SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Transmittal Memo
Glen Park Community Plan
Adoption Hearing Materials

HEARING DATE: NOVEMBER 10, 2011

Date:	November 3, 2011
Case No.:	**2005.1004 EMTZ**
Project Name:	**Glen Park Community Plan**
Project Sponsor:	Planning Department 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Staff Contact:	Jon Swae – (415) 575-9069, jon.swae@sfgov.org
Reviewed by:	John Billovits – (415) 558-6390, john.billovits@sfgov.org
Recommendation:	**Approval**

TRANSMITTAL

The Planning Department submits the following materials for consideration by the Commission in advance of the Glen Park Community Plan Adoption hearing scheduled on November 10, 2011. The materials here provide the necessary documentation to approve the Glen Park Community Plan's amendments to the General Plan, Planning Code and Zoning Map. A draft motion to certify the Final Environmental Impact Report was transmitted to the Commission on October 27, 2011. These documents are supported by the Initiation Package delivered to the Commission on October 6, 2011.

REQUESTED COMMISSION ACTIONS

At the adoption hearing, the Commission will be asked to take the following actions:

1. Adopt California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Findings and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.
2. Determine consistency of the Glen Park Community Plan with the General Plan and Planning Code Section 101.1 Priority Policies, and recommend adoption to the Board of Supervisors.
3. Approve adoption of amendments to the General Plan constituting the Glen Park Area Plan, pending approval by the Board of Supervisors.
4. Approve and recommend to the Board of Supervisors related amendments to the San Francisco Planning Code and Zoning Map.

PRELIMINARY STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Commission approve motions adopting CEQA Findings as well as approve the resolutions related to amending the General Plan, Planning Code, and Zoning Map.

ATTACHMENTS

- Motion adopting findings under CEQA (E Case)
    - Attachment A: California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Findings
    - Exhibit 1: Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program
- Resolution approving amendments to the General Plan (M Case)
- Resolution approving amendments to the Planning Code (T Case)
- Resolution approving amendments to the Zoning Map (Z Case)

SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

SAN FRANCISCO

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

MOTION NO. _____

ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS (AND A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS) UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT AND STATE GUIDELINES IN CONNECTION WITH THE ADOPTION OF THE GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN AND RELATED ACTIONS NECESSARY TO IMPLEMENT SUCH PLANS. THE PLAN AREA HAS THE FOLLOWING GENERAL BOUNDARIES: CHENERY STREET TO THE NORTH; ROANOKE STREET TO THE EAST; SAN JOSE AVENUE AND BOSWORTH STREET TO THE SOUTH; AND ELK STREET TO THE WEST.

Whereas, the Planning Department, the Lead Agency responsible for the implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") has undertaken a planning and environmental review process for the proposed Glen Park Community Plan ("Area Plan" or "Project") and provided for appropriate public hearings before the Planning Commission.

Whereas, the Planning Department initiated a public planning process in 2002 to create the Glen Park Community Plan. The Plan presents a vision and a set of objectives and policies that recognize Glen Park's unique character and seek to enhance the neighborhood's special quality and function.

Whereas, the Plan's policies generally seek to protect and reinforce the character of the neighborhood commercial district, resolve challenges caused by the area's massive vehicle infrastructure, enhance pedestrian and transit movement, improve the area's mix of open spaces, and restore connections to Glen Canyon Park and surrounding neighborhoods. The Plan recommends modifications to the neighborhood commercial zoning to support a transit-oriented commercial district, identifies streetscape and pedestrian amenities, suggests open space opportunities and encourages review of future development for compatibility with the neighborhood's scale and distinctive character. An accompanying Implementation Program outlines projects, actions, funding opportunities and interagency coordination the City must pursue to implement the Area Plan. Further description of the Area Plan's proposals and recommendations is contained in the Plan document.

Whereas, the Area Plan supports the General Plan's vision of strengthening neighborhood-serving commercial areas; encouraging travel by public transit, walking

and bicycling; preserving historic buildings; and providing and improving open space, streets and transportation in the Plan Area.

Whereas, the Plan proposes one new zoning district in the area of San Francisco generally located in south central San Francisco as described in the preamble, including the following: Glen Park Neighborhood Commercial Transit District.

Whereas, the above-mentioned use district would eliminate the existing density cap and minimum parking requirement as described in detail in the *Glen Park Community Plan Initiation Package*, dated October 20, 2011, transmitted to the Planning Commission and made available to the general public on October 6, 2011. This use district would replace the existing Neighborhood Commercial District within the Project Area.

Whereas, the Planning Commission will consider—in conjunction with the proposed new use district—adoption of General Plan amendments, including new and/or amended goals, objectives, and policies as part of the Glen Park Community Plan; Planning Code amendments; and Zoning Map amendments and other applicable changes.

Whereas, the actions listed in Attachment A hereto ("Actions") are part of a series of considerations in connection with the adoption of the Glen Park Community Plan ("Project"), as more particularly described in Attachment A hereto.

Whereas, the Planning Department determined that an Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") was required for the proposed Glen Park Community Plan, and provided public notice of that determination by publication in a newspaper of general circulation on July 1, 2009.

Whereas, the Planning Department on April 27, 2011 published the Draft Environmental Impact Report ("DEIR"). The DEIR was circulated for public review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, California Public Resources Code section 21000 *et seq.* ("CEQA"), the State CEQA Guidelines, 14 California Code of Regulations, Section 15000 *et seq.*, ("CEQA Guidelines"), and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code ("Chapter 31"). The Planning Commission held a public hearing on the DEIR on June 2, 2011.

Whereas, the Planning Department prepared responses to comments on the DEIR and published the Comments and Responses document on October 27, 2011, which together with the DEIR, background studies and materials, and additional information that became available, constitute the Final Environmental Impact Report ("FEIR").

Whereas, the Planning Commission, on November 10, 2011, by Motion No. _____, reviewed and considered the FEIR and found that the contents of said report and the procedures through which the FEIR was prepared, publicized, and reviewed complied with the provisions of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31.

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

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

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the FEIR and the actions associated with the Glen Park Community Plan and hereby adopts the Project Findings attached hereto as Attachment A including a statement of overriding considerations, and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Motion was ADOPTED by the Planning Commission at its regular meeting of November 10, 2011.

Linda Avery
Commission Secretary

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
EXCUSED:

ACTION: Adoption of CEQA Findings

ATTACHMENT A

GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN

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

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION

In determining to approve the proposed Glen Park Community Plan and related approval actions (the Project), the San Francisco Planning Commission (Planning Commission or Commission) makes and adopts the following findings of fact and statement of overriding considerations and adopts the following recommendations regarding mitigation measures and alternatives based on substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding and under the California Environmental Quality Act, California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq. (CEQA), 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.

I. Introduction

This document is organized as follows:

Section I provides a description of the proposed 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 (EIR) is not required;

Section VI evaluates the different project alternatives and the economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations that support the rejection of the alternatives analyzed; and

Section VII presents a statement of overriding considerations setting forth specific reasons in support of the Planning Commission's actions and its rejection of the Alternatives not incorporated into the Project.

Attached to these findings as **Exhibit 1** is the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the mitigation measures that have been proposed for adoption. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program is required by CEQA Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091. It provides a table setting forth each mitigation measure listed in the Final EIR that is required to reduce or avoid a significant adverse impact. **Exhibit 1** also specifies the

agency responsible for implementation of each measure 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 EIR or responses to comments in the Final EIR are for ease of reference and are not intended to provide an exhaustive list of the evidence relied upon for these findings.

a. Project Description

The proposed Project is the 2010 Glen Park Community Plan (2010 Community Plan), a product of a sustained community process that addresses the issues and opportunities facing the Glen Park neighborhood. The 2010 Community Plan introduces goals, objectives, and policies aimed at preserving and enhancing the unique character of Glen Park. The plan contains three elements: Land Use and Urban Design, Transportation, and Open Space. Each element presents policies that, collectively, encourage local business vitality, strengthen neighborhood identity, improve transportation conditions, calm traffic, and promote pedestrian safety. The 2010 Community Plan aims at directing the City to implement near-term projects as well as pursue larger future visions.

The 2010 Community Plan is an update of the November 2003 Glen Park Community Plan Summary (2003 Community Plan Summary), which was first developed through coordination among the San Francisco Planning Department (Planning Department), the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) District, and other agencies, with extensive involvement from the Glen Park community. After completion of the 2003 Community Plan Summary, the project was postponed until additional funding was identified to carry the plan forward. In 2009, the Planning Department re-initiated the community planning process and in September 2010, the Planning Department released an updated working draft, the 2010 Community Plan.

Upon adoption by the San Francisco Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors, the 2010 Community Plan would be incorporated into the San Francisco General Plan (General Plan) as an area plan. Implementation of the 2010 Community Plan would potentially result in a number of physical improvements, including street network changes, transportation and infrastructure changes, potential infill development, and open space improvements. In addition, the 2010 Community Plan would modify existing land use and zoning controls, but would not alter the land use pattern in the plan area.

The plan area is in the center of the Glen Park neighborhood in the City of San Francisco, and is bounded generally by Chenery Street to the north; Roanoke Street to the east; San Jose Avenue and Bosworth Street to the south; and Elk Street to the West. Glen Park is located south of the Diamond Heights and Noe Valley neighborhoods, west of the Bernal Heights neighborhood, and east of Glen Canyon Park. The plan area is consistent with the area known as the village or downtown that encompasses Glen Park's commercial district, the Glen Park Bart station, and nearby public open spaces.

