The evaluation report shall be reviewed by SFMTA staff, which shall make the final determination whether ongoing conflicts are occurring. In the event that ongoing conflicts are occurring, the above plan requirements may be altered (e.g., the hour and day restrictions listed above, number of loading vehicle operations permitted during certain hours listed above).</p>				
<p>E. Noise and Vibration</p> <p>No mitigation measures required to be implemented by the City and County of San Francisco.</p>				

**TABLE A: MITIGATION MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
 (TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)**

This table identifies Plan-level mitigation measures to be implemented by the City and County of San Francisco. Subsequent development projects within the Central SoMa Plan area, street network changes, and open space improvements would be required to comply with applicable mitigation measures listed in Table B. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
F. Air Quality				
<p>M-AQ-5c: Update Air Pollution Exposure Zone for San Francisco Health Code Article 38. The Department of Public Health is required to update the Air Pollution Exposure Zone Map in <i>San Francisco Health Code</i> Article 38 at least every five years. The Planning Department shall coordinate with the Department of Public Health to update the Air Pollution Exposure Zone taking into account updated health risk methodologies and traffic generated by the Central SoMa Plan.</p>	<p>Planning Department and Department of Public Health (DPH).</p>	<p>Ongoing at 5-year intervals.</p>	<p>Planning Department and Department of Public Health.</p>	<p>Ongoing at 5-year intervals.</p>
<p>M-AQ-5e Central SoMa Air Quality Improvement Strategy. The Central SoMa Plan is expected to generate \$22 million in revenue dedicated to greening and air quality improvements. A portion of these monies shall be dedicated to identifying and exploring the feasibility and effectiveness of additional measures that would reduce the generation of, and/or exposure of such emissions to persons whose primary residence is within the Plan Area and whose residence does not provide enhanced ventilation that complies with San Francisco Health Code Article 38. Objective 6.5 of the Plan calls for improvements to air quality, with specific strategies to support reduced vehicle miles traveled, increased greening around the freeway to improve air quality and use of building materials and technologies that improve indoor and outdoor air quality. The Planning Department, in cooperation with other interested agencies or organizations, shall consider additional actions for the Central SoMa Plan Area with the goal of reducing Plan-generated emissions and population exposure including, but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collection of air quality monitoring data that could provide decision makers with information to identify specific areas of the Plan where changes in air quality have occurred and focus air quality improvements on these areas • Additional measures that could be incorporated into the City's Transportation Demand Management program with the goal of further reducing vehicle trips • Incentives for replacement or upgrade of existing emissions sources • Other measures to reduce pollutant exposure, such as distribution of 	<p>Planning Department, in cooperation with other interested agencies or organizations.</p>	<p>Strategy will be developed within four years of the Central SoMa Plan adoption.</p>	<p>Planning Department, in cooperation with other interested agencies or organizations.</p>	<p>Ongoing for the duration of the Central SoMa Plan.</p>

**TABLE A: MITIGATION MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
 (TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)**

This table identifies Plan-level mitigation measures to be implemented by the City and County of San Francisco. Subsequent development projects within the Central SoMa Plan area, street network changes, and open space improvements would be required to comply with applicable mitigation measures listed in Table B. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
portable air cleaning devices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public education regarding reducing air pollutant emissions and their health effects The Department shall develop a strategy to explore the feasibility of additional air quality improvements within four years of plan adoption.				
G. Wind				
No mitigation measures required to be implemented by the City and County of San Francisco.				
H. Shadow				
No mitigation measures required to be implemented by the City and County of San Francisco.				
I. Hydrology and Water Quality (Combined Sewer System and Sea Level Rise)				
No mitigation measures required to be implemented by the City and County of San Francisco.				
Biological Resources (from Initial Study)				
No mitigation measures required to be implemented by the City and County of San Francisco.				
Hazardous Materials (from Initial Study)				
No mitigation measures required to be implemented by the City and County of San Francisco.				

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
A. Land Use				
M-LU-2: Conflict with <i>General Plan</i> Environmental Protection Element Noise Standards. Implement Mitigation Measures NO-1a, Transportation Demand Management , and Mitigation Measure NO-1b, Siting of Noise-Generating Uses , for new development projects.		See Mitigation Measures NO-1a and NO-1b.		
B. Aesthetics				
No mitigation measures required to be implemented by the Project Sponsor.				
C. Cultural and Paleontological Resources				
Mitigation Measure M-CP-1a: Mandatory Consultation Regarding Avoidance or Minimization of Effects on-Historical Resources. The project sponsor of a subsequent development project in the Plan Area shall consult with the Planning Department at the time of submittal of an environmental evaluation application or consolidated development application to determine whether there are feasible means to avoid a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historic architectural resource (including historic districts), whether previously identified or identified as part of the project's historical resources analysis. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b), "[s]ubstantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired." If avoidance is not feasible, the project sponsor shall consult with Planning Department staff to determine whether there are feasible means to reduce effects on historic architectural resource(s). Avoidance and minimization measures shall seek to retain the resource's character-defining features, and may include, but are not limited to: retention of character-defining features, building setbacks, salvage, or adaptive reuse. In evaluating the feasibility of avoidance or reduction of effects, the Planning Department shall consider whether avoidance or	Project sponsor and qualified historic preservation expert for each subsequent project undertaken in the Central SoMa Plan Area.	Prior to approval of project environmental document.	Planning Department	Considered complete when environmental document approved by Environmental Review Officer.

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>reduction can be accomplished successfully within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social and technological factors, along with the Central SoMa Plan policies and project objectives. The applicability of each factor would vary from project to project, and would be determined by staff on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>Should Planning Department staff determine through the consultation process that avoidance or reduction of effects on historic architectural resources is infeasible, Measures M-CP-1b, M-CP-1c, M-CP-1d, and/or M-CP-1e, shall be applicable.</p> <p>M-CP-1b: Documentation of Historical Resource(s). Where avoidance of effects to a less-than-significant level is not feasible, as described in M-CP-1a, the project sponsor of a subsequent development project in the Plan Area shall undertake historical documentation prior to the issuance of demolition or site permits. To document the buildings more effectively, the sponsor shall prepare Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS)-level photographs and an accompanying HABS Historical Report, which shall be maintained on-site, as well as in the appropriate repositories, including but not limited to, the San Francisco Planning Department, San Francisco Architectural Heritage, the San Francisco Public Library, and the Northwest Information Center. The contents of the report shall include an architectural description, historical context, and statement of significance, per HABS reporting standards. The documentation shall be undertaken by a qualified professional who meets the standards for history, architectural history, or architecture (as appropriate), as set forth by the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards</i> (36 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 61). HABS documentation shall provide the appropriate level of visual documentation and written narrative based on the importance of the resource (types of visual documentation typically range from producing a sketch plan to developing measured drawings and view camera (4x5) black and white photographs). The appropriate level of HABS documentation and written narrative shall be determined by the Planning Department's Preservation staff. The report shall be reviewed by the Planning</p>	<p>Project sponsor and qualified historic preservation expert for each subsequent project undertaken in the Central SoMa Plan Area.</p>	<p>Prior to the start of any demolition or adverse alteration on a designated historic resource.</p>	<p>Planning Department (Preservation Technical Specialist).</p>	<p>Considered complete upon submittal of final HABS documentation to the Preservation Technical Specialist.</p>

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>Department's Preservation staff for completeness. In certain instances, Department Preservation staff may request HABS-level photography, a historical report, and/or measured architectural drawings of the existing building(s).</p>				
<p>M-CP-1c: Oral Histories. For projects that would demolish a historical resource or contributor to a historic district for which Planning Department preservation staff determined that such a measure would be effective and feasible, the project sponsor shall undertake an oral history project prior to demolition or adverse alteration of the resource that includes interviews of people such as residents, past owners, or former employees. The project 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 Public Library, Planning Department, or other interested historical institutions.</p>	<p>Project sponsor and qualified historic preservation expert for each subsequent project undertaken in the Central SoMa Plan Area.</p>	<p>Prior to the start of any demolition or adverse alteration on a designated historic resource.</p>	<p>Professional historian, Planning Department (Preservation Technical Specialist).</p>	<p>Considered complete upon submittal of completed oral histories to the San Francisco Public Library or other interested historical institution.</p>
<p>M-CP-1d: Interpretive Program. For projects that would demolish a historical resource or contributor to a historic district for which Department Preservation staff determined that such a measure would be effective and feasible, the project sponsor shall work with Department Preservation staff or other qualified professional to institute an interpretive program on-site that references the property's history and the contribution of the historical resource to the broader neighborhood or historic district. An example of an interpretive program is the creation of historical exhibits, incorporating a display featuring historic photos of the affected resource and a description of its historical significance, in a publicly accessible location on the project site. This may include a website or publicly-accessible display. The contents of the interpretive program shall be determined by the Planning Department Preservation staff. The development of the interpretive displays should be overseen by a qualified professional who meets the standards for history, architectural history, or architecture</p>	<p>Project sponsor and qualified historic preservation individual for each subsequent project undertaken in the Central SoMa Plan Area.</p>	<p>Prior to the start of any demolition or adverse alteration of a designated historic resource.</p>	<p>Planning Department (Preservation Technical Specialist).</p>	<p>Considered complete upon installation of display.</p>