Community Plan Element 1 – Land Use and Urban Design

The Land Use and Urban Design Element of the 2010 Community Plan would provide long-term guidance to decision makers and public agencies to ensure future infrastructure projects and land use changes in the Glen Park neighborhood are carried out with sensitivity to the neighborhood's concerns, needs, and desires. The objectives of the Land Use and Urban Design Element are to protect and strengthen the qualities that make downtown Glen Park special, ensure the compatibility of new development with the form and character of Glen Park, and recognize the contribution of historic buildings to neighborhood identity.

The 2010 Community Plan's land use policies would support small local retailers and service businesses by concentrating development within the traditional commercial core. By restricting retail and commercial development to the commercial core, the 2010 Community Plan would prevent retail development on the fringes of this district that would not be economically supported by pedestrian traffic and which could increase the need for local parking. Although development potential in Glen Park is limited, the 2010 Community Plan would support development of additional housing, maintaining the neighborhood's diversity, and taking advantage of its close proximity to shops, restaurants, services, and transit. Together these policies are intended to preserve and enhance the existing character of the Glen Park neighborhood. Future infill projects under the proposed land use and Planning Code amendments would be subject to independent environmental review.

Proposed Planning Code Amendments

Implementation of the 2010 Community Plan would involve modification of Planning Code land use controls. A new Glen Park Neighborhood Commercial Transit (Glen Park NCT) District would incorporate parcels along Diamond Street, Chenery Street, Joost Avenue, and Wilder Street currently zoned NC-2 (Small-Scale Neighborhood Commercial) together with other parcels on Diamond Street currently zoned RH-3 (Residential House, Three Family) and on Chenery and Castro Streets, currently zoned RH-2 (Residential House, Two Family). The Glen Park NCT District rezoning would permit new physical changes such as modifications to density controls, increased heights, setbacks, façade treatments, and minimization of curb cuts.

While most of the plan area would retain the prevailing height limit of 40-X, the height limit would be increased by 5 feet in areas rezoned to Glen Park NCT to encourage active ground floor uses. In addition, the height limit would be reduced along portions of Wilder Street, Diamond Street, Castro Street and Chenery Street in the Glen Park NCT District from a range to 40 to 45 feet to a range of 30 to 35 feet. An increase in five feet would allow for storefronts with more space and provide easy access for pedestrians, but would not allow for an additional floor of development.

The 2010 Community Plan does not propose rezoning the BART parking lot. The EIR, however, analyzed the potential environmental effects that would result from infill development on this site under a potential future rezoning scenario, described below.

Anticipated Buildout

The potential development of the two infill sites identified by the plan and the broader plan area has been conservatively estimated as follows:

Northwest Corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street. The first infill site is the Diamond Street/Bosworth Street site, which includes five privately owned parcels and one P-zoned parcel on both sides of Kern Street, between Diamond Street, Bosworth Street, and Brompton Avenue (Assessor's Block 6744; Lots 013, 025, 027, 030, 031, 032). These parcels have a total area of approximately 22,859 gsf. This site is currently within the Small-Scale Neighborhood Commercial (NC-2) and Residential - Two family (RH-2) districts and extends northward across Kern Street (bounded by Brompton Avenue to the west). The portions of the site zoned NC-2 would be rezoned to the proposed Glen Park NCT District; parcels zoned RH-2 would remain as such. As permitted by the new NCT controls, future infill development at the Diamond Street and Bosworth Street site would consist of mixed-use development, including residential and commercial uses. This infill site is within the 40-X Height and Bulk District and

would be rezoned to 45-X Height and Bulk District under the 2010 Community Plan. Assuming full buildout of this site under the proposed zoning, infill development could include:

- 39 to 47 residential units (including two residential-only buildings);
- Between 0 and 8,582 gsf of ground-floor commercial space; and
- 13 to 26 private, off-street parking spaces.

BART Parking Lot. The second site is the BART parking lot on the north side of Bosworth Street and Arlington Street (east of Diamond Street), extending northward to Wilder Street (Assessor's Block 6745; Lots 042, 048, 053, 057, 066, 067, 068, and 069). This site is within the P (Public) District and the 40-X Height and Bulk District. This 27,400-gsf site is owned by BART and contains a 54-space surface parking lot and a small single-story building housing a BART transformer and ventilation system. The 2010 Community Plan does not propose rezoning this site, but identifies it as a potential location for future residential and commercial infill development. A proposal for the rezoning of the BART parking lot to allow housing or commercial uses may be forthcoming at the completion of BART's upcoming planning process for this site. Although the 2010 Community Plan does not itself propose development or rezoning of the site, the EIR analyzed the environmental effects that would result if the BART parking lot infill site were developed with a mixed residential and commercial project. The EIR assumed for analytical purposes that the site potentially could be rezoned to a Glen Park NCT District and a 65-X Height and Bulk District. The maximum building envelope at the site under a potential future rezoning scenario could include:

- Mixed use, three- to sic-story building with 45 to 90 residential units;
- Between 0 and 14,913 gsf of commercial uses; and
- Parking ranging from 2 to 123 off-street parking spaces.

Other Development Potential. With the exception of the infill sites discussed above, the Glen Park neighborhood is largely built out. The intensity of the development in the residential neighborhoods surrounding the downtown area would not be expected to change with implementation of the 2010 Community Plan. However, it is expected that over the life of the 2010 Community Plan development of additional parcels within the proposed Glen Park NCT District and 45-X Height and Bulk District could occur. The maximum development potential in the plan area, excluding potential development associated with the two infill sites identified above, is estimated to be as follows:

- 13 residential units; and
- Between 0 and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses.

Preservation of Historic Buildings within the Plan Area

The 2010 Community Plan encourages preservation and protection of existing historic buildings in the neighborhood. Specifically, the plan proposes to present a survey of Glen Park's historic resources for adoption to the Historic Preservation Commission; apply the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties for projects involving historic resources; protect the historic buildings in Glen Park from demolition or adverse alteration; and nominate properties that were found eligible to the San Francisco, California, or National Registers of Historical Places.

Community Plan Element 2 – Transportation

The 2010 Community Plan also proposes a number of transportation improvements, including improvements for pedestrian, transit, and bicycle circulation and accessibility. The project also

proposed, and the EIR studied, variants or options, to the proposed transportation improvements from the transportation feasibility study that were also considered worthy of environmental review. The set of transportation improvements included in the proposed project illustrates a possible, logical combination of street, sidewalk, bicycle circulation, and transit modifications, and, collectively, for the purpose of analyzing the maximum environmental impact of any possible combination of improvements.

While the proposed transportation improvements and their variants are evaluated collectively as part of the proposed project, whether or not they are ultimately implemented would depend upon decision-makers, funding, community interests and priorities, and other factors. The improvements may be implemented individually, in various combinations, or conceivably not at all. Notably, each improvement has independent utility, meaning that each can be implemented separate from the other improvements and still provide transportation benefit. Importantly, the combination of improvements that could be implemented that would result in the maximum environmental impact of any possible combination of improvements is evaluated in the EIR to provide a conservative analysis for the environmental analysis. Finally, the transportation effects of each improvement are highly localized and, thus, the combined effects of the full complement of the proposed transportation improvements would be virtually the same as the sum of the effects of each individual improvement.

Although the transportation improvements were fully analyzed in the EIR, they are not proposed for adoption at this time. Whether or not the transportation improvements are ultimately implemented will depend on decision-makers, funding, community interests and priorities, and other factors.

More specifically, the following improvements have been proposed, and were studied in the EIR:

Proposed Transportation Improvements and Variants

Type of Improvement	Proposed Improvement	Variant
Traffic Calming		
Bosworth Street Improvements	Speed table,[a] lane narrowing east of Arlington Street, and two new crosswalks with in-pavement warning lights.	Roundabout at Bosworth Street/Arlington Street/I-280 on-ramp with signal at Lyell Street; improve existing pedestrian crossing; new traffic signal with crosswalks at Bosworth Street and Lyell Street.
Monterey Boulevard/Joost Avenue and Arlington Street/Wilder Street Intersection Improvements	Pedestrian bulbout treatments and expanded traffic island at the Monterey Boulevard/Joost Avenue intersection. Pedestrian bulbouts at the Arlington Street/Wilder Street intersection. Extended curb between Arlington Street and San Jose Avenue off-ramp.	No variants
Bosworth Street/ Diamond Street Intersection Improvements	Modified signalization with restriping[b] and scramble phase.[c] widen sidewalk and add pedestrian bulbout on Diamond Street.	Widening of Diamond Street to add right-turn lane; add scramble phase; modify BART entry plaza.
Bicycle Networks		
Bicycle Lanes	Bicycle lane improvements and installation of bicycle racks in the commercial area.	No variants
Pedestrian Access		
Pedestrian Connectivity between Muni Metro J-Church Light Rail Platform and Glen Park BART Station	New pedestrian bridge from existing Muni Metro J-Church light rail platform to the intersection of San Jose Avenue off-ramp, Diamond Street, and Monterey Boulevard.[d]	New at-grade ramp (with or without bus loop)
BART Station Plaza Improvements	Plaza alterations to improve pedestrian access and access for persons with disabilities in the BART Station plaza.	No variants
Pedestrian Improvement under Overpass	Improvement of pedestrian experience under I-280 and San Jose Avenue.	No variants
Transit Improvements		
BART Access	Bus loop with BART concourse entry.	No bus loop with BART concourse entry; move Muni transit stop (inbound 23) to Bosworth Street.

Sources: SFMTA , PBS&J, 2010.