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>(as appropriate) set forth by the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards</i> (36 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 61). An outline of the format, location and content of the interpretive displays shall be reviewed and approved by the San Francisco Planning Department's Preservation staff prior to issuance of a demolition permit or site permit. The format, location and content of the interpretive displays must be finalized prior to issuance of any Building Permits for the project.</p> <p>M-CP-1e: Video Recordation. For projects that would demolish a historical resource or contributor to a historic district for which Department Preservation staff determined that such a measure would be effective and feasible, the project sponsor shall work with Department Preservation staff or other qualified professional, to undertake video documentation of the affected historical resource and its setting. The documentation shall be conducted by a professional videographer, preferably one with experience recording architectural resources. The documentation shall be narrated by a qualified professional who meets the standards for history, architectural history, or architecture (as appropriate), as set forth by the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards</i> (36 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 61). The documentation shall use visuals in combination with narration about the materials, construction methods, current condition, historic use, and historic context of the historical resource.</p> <p>Archival copies of the video documentation shall be submitted to the Planning Department, and to repositories including but not limited to the San Francisco Public Library, Northwest Information Center, and California Historical Society. This mitigation measure would supplement the traditional HABS documentation, and would enhance the collection of reference materials that would be available to the public and inform future research.</p> <p>The video documentation shall be reviewed and approved by the San Francisco Planning Department's Preservation staff prior to issuance of a demolition permit or site permit or issuance of any Building Permits for the project.</p>	<p>Project sponsor and qualified historic preservation individual for each subsequent project undertaken in the Central SoMa Plan Area.</p>	<p>Prior to the start of any demolition or adverse alteration of a designated historic resource.</p>	<p>Qualified videographer, Planning Department (Preservation Technical Specialist).</p>	<p>Considered complete upon submittal of completed video documentation to the San Francisco Public Library or other interested historical institution.</p>

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>M-CP-3a: Protect Historical Resources from Adjacent Construction Activities. The project sponsor of a development project in the Plan Area shall consult with Planning Department Environmental Planning/Preservation staff to determine whether buildings constitute historical resources that could be adversely affected by construction-generated vibration. For purposes of this measure, nearby historic buildings shall include those within 100 feet of a construction site for a subsequent development project if pile driving would be used at that site; otherwise, it shall include historic buildings within 25 feet if vibratory and vibration-generating construction equipment, such as jackhammers, drill rigs, bulldozers, and vibratory rollers would be used. If one or more historical resources is identified that could be adversely affected, the project sponsor shall incorporate into construction specifications for the proposed project a requirement that the construction contractor(s) use all feasible means to avoid damage to adjacent and nearby historic buildings. Such methods may include maintaining a safe distance between the construction site and the historic buildings (as identified by the Planning Department Preservation staff), using construction techniques that reduce vibration (such as using concrete saws instead of jackhammers or hoe-rams to open excavation trenches, the use of non-vibratory rollers, and hand excavation), appropriate excavation shoring methods to prevent movement of adjacent structures, and providing adequate security to minimize risks of vandalism and fire. No measures need be applied if no vibratory equipment would be employed or if there are no historic buildings within 100 feet of the project site.</p>	<p>Project sponsor and qualified historic preservation individual for each applicable subsequent project undertaken in the Central SoMa Plan Area.</p>	<p>Prior to the start of any demolition, construction or earth movement.</p>	<p>Planning Department (ERO and, optionally, Preservation Technical Specialist).</p>	<p>Considered complete upon acceptance by Planning Department of construction specifications to avoid damage to adjacent and nearby historic buildings.</p>
<p>M-CP-3b: Construction Monitoring Program for Historical Resources. For those historical resources identified in Mitigation Measure M-CP-3a, and where heavy equipment would be used on a subsequent development project, the project sponsor of such a project shall undertake a monitoring program to minimize damage to historic buildings and to ensure that any such damage is documented and repaired. The monitoring program, which shall apply within 100 feet where pile driving would be used and within 25 feet otherwise, shall include the following components, subject to access being granted by the owner (s) of adjacent properties, where applicable. Prior to</p>	<p>Project sponsor and construction contractor for each applicable subsequent project undertaken in the Central SoMa Plan Area.</p>	<p>Prior to and during construction activity identified by Planning Department as potentially damaging to historic</p>	<p>Planning Department (Preservation Technical Specialist).</p>	<p>Considered complete upon submittal to Planning Department of post-construction report on construction monitoring program and effects, if any, on proximate historical resources.</p>

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>the start of any ground-disturbing activity, the project sponsor shall engage a historic architect or qualified historic preservation professional to undertake a pre-construction survey of historical resource(s) identified by the San Francisco Planning Department within 125 feet of planned construction to document and photograph the buildings' existing conditions. Based on the construction and condition of the resource(s), the consultant shall also establish a standard maximum vibration level that shall not be exceeded at each building, based on existing condition, character-defining features, soils conditions, and anticipated construction practices (a common standard is 0.2 inch per second, peak particle velocity). To ensure that vibration levels do not exceed the established standard, the project sponsor shall monitor vibration levels at each structure and shall prohibit vibratory construction activities that generate vibration levels in excess of the standard. Should owner permission not be granted, the project sponsor shall employ alternative methods of vibration monitoring in areas under control of the project sponsor.</p> <p>Should vibration levels be observed in excess of the standard, construction shall be halted and alternative construction techniques put in practice, to the extent feasible. (For example, pre-drilled piles could be substituted for driven piles, if feasible based on soils conditions; smaller, lighter equipment might be able to be used in some cases.) The consultant shall conduct regular periodic inspections of each building during ground-disturbing activity on the project site. Should damage to either building occur, the building(s) shall be remediated to its pre-construction condition at the conclusion of ground-disturbing activity on the site.</p>		building(s).		
<p>M-CP-4a: Project-Specific Preliminary Archeological Assessment. This archeological mitigation measure shall apply to any project involving any soils-disturbing or soils-improving activities including excavation, utilities installation, grading, soils remediation, compaction/chemical grouting to a depth of 5 feet or greater below ground surface, for which no archeological assessment report has been prepared. Projects to which this mitigation measure applies shall be subject to Preliminary Archeology Review (PAR) by the San Francisco Planning Department archeologist.</p>	<p>Project sponsor, Planning Department's archeologist or qualified archaeological consultant, and Planning Department Environmental Review Officer (ERO) for each</p>	During the environmental review of subsequent projects.	Planning Department (ERO); Department's archeologist or qualified archaeological consultant).	Considered complete upon submittal of PAR to ERO.

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>Based on the PAR, the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) shall determine if there is a potential for effect to an archeological resource, including human remains, and, if so, what further actions are warranted to reduce the potential effect of the project on archeological resources to a less-than-significant level. Such actions may include project redesign to avoid the potential to affect an archeological resource; or further investigations by an archeological consultant, such as preparation of a project-specific Archeological Research Design and Treatment Plan (ARDTP) or the undertaking of an archeological monitoring or testing program based on an archeological monitoring or testing plan. The scope of the ARDTP, archeological testing or archeological monitoring plan shall be determined in consultation with the ERO and consistent with the standards for archeological documentation established by the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) for purposes of compliance with CEQA (OHP Preservation Planning Bulletin No. 5). Avoidance of effect to an archeological resource is always the preferred option.</p>	<p>subsequent project undertaken in the Central SoMa Plan Area.</p>			
<p>M-CP-4b: Procedures for Accidental Discovery of Archeological Resources. This mitigation measure is required for projects that would result in soil disturbance and are not subject to Mitigation Measure M-CP-4a. Should any indication of an archeological resource, including human remains, 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. If the ERO determines that an archeological resource may be present within the project site, the project sponsor shall retain the services of an archeological consultant from the pool of qualified archeological consultants maintained by the San Francisco Planning Department archeologist. The archeological consultant shall advise the ERO as to whether the discovery is an archeological resource, retains sufficient integrity, and is of potential scientific/historical/cultural significance. If an archeological resource is present, the archeological consultant shall identify and evaluate the archeological</p>	<p>Project sponsor, contractor, Planning Department's archeologist or qualified consultant, and Planning Department Environmental Review Officer (ERO) for each subsequent project undertaken in the Central SoMa Plan Area.</p>	<p>During soil-disturbing activities.</p>	<p>Planning Department (ERO; Planning Department archeologist).</p>	<p>Considered complete upon ERO's approval of FARR.</p>

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>resource. The archeological consultant shall make a recommendation as to what action, if any, is warranted. Based on this information, the ERO may require, if warranted, specific additional measures to be implemented by the project sponsor.</p> <p>Measures might include preservation in situ of the archeological resource, an archeological monitoring program, an archeological testing program, or an archeological treatment program. If an archeological treatment program, archeological monitoring program or archeological testing program is required, it shall be consistent with the Planning Department's Environmental Planning (EP) division guidelines for such programs. The ERO may also require that the project sponsor immediately implement a site security program if the archeological resource is at risk from vandalism, looting, or other damaging actions. If human remains are found all applicable state laws will be followed as outlined in Impact CP-7 and an archeological treatment program would be implemented in consultation with appropriate descendant groups and approved by the ERO.</p> <p>The project archeological consultant shall submit a Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archeological resource and describes the archeological and historical research methods employed in the archeological monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the final report.</p> <p>Copies of the Draft FARR shall be sent to the ERO for review and approval. Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one copy and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Environmental Planning Division of the San Francisco Planning Department shall receive one bound copy, one unbound copy, and one unlocked, searchable PDF copy on a CD of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest or interpretive value, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and</p>				

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>distribution from that presented above.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure M-CP-5: Project-Specific Tribal Cultural Resource Assessment. This tribal cultural resource mitigation measure shall apply to any project involving any soils-disturbing or soils-improving activities including excavation, utilities installation, grading, soils remediation, compaction/chemical grouting to a depth of 5 feet or greater below ground surface.</p> <p>Projects to which this mitigation measure applies shall be reviewed for the potential to affect a tribal cultural resource in tandem with the preliminary archeology review of the project by the San Francisco Planning Department archeologist. For projects requiring a mitigated negative declaration or environmental impact report, the Planning Department "Notification Regarding Tribal Cultural Resources and CEQA" shall be distributed to the department's tribal distribution list. Consultation with California Native American tribes regarding the potential of the project to affect a tribal cultural resource will occur at the request of any notified tribe. For all projects subject to this mitigation measure, if staff determines that the proposed project may have a potential significant adverse effect on a tribal cultural resource, then the following shall be required as determined warranted by the ERO.</p> <p>If staff determines that preservation-in-place of the tribal cultural resource is both feasible and effective, based on information provided by the applicant regarding feasibility and other available information, then the project archeological consultant shall prepare an archeological resource preservation plan. Implementation of the approved plan by the archeological consultant shall be required when feasible. If staff determines that preservation-in-place of the Tribal Cultural Resource is not a sufficient or feasible option, then the project sponsor shall implement an interpretive program of the resource in coordination with affiliated Native American tribal representatives. An interpretive plan produced in coordination with affiliated Native American tribal representatives, at a minimum, and approved by the ERO shall be required to guide the interpretive program. The plan shall identify proposed locations for installations or displays, the proposed content and materials of those displays or</p>	<p>Planning Department's archeologist, California Native American tribal representative, Planning Department-qualified archeological consultant.</p>	<p>During the environmental review of subsequent projects.</p>	<p>Planning Department archeologist, Planning Department-qualified archeological consultant, project sponsor.</p>	<p>Considered complete if no Tribal Cultural Resource is discovered or Tribal Cultural Resource is discovered and either preserved in-place or project effects to Tribal Cultural Resource are mitigated by implementation of Planning Department approved interpretive program.</p>

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>installation, the producers or artists of the displays or installation, and a long-term maintenance program. The interpretive program may include artist installations, preferably by local Native American artists, oral histories with local Native Americans, artifacts displays and interpretation, and educational panels or other informational displays.</p>				
D. Transportation and Circulation				
<p>*M-TR-3a: Transit Enhancements³. The following are City and County and sponsors of subsequent development projects that would reduce the transit impacts associated with implementation of the Central SoMa Plan.</p> <p><i>Enhanced Transit Funding.</i> To accommodate project transit demand, the SFMTA, and other City agencies and departments as appropriate, shall seek sufficient operating and capital funding, including through the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish fee-based sources of revenue. • Establish a congestion-charge scheme for downtown San Francisco, with all or a portion of the revenue collected going to support improved local and regional transit service on routes that serve Downtown and the Central SoMa Plan Area. • Area Plan funding for transit enhancements. <p><i>Transit Corridor Improvement Review.</i> During the design phase, the SFMTA shall review each street network project that contains portions of Muni transit routes where significant transit delay impacts have been identified (routes 8 Bayshore, 8AX Bayshore Express, 8BX Bayshore Express, 10 Townsend, 14 Mission, 14R Mission Rapid, 27 Bryant, 30 Stockton, 45 Union-Stockton, and 47 Van Ness). Through this review, SFMTA shall incorporate feasible street network design modifications that would meet the performance criteria of maintaining accessible transit service, enhancing transit service times, and offsetting transit delay. Such features could</p>	<p>Sponsors of subsequent development projects with off-street vehicular parking facilities with 20 or more vehicular parking spaces shall ensure that recurring vehicle queues do not substantially affect public transit operations on the public right-of-way near the off-street vehicular parking facility.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Planning Department and project sponsor.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

³ M-TR-3a: Transit Enhancements is identified in both Table A (Mitigation measures to be implemented by City and County of San Francisco) and Table B (Mitigation Measures to be implemented by the project sponsor).

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>include, but shall not be limited to, transit-only lanes, transit signal priority, queue jumps, stop consolidation, limited or express service, corner or sidewalk bulbs, and transit boarding islands, as determined by the SFMTA, to enhance transit service times and offset transit delay. Any subsequent changes to the street network designs shall be subject to a similar review process.</p> <p><i>Transit Accessibility.</i> To enhance transit accessibility, the Planning Department and the SFMTA shall establish a coordinated planning process to link land use planning and development in Central SoMa to transit and other sustainable transportation mode planning. This shall be achieved through some or all of the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement recommendations of the <i>Better Streets Plan</i> that are designed to make the pedestrian environment safer and more comfortable for walk trips throughout the day, especially in areas where sidewalks and other realms of the pedestrian environment are notably unattractive and intimidating for pedestrians and discourage walking as a primary means of circulation. This includes traffic calming strategies in areas with fast-moving, one-way traffic, long blocks, narrow sidewalks and tow-away lanes, as may be found in much of the Central SoMa area. • Implement building design features that promote primary access to buildings from transit stops and pedestrian areas, and discourage the location of primary access points to buildings through parking lots and other auto-oriented entryways. • Develop Central SoMa transportation implementation programs that manage and direct resources brought in through pricing programs and development-based fee assessments, as outlined above, to further the multimodal implementation and maintenance of these transportation improvements. • Sponsors of development projects with off-street vehicular parking facilities with 20 or more vehicular parking spaces shall ensure that recurring vehicle queues do not substantially affect public transit operations on the public right-of-way near the off-street vehicular parking facility. A vehicle queue is defined as one or more vehicles (destined to the parking facility) blocking 				

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>any portion of any public street, alley or sidewalk for a consecutive period of three minutes or longer on a daily or weekly basis.</p> <p>If a recurring queue occurs, the owner/operator of the parking facility shall employ abatement methods as needed to abate the queue. Appropriate abatement methods will vary depending on the characteristics and causes of the recurring queue, as well as the characteristics of the parking facility, the street(s) to which the facility connects, and the associated land uses (if applicable).</p> <p>Suggested abatement methods include but are not limited to the following: redesign of facility to improve vehicle circulation and/or onsite queue capacity; employment of parking attendants; installation of LOT FULL signs with active management by parking attendants; use of valet parking or other space-efficient parking techniques; use of off-site parking facilities or shared parking with nearby uses; use of parking occupancy sensors and signage directing drivers to available spaces; transportation demand management strategies such as those listed in the San Francisco Planning Code TDM Program.</p> <p>If the Planning Director, or his or her designee, suspects that a recurring queue is present, the Department shall notify the property owner in writing. Upon request, the owner/operator shall hire a qualified transportation consultant to evaluate the conditions at the site for no less than seven days. The consultant shall prepare a monitoring report to be submitted to the Department for review. If the Department determines that a recurring queue does exist, the facility owner/operator shall have 90 days from the date of the written determination to abate the queue.</p> <p><i>Muni Storage and Maintenance.</i> To ensure that Muni is able to service additional transit vehicles needed to serve increased demand generated by development in Central SoMa, the SFMTA shall provide maintenance and storage facilities.</p> <p>M-TR-6a: Driveway and Loading Operations Plan (DLOP). Sponsors of development projects that provide more than 100,000 square feet of residential, office, industrial, or</p>	Project sponsors of subsequent projects	Prior to the approval of any	SFMTA and Planning Department.	Considered complete for each subsequent

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>commercial uses shall prepare a DLOP, and submit the plan for review and approval by the Planning Department and the SFMTA in order to reduce potential conflicts between driveway operations, including loading activities, and pedestrians, bicycles and vehicles, and to maximize reliance of on-site loading spaces to accommodate new loading demand. The DLOP shall be submitted along with a building permit and approval should occur prior to the certificate of occupancy.</p> <p>Prior to preparing the DLOP, the project sponsor shall meet with the Planning Department and the SFMTA to review the proposed number, location, and design of the on-site loading spaces, as well as the projected loading demand during the entitlement/environmental review process. In addition to reviewing the on-site loading spaces and projected loading demand, the project sponsor shall provide the Planning Department and SFMTA a streetscape plan that shows the location, design, and dimensions of all existing and proposed streetscape elements in the public right-of-way. In the event that the number of on-site loading spaces does not accommodate the projected loading demand for the proposed development, the project sponsor shall pursue with the SFMTA conversion of nearby on-street parking spaces to commercial loading spaces, if determined feasible by the SFMTA.</p> <p>The DLOP shall be revised to reflect changes in accepted technology or operation protocols, or changes in conditions, as deemed necessary by the Planning Department and the SFMTA. The DLOP shall include the following components, as appropriate to the type of development and adjacent street characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Loading Dock Management.</i> To ensure that off-street loading facilities are efficiently used, and that trucks that are longer than can be safely accommodated are not permitted to use a building's loading dock, the project sponsor of a development project in the Plan Area shall develop a plan for management of the building's loading dock and shall ensure that tenants in the building are informed of limitations and conditions on loading schedules and truck size. The management plan could include strategies such as the use of an attendant to direct and guide trucks, installing a "Full" sign at the garage/loading dock driveway, limiting activity during peak hours, installation 	<p>undertaken in the Central SoMa Plan Area of more than 100,000 square feet of residential or commercial uses; SFMTA; Planning Department</p>	<p>building permit.</p>		<p>development project upon approval of a DLOP.</p>