Notes:

a. A speed table is a wide speed hump with a flat section in the middle.

b. Restriping refers to replacing old pavement markings.

c. Scramble phase refers to intersection signalization that allows pedestrians to cross the intersection from different directions simultaneously.

d. The existing pedestrian bridge would be demolished under the proposed project.

Community Plan Element 3 – Open Space

The objective of the Open Space Element is to maintain and improve the area's mix of public open spaces. The 2010 Community Plan includes policies that support open space and recreation within Glen Park, including the possibility of a greenway link between Glen Park and Glen Canyon. Specifically, the plan suggests the potential for daylighting a portion of Islais Creek to redirect the creek into above-ground channels. The 2010 Community Plan suggests conducting further studies to assess the feasibility of the Islais Creek daylighting and linear greenway. The plan also encourages the conversion of a block along Kern Street into a downtown public space. Modification could include special pavement, street trees, and shared street treatments. Additionally, the plan suggests the potential of Kern Street to function as the entrance to the greenway linking downtown to Glen Canyon.

b. Environmental Review

The Planning Department determined that an EIR was required for the Project. A Notice of Preparation was issued on July 1, 2009. The Planning Department published the Draft EIR and provided public notice of the availability of the Draft EIR for public review and comment on April 27, 2011.

The Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing on the Draft EIR on June 2, 2011. At this hearing, opportunity for public comment was given, and public comment was received on the Draft EIR. The Planning Department accepted public comments on the Draft EIR from April 27, 2011 to June 13, 2011.

The Planning Department prepared responses to comments on environmental issues received at the public hearing and in writing, prepared revisions to the text of the Draft EIR in response to comments received or based on additional information that became available during the public comment review period, and corrected errors in the Draft EIR. This material was presented in the Comments and Responses published on November 10, 2011, 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, and the Comments and Responses. The Draft EIR, the Comments and Responses 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.

c. Planning Commission Actions

The Planning Commission will take the following actions and approvals to implement the Project.

- Certify the Glen Park Community Plan EIR.

- Adopt CEQA Findings and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.
- Determine consistency of the Glen Park Community Plan with the General Plan and Planning Code Section 101.1 Priority Policies, and recommend adoption to the Board of Supervisors.
- Approve adoption of amendments to the General Plan constituting the Glen Park Area Plan, pending approval by the Board of Supervisors.
- Approve and recommend to the Board of Supervisors related amendments to the San Francisco Planning Code and Zoning Map.

d. Location of Records

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

- The Area Plans.
- 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 set forth in the EIR.
- All information (including written evidence and testimony) presented to the Planning Commission by the environmental consultant and sub consultants 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 administrative record, and background documentation for the Final EIR are located at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, San Francisco. Linda Avery, Commission Secretary, is the custodian of these documents and materials.

II. Impacts Found Not To Be Significant and Thus Requiring No Mitigation

Based on substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding, the City finds that the implementation of the Plan will not result any significant impacts in the following areas: Land Use (Section III.B of the EIR); Aesthetics (Section III.C); Transportation and Circulation (Section III.E of the EIR; most transportation impacts stemming from the Plan were found not to be significant; those that were not are discussed below, in Sections III and IV); Noise and

Vibration (Section III.F of the EIR; most noise impacts resulting from the Plan were found not to be significant; those that were not are discussed below, in Sections III and IV); Air Quality (Section III.G of the EIR; most air quality impacts resulting from the Plan were found not to be significant; those that were not are discussed below, in Sections III and IV); Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Section III.H). Each of these topics is analyzed and discussed in detail in the indicated section of the EIR.

In addition, the Initial Study found that the proposed Project would have no effect, or would have a less than-significant effect, or a less-than-significant effect with implementation of mitigation measures on the following environmental factors: Population and Housing, Wind and Shadow, Recreation, Utilities and Service Systems, Public Services, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Mineral and Energy Resources, Agricultural Resources, Biological Resources, Hydrology and Water Quality. Where the Initial Study identified mitigation measures to bring some potential impacts to less-than-significant levels, these impacts and mitigation measures are listed below, in Section III, below.

III. Findings of Potentially Significant Impacts That Can be Avoided or Reduced to a Less Than Significant Level

Finding: The California Environmental Quality Act (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. The mitigation measures proposed for adoption in this section are the same as the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR.

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

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. The Planning Commission hereby adopts the mitigation measures that are within its jurisdiction, as identified in **Exhibit 1**. This Planning Commission urges other agencies to consider, adopt and implement applicable mitigation measures set forth in the Final EIR that are within the jurisdiction and responsibility of such entities, as identified in **Exhibit 1**. 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 VII, the Planning Commission is adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

All mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR that will reduce or avoid significant adverse environmental impacts are proposed for adoption and are set forth in **Exhibit 1**, the Mitigation

Monitoring and Reporting Program. None of the mitigation measures set forth in the Final EIR that are needed to reduce or avoid significant adverse environmental impacts are rejected.

IMPACTS

A. Cultural and Paleontological Resources

1. **Impact CP-1**: Operation and design associated with the 2010 Community Plan's Diamond Street widening variant, pedestrian connectivity improvements, BART Station plaza improvements, and bus loop improvement at the BART Station would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the BART Station, a historical resource.

   Mitigation Measure M-CP-1: ***Verification of Compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties***. San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), in cooperation with BART and any other agency that may have jurisdiction, will prepare materials describing and depicting the widening of Diamond Street variant, pedestrian connectivity improvements, BART Station plaza improvements, and bus loop improvement at the BART Station, including but not limited to plans, drawings, and photographs of existing conditions. Prepared materials will be submitted to the Planning Department for review by staff who meet the Secretary of Interior's professional qualification standards. Such staff will review and the Historic Preservation Commission shall approve the project for compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. If any aspect of the design of the widening of Diamond Street variant, pedestrian bridge connectivity improvements, BART Station plaza improvements, or and bus loop improvement at the BART station is determined to be inconsistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction shall pursue and implement a redesign of those elements, consistent with the goals and objectives of the project, such that consistency with the standards is achieved.

   Conclusion: Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1 would ensure that operation and design associated with the 2010 Community Plan's Diamond Street widening variant, pedestrian connectivity improvements, BART Station plaza improvements, and bus loop improvement at the BART Station do not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the BART Station. M-CP-1 would therefore bring this impact to a less-than-significant level.

2. **Impact CP-2**: Construction activities resulting from the Diamond Street widening variant, pedestrian connectivity improvements access, BART Station plaza improvements, and bus loop improvements at the BART Station would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the BART Station, a historical resource.

   Mitigation Measure M-CP-2A: ***Protection of Historical Resource During Construction***. To protect the Glen Park BART Station from direct or indirect impacts during construction activities (e.g., due to damage from operation of construction equipment, vibration, staging, and material storage), SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction shall, prior to any construction activities, including any ground-disturbing work, prepare a plan establishing procedures to protect these resources.

SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction, shall ensure that the contractor follows this plan while working near these resources.

The plan shall be prepared by a qualified architectural historian who meets the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards. At a minimum, the plan shall include:

- A requirement for the placement of perimeter fencing and/or signs around the historical resource to identify it as a sensitive resource;
- Guidelines for operation of construction equipment adjacent to the historical resource;
- Guidelines for storage of construction materials away from the resource;
- Requirements for monitoring and documenting compliance with the plan; and
- Education/training of construction workers about the significance of the historical resource around which they would be working.

Mitigation Measure M-CP-2B: ***Historical Resource Documentation and Protection***. Prior to construction, a historic preservation architect and a structural engineer shall undertake an existing condition study of the Glen Park BART Station. The purpose of the study would be to establish the baseline condition of the building and plazas prior to construction. The documentation shall take the form of written descriptions and visual illustrations, including those physical characteristics of the resource that convey its historic significance and that justify its inclusion on, or eligibility for inclusion on, the California Register. The documentation shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department.

Conclusion: Implementation of mitigation measures M-CP-2A and M-CP-2B would ensure that construction activities resulting from the Diamond Street widening variant, pedestrian connectivity improvements access, BART Station plaza improvements, and bus loop improvements at the BART Station would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the BART Station, a historical resource. Therefore these mitigations would bring this impact to a less-than-significant level.

3. **Impact CP-3**: Future construction activities associated with the 2010 Community Plan area would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource.

Mitigation Measure M-CP-3: ***Accidental Discovery of Archaeological Resources.*** The

SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction shall distribute the Planning Department archaeological resource ALERT sheet to the project prime contractor; to any project subcontractor (including demolition, excavation, grading,

foundation, pile driving, etc. firms); or utilities firm involved in soil-disturbing activities

within the project site. Prior to any soil-disturbing activities being undertaken, each contractor is responsible for ensuring that the ALERT sheet is circulated to all field personnel, including machine operators, field crew, pile drivers, supervisory personnel, etc. The project sponsor shall provide the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) with a signed affidavit from the responsible parties (prime contractor, subcontractor(s), and utilities firm) to the ERO confirming that all field personnel have received copies of the Alert Sheet.

Should any indication of an archaeological resource be encountered during any soil-disturbing activity of the project, the project Head Foreman and/or project sponsor shall immediately notify the ERO and shall immediately suspend any soil-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 archaeological resource may be present within the project site, the project sponsor shall retain the services of a qualified archaeological consultant as provided by the Planning Department's List of Qualified Archeological Consultants. The archaeological consultant shall advise the ERO as to whether the discovery is an archaeological resource, retains sufficient integrity, and is of potential scientific/historical/cultural significance. If an archaeological resource is present, the archaeological consultant shall identify and evaluate the archaeological resource. The archaeological consultant shall make a recommendation as to what action, if any, is warranted. Based on this information, the ERO may require, if warranted, specific additional measures to be implemented by the project sponsor.