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>of audible and/or visual warning devices, and other features. Additionally, as part of the project application process, the project sponsor shall consult with the SFMTA concerning the design of loading and parking facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p><i>Garage/Loading Dock Attendant.</i> If warranted by project-specific conditions, the project sponsor of a development project in the Plan Area shall ensure that building management employs attendant(s) for the project's parking garage and/or loading dock, as applicable. The attendant would be stationed as determined by the project-specific review analysis, typically at the project's driveway to direct vehicles entering and exiting the building and avoid any safety-related conflicts with pedestrians on the sidewalk during the a.m. and p.m. peak periods of traffic, bicycle, and pedestrian activity, with extended hours as dictated by traffic, bicycle and pedestrian conditions and by activity in the project garage and loading dock. Each project shall also install audible and/or visible warning devices, or comparably effective warning devices as approved by the Planning Department and/or the SFMTA, to alert pedestrians of the outbound vehicles from the parking garage and/or loading dock, as applicable.</p> <p><i>Large Truck Access.</i> The loading dock attendant shall dictate the maximum size of truck that can be accommodated at the on-site loading area. In order to accommodate any large trucks (i.e., generally longer than 40 feet) that may require occasional access to the site (e.g., large move-in trucks that need occasional access to both residential and commercial developments), the DLOP plan shall include procedures as to the location of on-street accommodation, time of day restrictions for accommodating larger vehicles, and procedures to reserve available curbside space on adjacent streets from the SFMTA.</p> <p><i>Trash/Recycling/Compost Collection Design and Management.</i> When designs for buildings are being developed, the project sponsor or representative shall meet with the appropriate representative from Recology (or other trash collection firm) to determine the location and type of</p> 				

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>trash/recycling/compost bins, frequency of collections, and procedures for collection activities, including the location of Recology trucks during collection. The location of the trash/recycling/compost storage room(s) for each building shall be indicated on the building plans prior to submittal of plans to the Building Department. Procedures for collection shall ensure that the collection bins are not placed within any sidewalk, bicycle facility, parking lane or travel lane adjacent to the project site at any time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Delivery Storage.</i> Design the loading dock area to allow for unassisted delivery systems (i.e., a range of delivery systems that eliminate the need for human intervention at the receiving end), particularly for use when the receiver site (e.g., retail space) is not in operation. Examples could include the receiver site providing a key or electronic fob to loading vehicle operators, which enables the loading vehicle operator to deposit the goods inside the business or in a secured area that is separated from the business. <p>The final DLOP and all revisions shall be reviewed and approved by the Environmental Review Officer or designee of the Planning Department and the Sustainable Streets Director or designee of the SFMTA. The DLOP will be memorialized in the notice of special restrictions on the project site permit.</p>				
<p>*M-TR-6b: Accommodation of On-street Commercial Loading Spaces and Passenger Loading/Unloading Zones.⁴ The SFMTA shall develop a curb management strategy (strategy) for Central SoMa or within proximity of the street network changes that articulates curb use priorities for different types of streets, while safely managing loading demands. This strategy should guide the approach to any affected commercial and passenger loading/unloading zones (loading zones) during any City agency's development of detailed plans for each segment of the proposed street network</p>	<p>SFMTA, Planning Department, and sponsors of subsequent development projects that provide more than 100,000 square feet of residential or commercial uses with</p>	<p>Prior to receipt of final Certificate of Occupancy.</p>	<p>SFMTA, Planning Department, and project sponsor.</p>	<p>Plan considered complete upon approval by SFMTA and the Planning Department. Monitoring ongoing.</p>

⁴ M-TR-6b: Accommodation of On-street Commercial Loading Spaces and Passenger Loading/Unloading Zones is identified in Table A (Mitigation Measures to be implemented by City and County of San Francisco) and Table B (Mitigation Measures to be implemented by the project sponsor) as the responsibility for implementation is shared by both parties.

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>changes. Replacement of loading zones will be considered, to the extent feasible.</p> <p>The SFMTA and the Planning Department should develop protocols for ongoing assessment of commercial and passenger loading needs on the affected streets, and for review of new development projects along the affected street segments to identify needed changes to the street network design (e.g., when a new driveway to a development site is required), or need for additional on-street commercial and passenger loading spaces.</p> <p>Sponsors of development projects that provide more than 100,000 square feet of residential or commercial uses with frontages along a public right-of-way identified on the High Injury Network, with an existing or proposed bicycle facility, or include public transit operations shall develop a Passenger Loading Plan. The plan shall address passenger loading activities and related queuing effects associated with for-hire services (including taxis, and Transportation Network Companies) and the vanpool services, as applicable. Elements of this Passenger Loading Plan may include but would not be limited to the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination with for-hire vehicle companies to request passenger loading zones are incorporated into companies' mobile app device to better guide passengers and drivers where to pick up or drop off. • Designated on-site and on-street loading zones that are clearly marked with adequate signage to permit passenger loading space and no other vehicles to stop/park for any duration of time. For these zones, set specific time limits restricting vehicles to stopped/parked over a certain period of time (e.g., three minutes) and alert passengers that their driver will depart/arrive within the allotted timeframe. • Notifications and information to visitors and employees about passenger loading activities and operations, including detailed information on the vanpool services and locations pick-up/drop-off of for-hire services. • Detailed roles and responsibilities of managing and monitoring the passenger loading zone(s) and to properly enforce any passenger vehicles 	<p>frontages along a public right-of-way identified on the High Injury Network, with an existing or proposed bicycle facility, or public right-of-way that includes public transit operations, shall develop a Passenger Loading Plan.</p>			

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>that are in violation (e.g., blocking bicycle lane, blocking a driveway, etc.).</p> <p>The plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Environmental Review Officer or designee of the Planning Department and the Sustainable Streets Director or designee of the SFMTA. The plan shall be evaluated by a qualified transportation professional, retained by the Project Sponsor after a building(s) reaches 50% occupancy and once a year going forward until such time that the SFMTA determines that the evaluation is no longer necessary or could be done at less frequent intervals. The content of the evaluation report shall be determined by SFMTA staff, in consultation with the Planning Department, and generally shall include an assessment of on-street loading conditions, including actual loading demand, loading operation observations, and an assessment of how the project meets this mitigation measure. The evaluation report may be folded into other mitigation measure reporting obligations. If ongoing conflicts are occurring based on the assessment, the plan evaluation report shall put forth additional measures to address ongoing conflicts associated with loading operations. The evaluation report shall be reviewed by SFMTA staff, which shall make the final determination whether ongoing conflicts are occurring. In the event that the ongoing conflicts are occurring, the above plan requirements may be altered (e.g., the hour and day restrictions listed above, number of loading vehicle operations permitted during certain hours listed above, etc.).</p>	SFMTA	Prior to final design of each SFMTA street network project.	SFMTA and Planning Department.	Considered complete upon adoption of street network project design.
<p>Mitigation Measure M-TR-8: Emergency Vehicle Access Consultation.</p> <p>For street network projects that reduce the number of available vehicle travel lanes for a total distance of more than one block where transit-only lanes are not provided: Street network projects shall be designed to comply with adopted city codes regarding street widths, curb widths, and turning movements. To the degree feasible while still accomplishing safety-related project objectives, SFMTA shall design street network projects to include features that create potential opportunities for cars to clear travel lanes for emergency vehicles. Examples of such features include: curbside loading zones, customized signal timing, or other approaches developed through ongoing consultation between SFMTA and the San Francisco Fire Department.</p>	SFMTA	Prior to final design of each SFMTA street network project.	SFMTA and Planning Department.	Considered complete upon adoption of street network project design.

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>Mitigation Measure M-TR-9: Construction Management Plan and Construction Coordination. <i>Construction Management Plan</i> – For projects within the Plan Area, the project sponsor shall develop and, upon review and approval by the SFMTA and Public Works, implement a Construction Management Plan, addressing transportation-related circulation, access, staging and hours of delivery. The Construction Management Plan would disseminate appropriate information to contractors and affected agencies with respect to coordinating construction activities to minimize overall disruption and ensure that overall circulation in the project area is maintained to the extent possible, with particular focus on ensuring transit, pedestrian, and bicycle connectivity. The Construction Management Plan would supplement and expand, rather than modify or supersede, any manual, regulations, or provisions set forth by the SFMTA, Public Works, or other City departments and agencies, and the California Department of Transportation.</p> <p>If construction of the proposed project is determined to overlap with nearby adjacent project(s) as to result in transportation-related impacts, the project sponsor or its contractor(s) shall consult with various City departments such as the SFMTA and Public Works, and other interdepartmental meetings as deemed necessary by the SFMTA, Public Works, and the Planning Department, to develop a Coordinated Construction Management Plan. The Coordinated Construction Management Plan, to be prepared by the contractor, would be reviewed by the SFMTA and would address issues of circulation (traffic, pedestrians, and bicycle), safety, parking and other project construction in the area. Based on review of the construction logistics plan, the project may be required to consult with SFMTA Muni Operations prior to construction to review potential effects to nearby transit operations.</p> <p>The Construction Management Plan and, if required, the Coordinated Construction Management Plan, shall include, but not be limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Restricted Construction Truck Access Hours</i>—Limit construction truck movements during the hours between 7:00 and 9:00 a.m. and between 4:00 and 7:00 p.m., and other times if required by the SFMTA, to minimize disruption to vehicular traffic, 	<p>Project sponsor of each subsequent project undertaken in the Central SoMa Plan Area.</p>	<p>Prior to the start of each project's construction, and throughout the construction period.</p>	<p>SFMTA, SF Public Works, and Planning Department.</p>	<p>Considered complete upon approval of each construction management plan and completion of each project's construction.</p>

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>including transit during the a.m. and p.m. peak periods.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Construction Truck Routing Plans</i>— Identify optimal truck routes between the regional facilities and the project site, taking into consideration truck routes of other development projects and any construction activities affecting the roadway network. • <i>Coordination of Temporary Lane and Sidewalk Closures</i>— The project sponsor shall coordinate travel lane closures with other projects requesting concurrent lane and sidewalk closures through interdepartmental meetings, to minimize the extent and duration of requested lane and sidewalk closures. Travel lane closures shall be minimized especially along transit and bicycle routes, so as to limit the impacts to transit service and bicycle circulation and safety. • <i>Maintenance of Transit, Vehicle, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Access</i>— The project sponsor/construction contractor(s) shall meet with Public Works, SFMTA, the Fire Department, Muni Operations and other City agencies to coordinate feasible measures to include in the Coordinated Construction Management Plan to maintain access for transit, vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians. This shall include an assessment of the need for temporary transit stop relocations or other measures to reduce potential traffic, bicycle, and transit disruption and pedestrian circulation effects during construction of the project. • <i>Carpool, Bicycle, Walk and Transit Access for Construction Workers</i>— The construction contractor shall include methods to encourage carpooling, bicycling, walk and transit access to the project site by construction workers (such as providing transit subsidies to construction workers, providing secure bicycle parking spaces, participating in free-to-employee ride matching program from www.511.org, participating in emergency ride home program through the City of San Francisco (www.sferfh.org), and providing transit information to construction workers). • <i>Construction Worker Parking Plan</i>— The location of construction worker parking shall be identified as well as the person(s) responsible for monitoring the implementation 				

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>of the proposed parking plan. The use of on-street parking to accommodate construction worker parking shall be discouraged. All construction bid documents shall include a requirement for the construction contractor to identify the proposed location of construction worker parking. If on-site, the location, number of parking spaces, and area where vehicles would enter and exit the site shall be required. If off-site parking is proposed to accommodate construction workers, the location of the off-site facility, number of parking spaces retained, and description of how workers would travel between off-site facility and project site shall be required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Project Construction Updates for Adjacent Businesses and Residents</i>—To minimize construction impacts on access for nearby institutions and businesses, the project sponsor shall provide nearby residences and adjacent businesses with regularly-updated information regarding project construction, including construction activities, peak construction vehicle activities (e.g., concrete pours), travel lane closures, and lane closures. At regular intervals to be defined in the Construction Management Plan and, if necessary, in the Coordinated Construction Management Plan, a regular email notice shall be distributed by the project sponsor that shall provide current construction information of interest to neighbors, as well as contact information for specific construction inquiries or concerns. 				
E. Noise and Vibration				
<p>Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a: Transportation Demand Management for New Development Projects. Transportation Demand Management for New Development Projects. To reduce vehicle noise from subsequent development projects in the Plan Area, the project sponsor and subsequent property owners (excluding 100 percent affordable housing projects) shall develop and implement a TDM Plan for a proposed project's net new uses (including net new accessory parking spaces) as part of project approval. The scope and number of TDM measures included in the TDM Plan shall be in accordance with Planning Department's TDM Program Standards for the type of development proposed, and accompanying appendices in the Planning Department's TDM Programs and Standards, except that projects with complete development</p>	<p>Project sponsor and subsequent property owners of development projects in the Central SoMa Plan Area.</p>	<p>Project sponsor to submit TDM Plan to Planning Department for review prior to project consideration for approval.</p>	<p>Planning Department</p>	<p>TDM Plan to be approved as part of project approval; implementation to continue on ongoing basis, with reporting as required by text of TDM Plan.</p>

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>applications or Environmental Evaluation Applications (EEAs) on file with the Planning Department before January 1, 2018 shall meet a minimum of 75% of the TDM requirements in the Planning Department's TDM Program Standards. The TDM Program Standards and accompanying appendices are expected to be refined as planning for the proposed TDM Ordinance continues. Each subsequent development project's TDM Plan for proposed net new uses shall conform to the most recent version of the TDM Program Standards and accompanying appendices available at the time of the project Approval Action, as Approval Action is defined in Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code. The Planning Department shall review and approve the TDM Plan, as well as any subsequent revisions to the TDM Plan. The TDM Plan shall target a reduction in the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) rate (i.e., VMT per capita), monitor and evaluate project performance (actual VMT), and adjust TDM measures over time to attempt to meet VMT target reduction. This measure is applicable to all projects within the Plan Area that do not otherwise qualify for an exemption under Article 19 of the CEQA Guidelines. This measure is superseded for those projects that are already required to fully comply with the TDM Program Standards (i.e., without reductions in target requirements) in the Plan Area. The TDM Plan shall be developed in consultation with the Planning Department and rely generally on implementation of measures listed in the Planning Department TDM Program Standards and accompanying appendices in effect at the time of the Project Approval Action. The TDM program may include, but is not limited to the types of measures, which are summarized below for explanatory example purposes. Actual development project TDM measures shall be applied from the TDM Program Standards and accompanying appendices, which describe the scope and applicability of candidate measures in detail:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Active Transportation: Provision of streetscape improvements to encourage walking secure bicycle parking, shower and locker facilities for cyclists, subsidized bike share memberships for project occupants, bicycle repair and maintenance services, and other bicycle-related services; 2. Car-Share: Provision of car-share parking spaces and subsidized memberships for 				

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>project occupants;</p> <p>3. Delivery: Provision of amenities and services to support delivery of goods to project occupants;</p> <p>4. Family-Oriented Measures: Provision of on-site childcare and other amenities to support the use of sustainable transportation modes by families;</p> <p>5. High-Occupancy Vehicles: Provision of carpooling/vanpooling incentives and shuttle bus service;</p> <p>6. Information: Provision of multimodal wayfinding signage, transportation information displays, and tailored transportation marketing services;</p> <p>7. Land Use: Provision of on-site affordable housing and healthy food retail services in underserved areas; and</p> <p>8. Parking: Provision of unbundled parking, short-term daily parking provision, parking cash out offers, and reduced off-street parking supply.</p>				
<p>M-NO-1b: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses. To reduce potential conflicts between existing sensitive receptors and new noise-generating uses, for new development including PDR, Place of Entertainment, or other uses that may require the siting of new emergency generators/fire pumps or noisier-than-typical mechanical equipment, or facilities that generate substantial nighttime truck and/or bus traffic that would potentially generate noise levels substantially in excess of ambient noise (either short-term during the nighttime hours, or as a 24-hour average), the Planning Department shall require the preparation of a noise analysis that includes, at a minimum, a site survey to identify potential noise-sensitive uses within 900 feet of, and that have a direct line-of-sight-to, the project site, and including at least one 24-hour noise measurement (with maximum noise level readings taken so as to be able to accurately describe maximum levels reached during nighttime hours), prior to the first project approval action. The analysis shall be prepared by persons qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering and shall demonstrate that the proposed use would meet the noise standard identified in San Francisco Police Code Article 29. Should any concerns be present, the Department shall require the completion of a detailed noise assessment by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering, and the</p>	<p>Planning Department; project sponsor of each subsequent noise-generating project, as specified in mitigation measure, in the Central SoMa Plan Area; acoustical consultant</p>	<p>Analysis to be completed during environmental review of subsequent projects in the Plan Area.</p>	<p>Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection (DBI).</p>	<p>Considered complete upon project approval of subsequent development projects by Planning Department/ Planning Commission or approval of final plan set by DBI if Planning Department identifies project-specific noise reduction measures.</p>