Measures might include preservation in situ of the archaeological resource; an archaeological monitoring program; or an archaeological testing program. If an archaeological monitoring program or archaeological testing program is required, it shall be consistent with the Major Environmental Analysis (MEA) division guidelines for such programs. The ERO may also require that the project sponsor immediately implement a site security program if the archaeological resource is at risk from vandalism, looting, or other damaging actions. The project archaeological consultant shall submit a Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archaeological resource and describe the archaeological and historical research methods employed in the archaeological monitoring/data recovery

program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archaeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the final report.

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

Conclusion: Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-3 would ensure the appropriate treatment of archaeological resources that may be encountered during construction, and would reduce potential effects of future development in the plan area on archaeological resources to a less-than-significant level.

4. **Impact CP-4**: Future construction activities associated with the 2010 Community Plan would destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

Mitigation Measure M-CP-4: ***Paleontological Resources Monitoring Plan.*** If excavation in the plan area is expected to extend into previously undisturbed soil or rock, the SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction shall retain the services of a qualified paleontological consultant having expertise in California paleontology to design and implement a monitoring and mitigation program. The program shall include a description of when and where construction monitoring would be required; emergency discovery procedures; sampling and data recovery procedures; procedures for the preparation, identification, analysis, and curation of fossil specimens and data recovered; preconstruction coordination procedures; and procedures for reporting the results of the monitoring program. If potentially important paleontological resources (fossilized invertebrate, vertebrate, plant, or micro-fossil) are encountered

during excavation, work shall cease within 25 feet of the feature, the ERO shall be notified, and the paleontologist shall identify and evaluate the significance of the potential resource, documenting the findings in an advisory memorandum to the ERO. If it is determined that avoidance of effect to a significant paleontological resource is not feasible, the paleontologist shall prepare an excavation plan that may include curation of the paleontological resource in a permanent retrieval paleontological research collections facility such as the University of California Museum of Paleontology or California Academy of Sciences. The MEA division of the Planning Department shall receive two copies of a final paleontological excavation and recovery report.

The paleontologist's work shall be conducted in accordance with this measure and at the direction of the ERO. Plans and reports prepared by the paleontologist shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment, and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Paleontological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction for a maximum of four weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of construction could be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce to a less-than-significant level potential effects on a significant paleontological resource as previously defined.

Conclusion: Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-4 would ensure the appropriate treatment of paleontological resources that may be encountered during construction, and would reduce impacts of the 2010 Community Plan to paleontological resources to a less-than-significant level.

5. **Impact CP-5**: Future construction activities associated with the 2010 Community Plan would substantially disturb human remains.

Mitigation Measures M-CP-5: ***Treatment of Human Remains.*** The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and federal laws. This shall include immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the Coroner's determination that the human remains are Native American

remains, notification of the NAHC who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (Public Resource Code Section 5097.98). The SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction shall direct the archaeological consultant, in coordination with the MLD, to make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of, with appropriate dignity, human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(d)). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects.

Conclusion: Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-5 would ensure the appropriate treatment of human remains that may be encountered during construction, and would reduce potential adverse impacts to human remains to a less-than-significant level.

6. **Impact C-CP**: The 2010 Community Plan, in combination with other foreseeable development, would result in potentially significant cumulative impacts to cultural and paleontological resources.

Mitigation Measures M-CP-3: ***Accidental Discovery of Archaeological Resources*****; M-CP-4:** ***Paleontological Resources Monitoring Plan*** **and M-CP-5:** ***Treatment of Human Remains.*** (See descriptions above).

Conclusion: Implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CP-3, M-CP-4, and M-CP-5 would ensure the appropriate treatment of cultural and paleontological resources that may be encountered during the implementation of the 2010 Community Plan, in combination with other foreseeable development, and would reduce potential effects of cumulative impacts to cultural and paleontological resources.

B. Transportation and Circulation

1. **Impact TR-1**: The 2010 Community Plan would cause the level of service (LOS) at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection to deteriorate to unacceptable levels during the AM and PM peak hours.

Note that analysis of this impact was broken down in the EIR into the project components: the infill development, the addition of the transportation improvements, and the open space. The EIR found that the infill development had the potential to cause a significant impact, but this impact could be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of mitigation, as discussed below. The EIR also found, however, that the addition of the transportation improvements made this impact significant and unavoidable, for the reasons set forth in Section IV.A.1, Impact TR-1B, below.

Impact TR-1A: The infill development would cause the LOS at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection to degrade to unacceptable levels.

Mitigation Measure M-TR-1A: ***Signal Timing Modifications at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street Intersection without Transportation Improvements***. SFMTA shall monitor intersection operations at this location as the plan area builds out. Once the intersection LOS deteriorates to LOS E, SFMTA shall optimize the signal and increase the cycle length from 80 to 90 seconds. This signal timing modification would improve the intersection operations to acceptable conditions (LOS D) during both the weekday AM and PM peak hours under Existing plus Infill Development Conditions, and would therefore reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. No secondary impacts would occur as a result of this increase in cycle length, because this intersection is not coordinated with an adjacent signalized intersection.

Conclusion: Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR1A will ensure that the infill development does not cause the LOS at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection to degrade to unacceptable levels, therefore bringing this impact to a less-than-significant level.

2. **Impact TR-2:** The 2010 Community Plan would cause the LOS at the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection to deteriorate from acceptable levels to unacceptable levels during the AM peak hour.

   Impact TR-2A: The infill development plus transportation improvements or transportation improvement variants would cause the LOS at the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection to deteriorate to unacceptable levels during the AM peak hour.

   Mitigation Measure M-TR-2A: ***Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps Intersection Signal Timing Modifications.*** SFMTA shall monitor intersection operations at this location as the potential infill development builds out and transportation improvements occur. Once intersection LOS deteriorates to LOS E, SFMTA shall increase the cycle length to 90 seconds. This signal timing modification would improve the intersection operations to acceptable conditions (LOS D) during the weekday AM

peak hour. No secondary impacts would occur as a result of this increase in cycle length, because this intersection is not coordinated with an adjacent signalized intersection.

Conclusion: Implementation of M-TR-2A would reduce the traffic impacts at the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps Intersection to a less-than-significant level.

3. **Impact TR-12**: Implementation of the 2010 Community Plan could result in construction activities that interfere with local circulation and access over extended periods of time.

   Impact TR-12A: A simultaneous construction of two or more major components (bus loop, roundabout, or widening of northbound approach of Diamond Street) of the transportation improvements or transportation improvement variants would interfere with local circulation and access as a result of construction activities over extended periods of time.

   Mitigation Measure M-TR- 12A: ***Construction Transportation Management Plan.*** In the event that two or more major proposed transportation improvements (specifically the bus loop, roundabout, or widening of the northbound approach of Diamond Street) are constructed simultaneously, SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction shall develop and implement a Construction Transportation Management Plan (TMP) to anticipate and minimize impacts of potentially overlapping construction activities. The TMP would coordinate construction activities to minimize disruptions and ensure that overall circulation is maintained to the extent possible, with particular focus on ensuring pedestrian, transit and bicycle connectivity. The TMP would supplement and expand, rather than modify or supersede, any existing regulations and requirements. The TMP shall be submitted to SFMTA Traffic Engineering Division, the Department of Public Works (DPW) and presented as part of review by the Transportation Advisory Staff Committee.

   Conclusion: Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-12A would minimize the impacts of overlapping construction, reducing this impact to a less-than-significant level.

4. **Impact – C-TR-14**: The proposed project in combination with other foreseeable projects would cause the LOS to deteriorate to unacceptable levels at the Monterey

   Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps during the AM peak hour.

   Impact C-TR-14A: The infill development plus transportation improvements or transportation improvement variants in combination with other foreseeable projects would cause the LOS to deteriorate to unacceptable levels at the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps during the AM peak hour.

Mitigation Measure M-TR-2A: ***Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps Intersection Signal Timing Modifications.*** (See description above)

Conclusion: Implementation of M-TR-2A would reduce the traffic impacts at the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps Intersection to a less-than-significant level.

C. **Noise and Vibration**

1. **Impact NO-4**: Operation of the proposed project would expose residents of the BART parking lot infill development to excessive groundborne vibration.

Mitigation Measure M-NO-4: ***BART Infill Site Vibration Assessment.*** Prior to the submittal of a building permit application for the infill site, BART or BART's developer shall obtain a qualified vibration consultant to complete a site-specific vibration assessment. The vibration assessment shall measure the vibration levels at the existing BART parking lot within 200 feet of the underground BART alignment. If vibration levels exceed the FTA 72 VdB criteria for frequent vibration events impacting a residential use (i.e., more than 70 vibration events from the same source per day, which is typical of most rail rapid transit vibration sources), the vibration assessment shall recommend measures to reduce vibration levels to 72 VdB or less. Examples of such measures that have been very successfully used, separately or in combination, to avoid vibration impacts to other residential projects located near rail transit vibration sources include:

- Building Foundation Mats – the use of increased mass in the foundation of the building to increase the effective vibration reduction that occurs at the boundary between the soil and the building foundation structure.

- Vibration Isolation – after provision of a break or gap in the structure between the first floor concrete slab and the top of the basement walls/columns, isolation would be achieved by placing rubber pads between the top of the basement walls/columns and the first floor structure.