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>incorporation of noise reduction measures as recommended by the noise assessment prior to the first project approval action.</p> <p>M-NO-2a: General Construction Noise Control Measures. To ensure that project noise from construction activities is reduced to the maximum extent feasible, the project sponsor of a development project in the plan area that is within 100 feet of noise-sensitive receptors shall undertake the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require the general contractor to ensure that equipment and trucks used for project construction utilize the best available noise control techniques (e.g., improved mufflers, equipment redesign, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures and acoustically-attenuating shields or shrouds), wherever feasible. Require the general contractor to locate stationary noise sources (such as compressors) as far from adjacent or nearby sensitive receptors as possible, to muffle such noise sources, and to construct barriers around such sources and/or the construction site, which could reduce construction noise by as much as 5 dBA. To further reduce noise, the contractor shall locate stationary equipment in pit areas or excavated areas, if feasible. Require the general contractor to use impact tools (e.g., jack hammers, pavement breakers, and rock drills) that are hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools. Where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust shall be used, along with external noise jackets on the tools, which could reduce noise levels by as much as 10 dBA. Include noise control requirements in specifications provided to construction contractors. Such requirements could include, but are not limited to, performing all work in a manner that minimizes noise to the extent feasible; use of equipment with effective mufflers; undertaking the most noisy activities during times of least disturbance to surrounding residents and occupants, as feasible; and selecting haul routes that avoid residential buildings to the extent that such routes are otherwise 	<p>Project sponsor of each subsequent project in the Central SoMa Plan Area; construction general contractor.</p>	<p>During construction period.</p>	<p>Planning Department, Department of Building Inspection (as requested and/or on complaint basis), Police Department (on complaint basis).</p>	<p>Considered complete at the completion of construction for each subsequent project.</p>

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>feasible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prior to the issuance of each building permit, along with the submission of construction documents, submit to the Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection (DBI) a list of measures that shall be implemented and that shall respond to and track complaints pertaining to construction noise. These measures shall include (1) a procedure and phone numbers for notifying DBI and the Police Department (during regular construction hours and off-hours); (2) a sign posted on-site describing noise complaint procedures and a complaint hotline number that shall be answered at all times during construction; (3) designation of an on-site construction complaint and enforcement manager for the project; and (4) notification of neighboring residents and non-residential building managers within 300 feet of the project construction area at least 30 days in advance of extreme noise generating activities (defined as activities generating anticipated noise levels of 80 dBA or greater without noise controls, which is the standard in the Police Code) about the estimated duration of the activity. 	<p>Project sponsor of each subsequent project in the Central SoMa Plan Area and construction general contractor.</p>	<p>Prior to and during the period of pile-driving.</p>	<p>Project sponsor; Planning Department and construction contractor; Department of Building Inspection (as requested and/or on complaint basis).</p>	<p>Considered complete after implementation of noise attenuation measures during pile-driving activities and submittal of final noise monitoring report to Planning Department.</p>
<p>M-NO-2b: Noise and Vibration Control Measures During Pile Driving. For individual projects that require pile driving, a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures shall be prepared under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant. These attenuation measures shall be included in construction of the project and shall include as many of the following control strategies, and any other effective strategies, as feasible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project sponsor of a development project in the Plan Area shall require the construction contractor to erect temporary plywood or similar solid noise barriers along the boundaries of the project site to shield potential sensitive receptors and reduce noise levels; The project sponsor of a development project in the Plan Area shall require the construction contractor to implement "quiet" pile-driving technology (such as pre-drilling of piles, sonic pile drivers, and the use of more than one pile driver to shorten the total pile driving duration), where feasible, with consideration of 				

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
geotechnical and structural requirements and soil conditions (including limiting vibration levels to the FTA's 0.5 inches per second, PPV to minimize architectural damage to adjacent structures); <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project sponsor of a development project in the Plan Area shall require the construction contractor to monitor the effectiveness of noise attenuation measures by taking noise measurements, at a distance of 100 feet, at least once per day during pile-driving; and • The project sponsor of a development project in the Plan Area shall require that the construction contractor limit pile driving activity to result in the least disturbance to neighboring uses. 				
M-NO-3: Construction-Generated Vibration. Implement Mitigation Measures M-NO-2b, Noise and Vibration Control Measures during Pile Driving, M-CP-3a, Protect Historical Resources from Adjacent Construction Activities, and M-CP-3b, Construction Monitoring Program for Historical Resources.		See Mitigation Measures M-NO-2b, M-CP-3a, and M-CP-3b.		
F. Air Quality				
M-AQ-3: Violation of an Air Quality Standard, Contribute to an Existing or Projected Air Quality Violation, and/or Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase in Criteria Air Pollutants.	See Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a.			
Implement Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a, Transportation Demand Management for Development Projects.	Project sponsor of each subsequent project in the Central SoMa Plan Area; subsequent project owner; Homeowners'	Prior to receipt of final Certificate of Occupancy and every five years thereafter.	Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection (DBI).	Project sponsor to submit written information to Planning Department prior to DBI issuance of Certificate of Occupancy; Sponsor or Owner to

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>environmentally preferable purchasing and shall include contact information and links to SF Approved.</p> <p>M-AQ-3b: Reduce Operational Emissions. Proposed projects that would exceed the criteria air pollutant thresholds in this EIR shall implement the additional measures, as applicable and feasible, to reduce operational criteria air pollutant emissions. Such measures may include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For any proposed refrigerated warehouses or large (greater than 20,000 square feet) grocery retailers, provide electrical hook-ups for diesel trucks with Transportation Refrigeration Units at the loading docks. Use low- and super-compliant VOC architectural coatings in maintaining buildings. “Low-VOC” refers to paints that meet the more stringent regulatory limits in South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1113; however, many manufacturers have reformulated to levels well below these limits. These are referred to as “Super-Compliant” architectural coatings. Implement Mitigation Measure M-AQ-5a, Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Generators and Fire Pumps. Other measures that are shown to effectively reduce criteria air pollutant emissions onsite or offsite if emissions reductions are realized within the SFBAAB. Measures to reduce emissions onsite are preferable to offsite emissions reductions. 	<p>Association (for condominium projects).</p> <p>Project sponsor of each subsequent project in the Central SoMa Plan Area; subsequent project owner, as applicable based on mitigation measure; Homeowners’ Association (for condominium projects).</p>	<p>For warehouses and large grocers, prior to issuance of building permit.</p> <p>Ongoing for maintenance use of architectural coatings.</p> <p>For generators and fire pumps, see Mitigation Measure M-AQ-5a.</p> <p>For other measures, schedule to be determined by Planning Department.</p>	<p>Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection.</p>	<p>continue submittals at 5-year intervals (ongoing).</p> <p>For warehouses and large grocers, considered complete upon approval of final construction plan set.</p> <p>Ongoing for maintenance use of architectural coatings.</p> <p>For generators and fire pumps, see Mitigation Measure M-AQ-5a.</p> <p>For other measures, schedule to be determined by Planning Department.</p>
<p>M-AQ-4a: Construction Emissions Analysis. Subsequent development projects that do not meet the applicable screening levels or that the Planning Department otherwise determines could exceed one or more significance thresholds for criteria air pollutants shall undergo an analysis of the project’s construction emissions. If no significance thresholds are exceeded, no further mitigation is required. If one or more significance thresholds are exceeded, Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4b would be applicable to the project.</p>	<p>Project sponsors of projects in Central SoMa Plan Area that do not meet applicable screening levels; Planning Department</p>	<p>During environmental review.</p>	<p>Planning Department (ERO, Air Quality technical staff).</p>	<p>Considered complete upon approval of analysis by ERO.</p>
<p>M-AQ-4b: Construction Emissions Minimization Plan. If required based on the analysis described in Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4a or as required in Impact AQ-6 the</p>	<p>Project sponsor of applicable projects in</p>	<p>Prior to the start of diesel equipment</p>	<p>Planning Department (ERO, Air Quality</p>	<p>Considered complete upon Planning Department</p>

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>project sponsor shall submit a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan (Plan) to the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) for review and approval by an Environmental Planning Air Quality Specialist. The Plan shall be designed to reduce air pollutant emissions to the greatest degree practicable.</p> <p>The Plan shall detail project compliance with the following requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All off-road equipment greater than 25 horsepower and operating for more than 20 total hours over the entire duration of construction activities shall meet the following requirements: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Where access to alternative sources of power are available, portable diesel engines shall be prohibited; b) All off-road equipment shall have: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Engines that meet or exceed either U.S. Environmental Protection Agency or California Air Resources Board Tier 2 off-road emission standards (or Tier 3 off-road emissions standards if NOx emissions exceed applicable thresholds), <i>and</i> ii. Engines that are retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy (VDECS), <i>and</i> iii. Engines shall be fueled with renewable diesel (at least 99 percent renewable diesel or R99). c) Exceptions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Exceptions to 1(a) may be granted if the project sponsor has submitted information providing evidence to the satisfaction of the ERO that an alternative source of power is limited or infeasible at the project site and that the requirements of this exception provision apply. Under this circumstance, the sponsor shall submit documentation of compliance with 1(b) for onsite power generation. ii. Exceptions to 1(b)(ii) may be granted if the project sponsor has submitted information providing evidence to the satisfaction of the ERO that a particular piece of off-road equipment with an ARB Level 3 VDECS (1) is 	<p>Central SoMa Plan Area; Planning Department.</p>	<p>use on site.</p>	<p>technical staff).</p>	<p>review and acceptance of Construction Emissions Minimization Plan.</p>