Recommended vibration reduction measures provided by the site-specific assessment shall be incorporated into the design and construction of the proposed infill development project and their effectiveness shall be verified by vibration monitoring measurements after construction. BART or BART's developer shall provide the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) documentation demonstrating compliance with this measure for review and approval once construction has been completed, but prior to occupancy of the building(s).

Conclusion: Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-4 would ensure the appropriate treatment of vibration that may be encountered during operation of the proposed project, and would reduce impacts of groundborne vibration on the residents of the BART parking lot infill development to a less-than-significant level.

D. Biological Resources

1. **Impact BY-1**: Implementation of the Proposed Project would potentially result in the destruction or disturbance of the nesting habitat for migratory bird species.

   Mitigation Measure M-BI-1: ***Pre-Construction Nesting Bird Survey.*** Any construction pursuant to the draft Community Plan, including development of the infill sites, transportation improvements, and creek daylighting, shall avoid the February 1 through August 31 bird nesting period to the extent feasible. If it is not feasible to avoid the nesting period, a survey for nesting birds shall be conducted by a qualified wildlife biologist no earlier than 14 days prior to the construction. The area surveyed shall include all clearing/construction areas, as well as areas within 150 feet of the boundaries of these areas, or as otherwise determined by the biologist. In the event that an active nest is discovered, clearing/construction shall be postponed within 1 feet of the nest until a wildlife biologist has determined the nesting avian species and consulted on further measures with the California Department of Fish and Game. If the avian species present is protected under the MBTA, further mitigation could entail postponement of clearing or construction activities within 150 feet of the active nest until the young have fledged (left the nest), the nest is vacated, and there is no evidence of second nesting attempts. If the avian species is not protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), no further action is required and construction activities may proceed.

Conclusion: Mitigation Measure M-BI-1 would reduce potential impacts to nesting birds to a less-than-significant level.

E. Hydrology and Water Quality

1. **Impact HY-1**: The daylighting of Islais Creek under the Community Plan would potentially result in substantial creek bed and bank erosion impacts.

   Mitigation Measure M-HY-1: *Daylighted Streambed and Bank Stabilization.* Prior to daylighting Islais Creek, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission shall prepare a Hydraulics and Hydrology Study to determine the expected flow rates for the daylighted creek, for up to the 200-year storm event. The daylighted portion shall be designed by a qualified engineer, erosion control specialist, or stream restoration specialist to effectively convey the highest expected flow-through rate without causing or contributing to bed or bank erosion. This can be accomplished by off-site detention of peak flows, by-passing peak flow rates in excess of stabile velocity, channel configuration (e.g., longitudinal slope, side slopes, check dams, and others) to reduce flow rates, and bed and bank stabilizing structures. It is recommended that bio-engineering processes be maximized and that hard engineering structures, if used, be vegetated (e.g., vegetated gabion, riprap, GEOWEB™, or geogrid structures) to comply with other design principles.

   Conclusion: Implementation of M-HY-1 would reduce the creek daylighting impacts to a less-than-significant level.

F. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

1. **Impact HZ-1**: Construction under the 2010 Community Plan would potentially expose construction workers to hazardous building materials such as PCB-containing electrical equipment or fluorescent lights if not properly disposed.

   Mitigation Measure M-HZ-1: *Hazardous Building Materials.* The City shall condition future development approvals to require that the subsequent project sponsors ensure that any equipment containing PCBs or Di-Ethylhexyl Phthalate (DEPH), such as fluorescent light ballasts, are removed and properly disposed of according to applicable federal, State, and local laws prior to the start of demolition, and that any fluorescent light tubes, which could contain mercury, are similarly removed and properly disposed of. Any other

hazardous materials identified, either before or during construction, shall be abated according to applicable federal, State, and local laws.

Conclusion: Implementation of M-HZ-1 would reduce the risk of construction workers to be exposed to hazardous building materials to a less-than-significant level.

IV. Significant Impacts that Cannot be Avoided or Reduced to a Less Than Significant Level

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

A. Transportation and Circulation

1. **Impact – TR-1**: The 2010 Community Plan would cause the level of service (LOS) at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection to deteriorate to unacceptable levels during the AM and PM peak hours.

   Implementation of the 2010 Community Plan would not, in itself, result in the construction of new development, but would establish a policy framework to encourage new residential, retail and commercial development, transportation/street improvements, and open space improvements. Traffic associated with infill development would cause the LOS at the intersection of Bosworth Street/Diamond Street to deteriorate to unacceptable levels during the AM and PM peak hours. As explained above, implementation of M-TR-1A would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. However, of addition of the proposed transportation improvements to the infill development, namely the pedestrian scramble phase, the LOS also would deteriorate to unacceptable levels. Implementation of the transportation improvement variants, specifically the widening of Diamond Street together with the infill development, would result in acceptable operating conditions at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection.

   Impact TR-1B: The addition of the proposed pedestrian scramble phase to the infill development would cause the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection LOS to deteriorate to unacceptable levels.

Mitigation Measure M-TR-1B: ***Bosworth Street/Diamond Street Intersection Signal Timing Modifications with Transportation Improvements.*** SFMTA shall monitor intersection operations at this location as the plan area builds out and transportation improvements occur. Once the intersection LOS deteriorates to LOS E, if feasible, SFMTA shall re-optimize the signal and increase the cycle length to 140 seconds (compared to 90 seconds as recommended by M-TR-1A if the transportation improvements are not implemented).

Conclusion: Implementation of Mitigation Measures M-TR-1B would reduce the impact of the infill development to a less-than-significant level, but the impact of the proposed transportation improvements, specifically the pedestrian scramble phase, would remain significant and unavoidable. A secondary effect of mitigation M-TR-1B, although less than significant, would be that lengthening the cycle would cause pedestrians and vehicles to wait longer before being able to cross and access the intersection. Given the undesirable consequences of a signal cycle length increase of this magnitude, SFMTA has expressed strong reservations about the feasibility of this mitigation measure. For this reason, implementation of this mitigation measure is considered uncertain.

2. **Impact C-TR-13**: The 2010 Community Plan in combination with other foreseeable projects would cause the LOS at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection to deteriorate to unacceptable levels during the AM and PM peak hours.

   Impact C-TR-13A: The infill development in combination with other foreseeable projects would cause the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection to degrade to unacceptable levels during the PM peak hour and significantly contribute to unacceptable operating conditions in the AM peak hour.

   Mitigation Measure M-TR-1A: ***Signal Timing Modifications at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street Intersection without Transportation Improvements***. (See description above)

   Conclusion: Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce traffic at this intersection, but the degradation of the LOS would be a significative cumulative traffic impact. Therefore the proposed Project's cumulative contribution to the impact at the Bosworth Street/ Diamond Street would be significant and unavoidable.

   Impact C-TR-13B: The addition of the proposed transportation improvements to the infill development, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would cause the

intersection level of service at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection to deteriorate to unacceptable levels during the PM peak hour and significantly contribute to unacceptable operating conditions in the AM peak hour.

Mitigation Measure M-C-TR-13B: ***Intersection #10 Signal Timing Modifications***. MTA shall monitor intersection operations at this location as the plan area infill development and transportation improvements occur. Once the transportation improvements are complete and/or the intersection LOS deteriorates to LOS E, if feasible, SFMTA shall re-optimize the signal and increase the cycle length to 150 seconds.

Conclusion: This measure would be expected to improve traffic operations during both the weekday AM and PM peak hours under 2030 Cumulative plus Project Conditions, but the intersection would likely continue to operate at unacceptable conditions, and therefore the project's impact at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection during both AM and PM weekday peak hours would remain significant and unavoidable. A secondary effect of this mitigation, although less than significant, would be that lengthening the cycle would cause pedestrians and vehicles to wait longer before being able to cross and access the intersection. Given the undesirable consequences of a signal cycle length increase of this magnitude, SFMTA has expressed strong reservations about the feasibility of this mitigation measure. For this reason, implementation of this mitigation measure is considered uncertain.

B. Air Quality

1. **Impact AQ-3**: Equipment used for construction activities associated with the 2010 Community Plan would result in short-term emission increases of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors that exceed the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria.

   Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3A: ***Construction Vehicle Emissions Minimization***. To reduce the potential health risk resulting from project construction activities, the project sponsor shall include in contract specifications a requirement for the following measures:

- Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to two minutes;

- The project shall develop a construction plan demonstrating that the off-road equipment (more than 50 horsepower) to be used in the construction project (i.e., owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles) would achieve a project wide fleet-average 20 percent NOX reduction and 45 percent PM reduction compared to the most recent ARB fleet average (as specified in California Code of Regulations Article 4.8, Section 2449 General Requirements for In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets). Acceptable options for reducing emissions include the use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, add-on devices such as particulate filters, and/or other options as such become available;
- All construction equipment, diesel trucks, and generators shall be equipped with Best Available Control Technology for emission reductions of NOx and PM;
- Use of Interim Tier 4 or equivalent equipment for all uses where such equipment is available;
- Use of Tier 3 equipment with Best Available Control Technology (BACT) or alternative fuel vehicles for applications where Tier 4 Interim engines are not available; and
- Prohibition of diesel generators for construction purposes where feasible alternative sources of power are available.

M-AQ-3B: ***Construction Phasing***. Prior to construction of development at the infill sites, any transportation improvements, or any open space improvements, the project sponsor shall coordinate with the Planning Department to determine: (1) whether any concurrent construction activities identified in the 2010 Community Plan is occurring, (2) whether

concurrent construction activities could exceed the BAAQMD's criteria air pollutant thresholds, and (3) whether project phasing could reduce criteria air pollutant to below BAAQMD's significance thresholds. The Planning Department may require additional criteria air pollutant analysis that includes implementation of the mitigation measures described in M-AQ-3A or more refined construction details.