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed									
<p>technically not feasible, (2) would not produce desired emissions reductions due to expected operating modes, (3) installing the control device would create a safety hazard or impaired visibility for the operator, or (4) there is a compelling emergency need to use off-road equipment that are not retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 VDECS and the sponsor has submitted documentation to the ERO that the requirements of this exception provision apply. If granted an exception to 1(b)(ii), the project sponsor shall comply with the requirements of 1(c)(iii).</p> <p>iii. If an exception is granted pursuant to 1(c)(ii), the project sponsor shall provide the next-cleanest piece of off-road equipment as provided by the step down schedule in Table M-AQ-4:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">TABLE M-AQ-4B: OFF-ROAD EQUIPMENT COMPLIANCE STEP DOWN SCHEDULE*</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Compliance Alternative</th> <th>Engine Emission Standard</th> <th>Emissions Control</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Tier 2**</td> <td>ARB Level 2 VDECS</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Tier 2</td> <td>ARB Level 1 VDECS</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>* How to use the table. If the requirements of 1(b) cannot be met, then the project sponsor would need to meet Compliance Alternative 1. Should the project sponsor not be able to supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 1, then Compliance Alternative 2 would need to be met. Should the project sponsor not be able to supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 2, then Compliance Alternative 3 would need to be met.</p> <p>** Tier 3 off road emissions standards are required if NOx emissions exceed applicable thresholds.</p>	Compliance Alternative	Engine Emission Standard	Emissions Control	1	Tier 2**	ARB Level 2 VDECS	2	Tier 2	ARB Level 1 VDECS				
Compliance Alternative	Engine Emission Standard	Emissions Control											
1	Tier 2**	ARB Level 2 VDECS											
2	Tier 2	ARB Level 1 VDECS											

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>2. The project sponsor shall require the idling time for off-road and on-road equipment be limited to no more than two minutes, except as provided in exceptions to the applicable State regulations regarding idling for off-road and on-road equipment. Legible and visible signs shall be posted in multiple languages (English, Spanish, Chinese) in designated queuing areas and at the construction site to remind operators of the two minute idling limit.</p> <p>3. The project sponsor shall require that construction operators properly maintain and tune equipment in accordance with manufacturer specifications.</p> <p>4. The Plan shall include estimates of the construction timeline by phase with a description of each piece of off-road equipment required for every construction phase. Off-road equipment descriptions and information may include, but is not limited to, equipment type, equipment manufacturer, equipment identification number, engine model year, engine certification (Tier rating), horsepower, engine serial number, and expected fuel usage and hours of operation. For the VDECS installed: technology type, serial number, make, model, manufacturer, ARB verification number level, and installation date and hour meter reading on installation date. For off-road equipment not using renewable diesel, reporting shall indicate the type of alternative fuel being used.</p> <p>5. The Plan shall be kept on-site and available for review by any persons requesting it and a legible sign shall be posted at the perimeter of the construction site indicating to the public the basic requirements of the Plan and a way to request a copy of the Plan. The project sponsor shall provide copies of Plan as requested.</p> <p>6. <i>Reporting.</i> Quarterly reports shall be submitted to the ERO indicating the construction phase and off-road equipment information used during each phase including the information required in Paragraph 4, above. In addition, for off-road equipment not using renewable diesel, reporting shall indicate the type of alternative fuel being used.</p> <p>Within six months of the completion of construction activities, the project sponsor shall submit to the ERO a final report summarizing construction activities. The final report shall indicate the start and end dates and duration of each construction</p>				

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>phase. For each phase, the report shall include detailed information required in Paragraph 4. In addition, for off-road equipment not using renewable diesel, reporting shall indicate the type of alternative fuel being used.</p> <p>7. <i>Certification Statement and On-site Requirements.</i> Prior to the commencement of construction activities, the project sponsor shall certify (1) compliance with the Plan, and (2) all applicable requirements of the Plan have been incorporated into contract specifications.</p>				
<p>M-AQ-5: Operational Emissions of Fine Particulate Matter and Toxic Air Contaminants that would Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations</p> <p>Implement Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a, Transportation Demand Management (TDM) for Development Projects.</p>	<p>See Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a.</p>			
<p>M-AQ-5a: Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Generators and Fire Pumps All diesel generators and fire pumps shall have engines that (1) meet Tier 4 Final or Tier 4 Interim emission standards, or (2) meet Tier 2 emission standards and are equipped with a California Air Resources Board Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy. All diesel generators and fire pumps shall be fueled with renewable diesel, R99, if commercially available. For each new diesel backup generator or fire pump permit submitted for the project, including any associated generator pads, engine and filter specifications shall be submitted to the San Francisco Planning Department for review and approval prior to issuance of a permit for the generator or fire pump from the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection. Once operational, all diesel backup generators and Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy shall be maintained in good working order in perpetuity and any future replacement of the diesel backup generators, fire pumps, and Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy filters shall be required to be consistent with these emissions specifications. The operator of the facility shall maintain records of the testing schedule for each diesel backup generator and fire pump for the life of that diesel backup generator and fire pump and provide this information for review to the</p>	<p>Project sponsors of projects in the Central SoMa Plan Area with new diesel generators and/or fire pumps; Planning Department.</p>	<p>For specifications, prior to issuance of building permit for diesel generator or fire pump. For maintenance, ongoing.</p>	<p>Planning Department (ERO, Air Quality technical staff).</p>	<p>Equipment specifications portion considered complete when equipment specifications approved by ERO. Maintenance portion is ongoing and records are subject to Planning Department review upon request.</p>

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>Planning Department within three months of requesting such information.</p> <p>M-AQ-5b: Siting of Uses that Emit Particulate matter (PM_{2.5}), Diesel Particulate Matter, or Other Toxic Air Contaminants. To minimize potential exposure of sensitive receptors to diesel particulate matter or substantial levels of toxic air contaminants as part of everyday operations from stationary or area sources (other than the sources listed in M-AQ-5a), the San Francisco Planning Department shall require, during the environmental review process of such projects, but not later than the first project approval action, the preparation of an analysis by a qualified air quality specialist that includes, at a minimum, a site survey to identify residential or other sensitive receptors within 1,000 feet of the project site. For purposes of this measure, sensitive receptors are considered to include housing units; child care centers; schools (high school age and below); and inpatient health care facilities, including nursing or retirement homes and similar establishments. The assessment shall also include an estimate of emissions of toxic air contaminants from the source and shall identify all feasible measures to reduce emissions. These measures shall be incorporated into the project prior to the first approval action.</p>	<p>Project sponsors of projects in the Central SoMa Plan Area with stationary equipment other than diesel generators and fire pumps that emit PM_{2.5}, diesel particulate, or other toxic air contaminants, as determined by the Planning Department.</p>	<p>Prior to first project approval action.</p>	<p>Planning Department (ERO, Air Quality technical staff).</p>	<p>Considered complete upon ERO review and approval of air quality analysis and implementation of any required measures to reduce emissions.</p>
<p>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-5d: Land Use Buffers around Active Loading Docks. Locate sensitive receptors as far away as feasible from truck activity areas including loading docks and delivery areas.</p>	<p>Project sponsor of any project in the Central SoMa Plan Area with sensitive receptors.</p>	<p>Prior to approval of final plan set.</p>	<p>Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection.</p>	<p>Considered complete upon approval of final plan set.</p>
<p>M-AQ-6a: Construction Emissions Minimization Plan. All projects within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone and newly added Air Pollutant Exposure Zone lots identified in Figure IV.F-2 shall comply with M-AQ-4b, Construction Emissions Minimization Plan.</p>	<p>Project sponsor of applicable projects in the Central SoMa Plan Area identified by the Planning Department.</p>		<p>See Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4b.</p>	
<p>M-AQ-6b: Implement Clean Construction Requirements. Construction of street network changes and open space improvements adjacent to newly added air pollution exposure zone lots identified in Figure IV.F-2 shall comply with the Clean Construction requirements for projects located within the APEZ.</p>	<p>Planning Department, San Francisco Public Works, for sites in the Central SoMa Plan Area</p>	<p>During construction of each applicable street network and</p>	<p>Planning Department</p>	<p>Considered complete at the end of construction for each applicable street network and open space</p>

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>G. Wind</p> <p>*M-WT-1: Wind Hazard Criterion for the Plan Area. In portions of the Central SoMa Plan area outside the C-3 Use Districts, projects proposed at a roof height greater than 85 feet shall be evaluated by a qualified wind expert as to their potential to result in a new wind hazard exceedance or aggravate an existing pedestrian-level wind hazard exceedance (defined as the one-hour wind hazard criterion of 26 miles per hour equivalent wind speed). If the qualified expert determines that wind-tunnel testing is required due to the potential for a new or worsened wind hazard exceedance, the project shall adhere to the following standards for reduction of ground-level wind speeds in areas of substantial pedestrian use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New buildings and additions to existing buildings shall be shaped (e.g., include setbacks, or other building design techniques), or other wind baffling measures shall be implemented, so that the development would result in the following with respect to the one-hour wind hazard criterion of 26 miles per hour equivalent wind speed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No increase, compared to existing conditions, in the overall number of hours during which the wind hazard criterion is exceeded (the number of exceedance locations may change, allowing for both new exceedances and elimination of existing exceedances, as long as there is no net increase in the number of exceedance locations), based on wind-tunnel testing of a representative number of locations proximate to the project site; OR o Any increase in the overall number of hours during which the wind hazard criterion is exceeded shall be evaluated in the context of the overall wind effects of anticipated development that is in accordance with the Plan. Such an evaluation shall be undertaken if the project contribution to the wind hazard exceedance at one or more locations relatively distant from the individual project 	<p>identified by the Planning Department.</p>	<p>open space improvement project.</p>	<p>Planning Department</p>	<p>improvement project.</p>
<p></p>	<p>Project sponsors of projects in the Central SoMa Plan Area in excess of 85 feet in rooftop height.</p>	<p>During the environmental review process for subsequent development projects.</p>	<p></p>	<p>Considered complete upon approval of final construction plan set.</p>