Conclusion: Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3A and M-AQ-3B, would reduce construction-related emissions; however, even with these measures, construction-related emissions would still have the potential to exceed the 2010 BAAQMD significance thresholds. It may be possible to phase construction of each of the individual components of the 2010 Community Plan to avoid overlapping construction schedules. However, since specific timing has not been identified for the various components, it is unknown whether phasing is feasible. Therefore, construction impacts for ROG and NOx are considered significant and unavoidable.

2. **Impact AQ-6**: Construction equipment associated with the proposed development under the 2010 Community Plan would emit PM2.5 and other TACs that exceed the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria.

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3A: ***Construction Vehicle Emissions Minimization***. (See description above).

Conclusion: Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3A would reduce exposure to PM2.5 and TACs. However, even with this mitigation measure, construction-related health risks would have the potential to exceed the BAAQMD's significance thresholds, and therefore this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

3. **Impact AQ-7**: Motor vehicles and stationary sources operating in and near the 2010 Community Plan area emit PM2.5 and other TACs. Given that project implementation would introduce new residential sensitive receptors in locations exposed to high levels of

PM2.5 and other TACs, resultant health risks would exceed the 1999 and the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria.

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7: ***Health Risk Review for Future Sensitive Receptors.*** To reduce the potential health risk to new sensitive receptors within the plan area, new residential or open space development proposed under the 2010 Community Plan that is within 500 feet of Bosworth Street, San Jose Avenue, or I-280 shall, as part of its CEQA review, include an analysis of toxic air contaminants, including PM2.5, diesel particulate matter (DPM), and total organic gases (TOGs), and shall, if warranted based on the results, develop a plan to minimize exposure of future sensitive receptors to TACs (which includes PM2.5, DPM, and TOGs). The analysis shall employ either site-specific modeling of TAC concentrations or BAAQMD methodology to determine whether the average annual concentration of PM2.5 from the roadway sources within 500 feet would exceed the threshold, or action level of 0.3 μg/m3, or if the TAC exposure of PM2.5, DPM, and TOGs would result in an increased cancer risk greater than 10 in a million or a hazard index greater than 1.0.

The health risk analysis shall be submitted to the Planning Department and shall identify measures to reduce exposure of new sensitive receptors in the plan area. These measures may include redesigning the project site plan to provide greater separation between the sensitive receptors and pollutant sources, installation of a filtered air supply system for residential uses, or placement of air intakes for the ventilation system at greater horizontal and/or vertical distances from pollutant sources.

Conclusion: Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7 would reduce exposure of residents to TACs from mobile sources; however, even with implementation of M-AQ-7, it may not be possible to reduce exposure at the sites to levels below the BAAQMD's thresholds of significance for cancer risks. Therefore, this would be a significant and unavoidable impact of the project.

4. **Impact C-AQ-1**: Construction activity associated with the proposed development under the 2010 Community Plan and with other development in the area would generate criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors that would exceed the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria.

   Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3A: *Construction Vehicle Emissions Minimization*. (See description above).

   Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3B: *Construction Phasing.* (See description above).

   Conclusion: Implementation of Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3A and M-AQ-3B would reduce emissions from construction of all projects, and would phase the project components; however, even with the implementation of these mitigation measures, construction-related emissions resulting from the 2010 Community Plan would still have the effect to exceed the BAAQMD's thresholds of significance. The BAAQMD considers all projects that result in a significant criteria air pollutant impact to also result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to regional criteria air pollutants. Therefore, construction activities under the 2010 Community Plan would contribute to a significant cumulative impact with respect to criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors.

5. **Impact C-AQ-2**: Construction activities associated with the proposed development under the 2010 Community Plan and with other development in the area would emit PM2.5 and other TACs. Although construction emissions would be temporary for each separate project, given the close proximity of sensitive receptors in the 2010 Community Plan area to the project and other development sites, resultant cumulative health risks would be significant.

   Mitigation Measure_M-AQ-3A: *Construction Vehicle Emissions Minimization*. (See description above).

   Conclusion: Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3A would reduce construction-related emissions, which would also reduce exposure of nearby residents to construction-related health risks. However, even with implementation of this mitigation measure construction related health risks would still have the potential to exceed

BAAQMD's significance thresholds. Therefore, the proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable cumulative TAC impacts.

V. Neither Recirculation Nor a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR Is Required

The Planning Commission recognizes that the Final EIR incorporates information obtained and produced after the Draft EIR was completed, and that it contains additions, clarifications, and modifications, including an analysis of the Plan Refinements. The Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the Final EIR and all of this information. In certifying the Final EIR, the Planning Commission finds that the Final EIR does not add significant new information to the Draft EIR that would require recirculation of the EIR under CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. The new information added to the Draft EIR does not involve a new significant environmental impact, a substantial increase in the severity of a significant environmental impact, or a feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed that would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the Project and that the Project Sponsor declines to adopt. No information indicates that the Draft EIR was inadequate or conclusory.
The Project as it now stands falls within the range of impacts and the range of alternatives studied in the Draft EIR.

The Planning Commission finds that, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, (1) modifications incorporated into the 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; (2) no substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the Project 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 (3) no new information of substantial importance to the Project has become available that would indicate (a) the Project will have significant effect not discussed in the Final EIR, (b) significant environmental effects will be substantially more severe; (c) mitigation measures or alternatives found not feasible that would reduce one or more significant effects have become feasible; or (d) mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those in the Final EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment.

VI. Evaluation of Project Alternatives

This section describes the Project as well as the Project Alternatives and the reasons for rejecting the Alternatives. This Section also outlines the Project's purposes and provides a context for understanding the reasons for selecting or rejecting alternatives, and describes the Project alternative components analyzed in the Final EIR.

CEQA mandates that an EIR evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the Project or the Project location that generally reduce or avoid potentially significant impacts of the Project. CEQA requires that every EIR evaluate a No Project alternative. 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 Project.

A. Reasons for Selection of the Project

As discussed above in Section I, the Project is based on the Project Description analyzed in the Final EIR. In addition to the proposed Project, the Final EIR analyzed three Alternatives:

- Alternative A: No Project Alternative; and
- Alternative B: Reduced Development (High Residential / Low Retail Development); and
- Alternative C: Reduced Development (Hybrid Mix).

Comparison of the Proposed Project to Reduced Project Alternatives B and C

	Proposed Project	Alternative B - Reduced Development - High Residential/Low Retail Development	Alternative C - Reduced Development - Hybrid Mix
Description	**Northwest Corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street**	**Northwest Corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street**	**Northwest Corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street**
	Up to 47 residential units	Up to 10 residential units	Up to 15 residential units
	Up to 8,582 gsf ground-floor commercial	Up to 1,000 gsf ground-floor commercial	No ground-floor commercial
	Up to 26 private parking spaces	Up to 11 private parking spaces	Up to 15 private parking spaces
	BART Parking Lot	**BART Parking Lot**	**BART Parking Lot**
	Up to 90 residential units	Up to 31 residential units	19 residential units
	0 to 14,913 gsf commercial uses	Up to 2,000 gsf commercial uses	Up to 5,000 gsf commercial uses
	Up to 123 private parking spaces	Up to 33 private parking spaces	Up to 22 private parking spaces
	Other Development	**Other Development**	**Other Development**
	13 residential units	13 residential units	13 residential units
	5,250 gsf ground-floor commercial	5,250 gsf ground-floor commercial	5,250 gsf ground-floor commercial
	Proposed Transportation Improvements	**Proposed Transportation Improvements**	**Proposed Transportation Improvements**
	Traffic Calming	Traffic Calming	Traffic Calming
	Bicycle Networks	Bicycle Networks	Bicycle Networks
	Pedestrian Access	Pedestrian Access	Pedestrian Access
	Transit Improvements	Transit Improvements	Transit Improvements

These Alternatives are discussed in greater detail below, and in Chapter V of the EIR.

In approving the Project, the Planning Commission has carefully considered the attributes and the environmental effects of the Project and the Alternatives discussed in the Final EIR. This consideration, along with reports from City staff and public testimony, has resulted in the Project.

The Project is selected because it will promote the greatest achievement of all of the following objectives, which would not be achieved to the same degree by the No Project Alternative or either of the Reduced Development Alternatives. The Project achieves the objectives set forth in the Final EIR as follows:

1. **Protect and strengthen the character of Glen Park's vibrant walkable neighborhood commercial district.**

The vibrancy, safety of and character of downtown Glen Park depends on a certain intensity and concentration of activity. The Plan supports the addition of appropriately scaled and designed housing and small-scale retail that reinforces the established neighborhood pattern. While no development projects are proposed at this time, the Project would allow the consideration of future development within the Project Area to optimize opportunities for housing and commercial activity in this highly transit-oriented area. Limited sites for infill development exist in the area. Given their central commercial district location and proximity to major local and regional transit including the Glen Park BART Station and Muni bus and light rail lines, new mixed use development here would benefit the area by boosting economic vitality, sustaining transit service and improving public safety by contributing to a more active street environment.

2. **Balance the use of streets for pedestrians, bicycles, transit, and automobiles in a way that satisfies circulation and enhances the livability of Glen Park.**

Glen Park is located at the center of a major transportation interchange where regional freeway traffic, local traffic, public transit and high volumes of pedestrians all converge. Over 9,000 transit riders use the Glen Park BART station each weekday with over half (56%) arriving by walking. Conflicts between vehicle traffic, pedestrians and public transit threaten the area's livability and important transportation function. The Project emphasizes movement by transit, biking and walking and contains recommendations for street improvements benefitting these modes and fulfilling the City's Transit First Policy.

3. **Minimize the negative impacts of past large-scale infrastructure projects on the community.**

The Project provides strategies to resolve challenges posed by past major infrastructure project in Glen Park, primarily vehicle related infrastructure such as the I-280 freeway and San Jose Avenue. The Project proposes a series of interventions to reduce conflicts posed by these structures and related vehicle traffic. These include restoring the primacy of pedestrian and transit movement in the area through related transportation projects and determining the feasibility of redesigning San Jose Avenue to better serve the surrounding neighborhoods.

These objectives would not be achieved to the same degree by the No Project Alternative or either of the Reduced Development Alternatives, as explained below.

B. Alternatives Rejected and Reasons for Rejection

The Planning Commission rejects the Alternatives set forth in the Final EIR and listed below because the Planning Commission finds that there is substantial evidence, including evidence of economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations described in this Section, in addition to those described in Section VII below under CEQA Guidelines 15091(a)(3), that make infeasible such Alternatives.

1. **Alternative A: No Project**

DESCRIPTION

The No Project Alternative would entail no 2010 Community Plan for the Glen Park community, including no new guiding policies proposals for the community character. Specifically, the No

Project Alternative would entail no specific changes to existing land use policies or Planning Code amendments (no new Glen Park Neighborhood Commercial Transit [NCT] District or rezoning of parcels in the plan area); no policies for infill development on the northwest corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street or at the BART parking lot; and no transportation and open space improvements. For the purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that the existing land use policies, zoning, height and bulk district, as well as structures in the plan area would not change.

This alternative would not preclude future proposals for development at the two infill sites or elsewhere within the plan area, or proposals for other transportation and open space improvements.

IMPACTS

If the No Project Alternative were implemented, none of the environmental impacts associated with the 2010 Community Plan would occur. The 2010 Community Plan's significant and unavoidable impact associated with transportation would not occur. In addition, the less-than-significant (with mitigation) potential impacts associated with noise and vibration, and cultural and paleontological resources would not occur. The project's less-than-significant aesthetic, land use, and greenhouse gas emissions impacts would also not occur under this alternative.

The No Project Alternative would not avoid the significant air quality impacts since new residential uses could be constructed within the plan area near Bosworth Street, San Jose Avenue, and I-280, similar to the proposed project. These new residential uses could be exposed to substantial levels of toxic air contaminants and particulate matter associated with the identified roadways. However, the amount of residential uses that could be constructed within this area would likely be less than under the 2010 Community Plan. In addition, any construction activities that would occur within the plan area under the No Project Alternative could expose existing sensitive uses to significant health risks and significant cumulative health risks from construction emissions. However, new residential uses developed within the plan area under the No Project Alternative would not be exposed to significant cumulative health risks in excess of Bay Area Air Quality Management District cumulative project thresholds, for the same reasons described for the proposed project.

In addition, the significant effects in the areas of biological resources, hydrology and water quality, and hazards and hazardous materials associated with the 2003 Community Plan Summary described in the Initial Study would not occur with this alternative; no mitigation measures would be required. Other less-than-significant effects would not occur, including: population and housing; wind and shadow; recreation; utilities and service systems; public services; geology and soils; mineral and energy resources; and agricultural resources.

The No Project Alternative would not include any of the transportation improvements that are part of the proposed project. As a result, two of the study intersections would experience higher vehicle delay under the No Project Alternative as compared with the proposed project: Intersection #3 Chenery Street/Natick Street, and Intersection #5 Wilder Street/Carrie Street. Although the vehicle delay at these intersections would be higher, the overall intersection level of service would remain at acceptable levels of LOS. Additionally, conditions for nonmotorized transportation (i.e., pedestrians, bicyclists) in the plan area under the No Project Alternative would be worse than with the proposed project, due to the fact that many of the proposed project's transportation improvements would slow vehicular traffic and reduce potential vehicle conflicts with pedestrians and bicyclists throughout the plan area.

Because residential infill under the No Project Alternative would be less than under the proposed Project, the No Project Alternative would not meet the Project goals to strengthen the character of Glen Park's vibrant walkable neighborhood commercial district. Additionally, because under the No Project Alternative conditions for non-motorized transportation would worsen, this alternative appears not to meet the proposed Project's goals balance the use of streets for pedestrians, bicycles, transit, and automobiles in a way that satisfies circulation and enhances the livability of Glen Park, and to minimize the impact of past large-scale infrastructure projects on the community.

2. **Alternative B: Reduced Development - High Residential/Low Retail Development**

DESCRIPTION

Alternative B proposes a reduced development scenario, with fewer residential units and commercial space at both the Diamond Street and Bosworth Street infill site and the BART parking lot infill site (fewer than the proposed project). All of the other aspects of the proposed project, such as the land use and zoning controls (including the Glen Park NCT District and the height increases), and transportation and open space improvements would be the same under the Reduced Development Alternative.

The Reduced Development Alternative was crafted to reduce any potential impacts associated with transportation and circulation (vehicle trip generation) from the high development potential

at both of the infill sites. It was also designed to provide the opportunity for mixed-use

development near the Glen Park BART Station. The development at the infill sites under the Reduced Development Alternative would be reduced to 54 residential units compared to 150 under the proposed project. In addition, the total commercial space would be limited to 3,000 gsf compared to approximately 28,745 gsf proposed under the 2010 Community Plan.

IMPACTS

This alternative would have environmental effects similar to those of the proposed project, except that it would result in reduced development intensity at the infill sites. Other development controls would be implemented as proposed under the 2010 Community Plan, including the modification to the height and bulk district. Transportation improvements would also be implemented as proposed under the 2010 Community Plan. Similar to the 2010 Community Plan and individual plan components, Alterative B would not conflict with adopted plans, policies, and regulations. The maximum development potential in the plan area, excluding development potential associated with the two infill sites, would be 13 residential units. The development at the infill sites would be reduced compared to potential development under the 2010 Community Plan. For the infill sites there would be potential for 54 residential units compared to 150 proposed under the project. In addition, the total commercial space would be limited to 3,000 gsf compared to approximately 28,745 gsf proposed under the 2010 Community Plan. Overall, the development at the infill sites anticipated in the plan area under Alternative B would be less than the 2010 Community Plan and would not have significant adverse impacts on the land use character of the plan area and vicinity.

Alternative B would result in a less intense use of the plan area than the proposed project. The residential component of Alternative B would consist of 54 residential units, as compared with 150 residential units under the proposed project – a reduction of approximately 64 percent. The retail component of Alternative B would consist of 3,000 gsf, as compared with 28,745 gsf of retail space under the proposed project – a reduction of approximately 89 percent. As such, fewer retail and residential trips would be generated, which would reduce the demand for vehicle parking, bicycle parking, pedestrian space, and on and off-street freight loading/unloading. The significant and unavoidable impacts identified for Intersection #10 Bosworth Street / Diamond Street (Existing Conditions and Cumulative Conditions – AM and PM Peak Hour), would likely not occur with Alternative B. In addition, the impacts identified for Intersection #16 Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection (Existing Conditions and Cumulative Conditions – AM Peak Hour), would also likely not occur with Alternative B. The project contributions to these affected intersections would be less than with the proposed project. Thus, Mitigation Measures M-TR-1A, M-TR-1B, and M-TR-2.2A would not be necessary.

Furthermore, transportation impacts from construction activities associated with the transportation improvements would include temporary changes to or restrictions on traffic lanes and grading and paving activities. As with the proposed project, the impacts of the transportation improvements would be less than significant unless the bus loop element were

constructed at the same time as the variant roundabout improvement, or widening of northbound approach of Diamond Street, also a variant improvement, in which case the transportation impact would be significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-12A would reduce construction impacts to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, Alternative B would result in less-than-significant transportation impacts.

Because under Alternative B there would be less intense use of the plan area than the proposed project, this alternative would result in less construction-related emissions over the entire construction period (since it likely would take a shorter time to build fewer residential units and less retail space), including emissions of PM2.5 associated with health risks. However, the level of construction activities on the most active days of construction would be comparable for this alternative and the proposed project. Thus, Alternative B would still have the potential to exceed the 2010 BAAQMD construction significance thresholds for daily emissions of criteria air pollutants and expose people to PM2.5 TACs, even with implementation of Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3A and M-AQ- 3B. Therefore, impacts under Alternative B during construction would be significant and unavoidable, similar to the proposed project. The proposed infill sites are within an area that exceeds the BAAQMD significance thresholds for TACs from mobile sources. Alternative B would allow for fewer residential units at the infill sites than the proposed project; however, the placement of residential units within this area would result in significant and unavoidable impacts with mitigation, similar to the proposed project. Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7 would reduce exposure of residents to TACs from mobile sources; however, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7, it may not be feasible to reduce exposure at the sites to below the 2010 BAAQMD significance thresholds for cancer risks.

Because residential infill under the Alternative B would be significantly less than under the proposed Project, the Alternative B appears to meet the Project goals (particularly the goals to strengthen the character of Glen Park's vibrant walkable neighborhood commercial district and support the development of mixed use infill projects) to a lesser degree than the proposed Project.