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>site is minimal and if anticipated future Plan area development would substantively affect the wind conditions at those locations. The project and foreseeable development shall ensure that there is no increase in the overall number of hours during which the wind hazard criterion is exceeded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o New buildings and additions to existing buildings that cannot meet the one-hour wind hazard criterion of 26 miles per hour equivalent wind speed performance standard of this measure based on the above analyses, shall minimize to the degree feasible the overall number of hours during which the wind hazard criterion is exceeded. 				
H. Shadow				
No mitigation measures identified to be implemented by the Project Sponsor.				
I. Hydrology (Sea Level Rise and Combined Sewer System)				
No mitigation measures identified to be implemented by the Project Sponsor.				
Biological Resources (from Initial Study)				
<p>M-BI-1: Pre-Construction Bat Surveys: Conditions of approval for building permits issued for construction within the Plan Area shall include a requirement for pre-construction special-status bat surveys when trees with a diameter at breast height equal to or greater than 6 inches are to be removed or vacant buildings that have been vacant for six months or longer are to be demolished. If active day or night roosts are found, a qualified biologist (i.e., a biologist holding a CDFW collection permit and a Memorandum of Understanding with the CDFW allowing the biologist to handle and collect bats) shall take actions to make such roosts unsuitable habitat prior to tree removal or building demolition. A no disturbance buffer shall be created around active bat roosts being used for maternity or hibernation purposes at a distance to be determined in consultation with CDFW. Bat roosts initiated during construction are presumed to be unaffected, and no buffer would necessary.</p>	<p>Project sponsor of subsequent development projects in Central SoMa Plan Area with large trees to be removed and/or vacant buildings to be demolished; and qualified biologist, CDFW.</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of demolition or building permits when trees would be removed or buildings demolished as part of an individual project.</p>	<p>Planning Department; CDFW if applicable</p>	<p>Considered complete upon issuance of demolition or building permits.</p>

TABLE B: MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies mitigation measures that may be applicable to subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of each measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project. Measures with uncertain feasibility of being accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, operational, social, and technological factors, are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
Hazardous Materials (from Initial Study)				
<p>M-HZ-3: Hazardous Building Materials Abatement. The project sponsor of any development project in the Plan Area shall ensure that any building planned for demolition or renovation is surveyed for hazardous building materials including, electrical equipment containing polychlorinated biphenyl (PCBs), fluorescent light ballasts containing PCBs or bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP), and fluorescent light tubes containing mercury vapors. These materials shall be removed and properly disposed of prior to the start of demolition or renovation. Light ballasts that are proposed to be removed during renovation shall be evaluated for the presence of PCBs and in the case where the presence of PCBs in the light ballast cannot be verified, they shall be assumed to contain PCBs, and handled and disposed of as such, according to applicable laws and regulations. Any other hazardous building materials identified either before or during demolition or renovation shall be abated according to federal, State, and local laws and regulations.</p>	<p>Project sponsor of subsequent development projects in Central SoMa Plan Area with buildings to be demolished.</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of demolition permit.</p>	<p>Planning Department</p>	<p>Considered complete upon ERO review and acceptance of hazardous materials building survey report and remediation plan.</p>

**TABLE C: PROPOSED IMPROVEMENT MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
 (TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)**

This table identifies Plan-level improvement measures to be implemented by the City and County of San Francisco. Subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements within the Central SoMa Plan area would be required to comply with the applicable improvement measure listed in Table D.

Improvement Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
D. Transportation and Circulation				
<p>Improvement Measure I-TR-5a: Protected Bicycle Lane Public Education Campaign. To further reduce potential conflicts between bicyclists and pedestrians, transit and other vehicles, the SFMTA could develop and implement a protected bicycle lane public education campaign to develop safety awareness by providing information to the public through outreach channels such as media campaigns, brochures, and websites. This campaign would be in addition to the existing SFMTA bicycle safety outreach, specifically geared to Central SoMa and protected bicycle lanes. Elements of the education campaign could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarifying rules of the road for protected bicycle lanes. • Improving pedestrian awareness about where to wait and how to cross the protected bike lane (i.e., on the sidewalk or buffer zone, rather than in the separate lane or adjacent to parked vehicles). • Ensuring that the San Francisco Police Department officers are initially and repeatedly educated on traffic law as it applies to bicyclists and motorists. • Providing safety compliance education for bicyclists coupled with increased enforcement for violations by bicyclists. 	SFMTA	Prior to Planning Department approval of 20 percent of the Central SoMa Plan development, as estimated in the EIR.	SFMTA and Planning Department.	Considered complete with the implementation of cycle track public education campaign.
<p>The public education campaign could include a webpage, as well as instruction videos with information for cyclists, motorists, and pedestrians. The public education should be coordinated, to the extent possible, with community organizations including South of Market Community Action Network (SOMCAN), San Francisco Bicycle Coalition (SFBC), and neighborhood business groups.</p>	SFMTA	Within one year of installation of one or more cycle tracks specified in the mitigation measure.	SFMTA and Planning Department.	Considered complete with the implementation of Cycle Track Surveys.
<p>Improvement Measure I-TR-5b: Protected Bicycle Lane Post-Implementation Surveys. Following implementation of the protected bicycle lanes on Howard, Folsom, Brannan, Third and Fourth Streets, the SFMTA could conduct motorist, pedestrian, bicycle, and business surveys to understand how the protected bicycle lanes are performing, and to make adjustments to the design and supplemental public education campaign. In addition to the user surveys, the post-implementation assessment could include before/after photos, bicyclist ridership and traffic volume counts, video analysis of behavior of bicyclists, pedestrians, and drivers, assessment of vehicle queuing, and compliance with new signs/signals. The information would be used as input for subsequent design and implementation of protected bicycle lanes on other streets in San Francisco, as well as documenting the effectiveness of the</p>	SFMTA	Within one year of installation of one or more cycle tracks specified in the mitigation measure.	SFMTA and Planning Department.	Considered complete with the implementation of Cycle Track Surveys.

**TABLE C: PROPOSED IMPROVEMENT MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
 (TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)**

This table identifies Plan-level improvement measures to be implemented by the City and County of San Francisco. Subsequent development projects, street network changes, and open space improvements within the Central SoMa Plan area would be required to comply with the applicable improvement measure listed in Table D.

Improvement Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
protected bicycle lane.				

TABLE D: PROPOSED IMPROVEMENT MEASURES TO BE IMPLEMENTED AS PART OF SUBSEQUENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE PLAN AREA, AS DETERMINED TO BE APPLICABLE DURING SUBSEQUENT PROJECT REVIEW.

(TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY PROJECT SPONSOR)

This table identifies improvement measures applicable to subsequent development projects. During subsequent project review, the Planning Department would determine the applicability of the improvement measure and prepare a project-specific Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program to be adopted with each subsequent project.

Improvement Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
Biological Resources (from Initial Study)				
<p>I-BI-2: Night Lighting Minimization. In compliance with the voluntary San Francisco Lights Out Program, the Planning Department could encourage buildings developed pursuant to the draft Plan to implement bird-safe building operations to prevent and minimize bird strike impacts, including but not limited to the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce building lighting from exterior sources by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Minimizing the amount and visual impact of perimeter lighting and façade up-lighting and avoid up-lighting of rooftop antennae and other tall equipment, as well as of any decorative features; ○ Installing motion-sensor lighting; ○ Utilizing minimum wattage fixtures to achieve required lighting levels. • Reduce building lighting from interior sources by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dimming lights in lobbies, perimeter circulation areas, and atria; ○ Turning off all unnecessary lighting by 11:00 p.m. through sunrise, especially during peak migration periods (mid-March to early June and late August through late October); ○ Utilizing automatic controls (motion sensors, photo-sensors, etc.) to shut off lights in the evening when no one is present; ○ Encouraging the use of localized task lighting to reduce the need for more extensive overhead lighting; ○ Scheduling nightly maintenance to conclude by 11:00 p.m.; ○ Educating building users about the dangers of night lighting to birds. 	<p>Planning Department, working with project sponsors of each subsequent development project in the Central SoMa Plan Area.</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of building permit, and during project operation.</p>	<p>Planning Department</p>	<p>Considered complete upon approval of building plans by Planning Department. Planning Department may engage in follow-up discussions with project sponsors, as applicable.</p>