3. ALTERNATIVE C: REDUCED DEVELOPMENT- HYBRID MIX

DESCRIPTION

Like Alternative B, Alternative C proposes a reduced development scenario (different from Alternative B), with fewer residential units and commercial space at both the Diamond Street and Bosworth Street infill sites (fewer than the proposed project). All of the other aspects of the proposed project, such as the land use and zoning controls (including the Glen Park NCT District and the height increases), and transportation and open space improvements would be the same under Alternative C.

As with Alternative B, Alternative C was crafted to reduce any potential impacts associated with transportation and circulation (vehicle trip generation) from the high development potential at both of the infill sites. It was also designed to provide, the opportunity for mixed-use development near the Glen Park BART Station.

Under Alternative C, the development at the infill sites would be reduced to 47 residential units compared to 150 under the proposed project. In addition, the total commercial space would be limited to 5,000 gsf compared to approximately 28,750 gsf proposed under the 2010 Community Plan.

IMPACTS

This alternative would have characteristics and potential environmental effects similar to those of the propose project, as described in Chapter III, Environmental Setting and Impacts, of the EIR and the Initial Study, except with reduced development intensity at the infill sites.

Under Alternative C, there would be a less intense use of the plan area than the proposed Project. The residential component of Alternative C would consist of 47 residential units, as compared with 150 residential units under the proposed project – a reduction of approximately 69 percent. The retail component of Alternative C would consist of 5,000 gsf, as compared with 28,745 gsf of retail space under the proposed project – a reduction of approximately 83 percent. As such, fewer retail and residential trips would be generated, which would reduce the demand for vehicle parking, bicycle parking, pedestrian space, and on and off-street freight loading/unloading. The significant and unavoidable impacts identified for Intersection #10 Bosworth Street / Diamond Street (Existing Conditions and Cumulative Conditions – AM and PM Peak Hour) would likely be reduced to a less-than-significant level with Alternative C. In addition, the impacts identified for Intersection #16 Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection (Existing Conditions and Cumulative Conditions – AM Peak Hour), would also likely be reduced with Alternative C. The project contributions to these affected intersections would be less than with the proposed project, which would negate the use of the identified mitigation measures. The project contributions to these affected intersections would be less than with the proposed project.

As with Alternative B, however, Alternative C would still have the potential to exceed the 2010 BAAQMD significance thresholds for daily emissions of criteria air pollutants and expose people to PM2.5 TACs, even with implementation of Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3A and M-AQ-3B. Therefore, impacts under Alternative C during construction would be significant and unavoidable, similar to the proposed project. The proposed infill sites are within an area that exceeds the BAAQMD significance thresholds for TACs from mobile sources. Alternative C would allow for fewer residential units at the infill sites than the proposed project; however, the placement of residential units within this area would result in significant and unavoidable impacts with mitigation, similar to the proposed project. Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7 would reduce exposure of residents to TACs from mobile sources; however, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure M AQ-7, it may not be feasible to reduce exposure at the sites to below the 2010 BAAQMD significance thresholds for cancer risks.

Again, as with Alternative B, because residential development under the Alternative C would be significantly smaller than under the proposed Project, this alternative appears to meet the Project goals to a lesser degree than the proposed Project.

C. Environmentally Superior Alternative

As required by CEQA (Guidelines, Section 15126.6(e)(2)), the environmentally superior alternative must be identified from among the alternatives to the project. Based on the analysis in this chapter, the No Transportation Improvements Alternative is considered the environmentally superior alternative, because it would result in the least significant unavoidable impacts. However, it still does not eliminate all impacts to less-than-significant levels. This conclusion is based on a comparison of environmental effects only, and does not consider other factors such as compatibility with project objectives or economic feasibility. Those factors will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors during their consideration of the proposed Area Plan.

The potentially significant and unavoidable impacts identified under the proposed project in the EIR would result from the direct impacts associated with the addition of traffic generated by the new uses at the infill sites and the exposure of sensitive receptors (i.e. residential) to poor air quality.

The significant and unavoidable impacts identified under the proposed project associated with transportation and circulation would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels under Alternative B - Reduced Development - High Residential/Low Retail Development, and Alternative C - Reduced Development - Hybrid Mix. The significant and unavoidable impacts associated with air quality remain significant and unavoidable under both Alternative B - Reduced Development - High Residential/Low Retail Development, and Alternative C - Reduced Development - Hybrid Mix.

Under the No Project Alternative, the potential significant and unavoidable impact associated with air quality would not occur. Similarly, the 2010 Community Plan's less-than-significant (with mitigation) potential impact associated with noise and vibration would not occur. The project's less-than-significant aesthetic, land use, and greenhouse gas emissions impacts would

also not occur under this alternative. When a No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, CEQA requires an EIR to identify the environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

As such, Alternative B - Reduced Development - High Residential/Low Retail Development, and Alternative C - Reduced Development - Hybrid Mix have less environmental impacts than the proposed project. Alternative B and Alternative C are both environmentally superior compared to the proposed project.

As described in the 2010 Community Plan, housing, as well as commercial space, is a key contributing element to the vitality and character of Glen Park. Specifically, the 2010 Community Plan encourages mixed-uses, including residential and commercial uses on the BART parking lot infill site. Alternative B - Reduced Development - High Residential/Low Retail Development, would include up to 31 residential units and 2,000 gsf of commercial in the BART infill site, where as Alternative C - Reduced Development - Hybrid Mix, would include only up to 19 residential units and 5,000 gsf of commercial. Because Alternative B offers a higher number of residential units (than Alternative C) and still proposes commercial space, Alternative B best meets the project objectives of providing mixed-used development.

Based on this analysis, Alternative B - Reduced Development - High Residential/Low Retail Development would have the least environmental impacts and would best meet the project objectives, as set forth by the 2010 Community Plan. As a result, the environmentally superior alternative is Alternative B - Reduced Development - High Residential/Low Retail Development. Alternative B, however, appears to meet the project objectives to a lesser degree than the proposed Project, for the reasons set forth above.

VII. Statement of Overriding Considerations

Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081 and CEQA Guideline 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. The specific reasons for this finding, based on substantial evidence in the record, constitute the following Statement of Overriding Considerations.

On the basis of the above findings and the substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding, the Planning Commission specially finds, and therefore makes this Statement of Overriding Considerations. The Commission further finds that, as part of the process of obtaining project approval, all significant effects on the environment from implementation of the Project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible. The Planning Commission acknowledges that if any of the mitigation measures identified in **Exhibit 1** 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.

1. **The Glen Park Community Plan reinforces and supports the policy framework of the City's General Plan**. Review of applicable General Plan Objectives and Policies has determined the proposed action is, on balance, consistent with the General Plan. The proposed actions offer a compelling articulation and implementation of many of the concepts outlined in the General Plan, especially the Commerce and Industry, Recreation and Open Space, Transportation, Urban Design and Air Quality Elements. Below are key policies and objectives that support the proposed actions. The Project will implement and fulfill the policies and objectives of the General Project including, but not limited to, the following described below.

NOTE: General Plan Elements are in CAPITAL BOLD LETTERS

General Plan Objectives are in CAPITAL LETTERS

General Plan Policies are in italics font

COMMERCE & INDUSTRY ELEMENT

OBJECTIVE 2: MAINTAIN AND STRENGTHEN VIABLE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL AREAS EASILY ACCESSIBLE TO CITY RESIDENTS

This Objective is satisfied in that a major goal of the Project is to protect and strengthen the function and character of Glen Park's neighborhood commercial district. To support the district's vibrant mix of uses and strong transit-orientation, the Project creates a new zoning district - the Glen Park Neighborhood Commercial Transit District (Glen Park NCT). The Glen Park NCT District provides customized controls regarding parking, density and commercial uses. The Project encourages mixed use infill development that is sensitive to the neighborhood's scale and form. In addition, the Project improves pedestrian safety, transit movement and the public realm through a variety of proposed streetscape, transportation and open space projects.

RECREATION & OPEN SPACE ELEMENT

This Project recommends serving Glen Park's neighborhood commercial district with new and improved open spaces. The Project proposes a linear greenway connection to Glen Canyon Park, redesign of the underused BART station plazas, and streetscape improvements in the commercial core. These projects would increase active and passive recreational opportunities in this busy area.

OBJECTIVE 4: PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR RECREATION AND THE ENJOYMENT OF OPEN SPACE IN EVERY SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOOD

Policy 4.7 Provide open space to serve neighborhood commercial districts.

TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

The Project satisfies many Objectives and Policies of the Transportation Element. The Project establishes policies to balance transportation choices in the neighborhood and maintain the area's

role as a local and regional intermodal transit center. The Project seeks to reestablish a more balanced street environment by emphasizing pedestrian and transit movement in the area and implementing traffic calming measures on key streets. The Project will help reduce dependence on the private automobile by encouraging use of transit, bicycle, and walking to reach destinations and meet daily needs. The Project identifies various street improvements and transportation projects to be pursued by the City. In addition, the Project proposes elimination of minimum parking requirements within the neighborhood commercial district to allow an increment of car-free housing.

OBJECTIVE 1: MEET THE NEEDS OF ALL RESIDENTS AND VISITORS FOR SAFE, CONVENIENT AND INEXPENSIVE TRAVEL WITHIN SAN FRANCISCO AND BETWEEN THE CITY AND OTHER PARTS OF THE REGION WHILE MAINTAINING THE HIGH QUALITY LIVING ENVIRONMENT OF THE BAY AREA.

Policy 1.1 Involve citizens in planning and developing transportation facilities and services, and in further defining objectives and policies as they relate to district plans and specific projects.

The Project's proposals and policies were developed closely in collaboration with the Glen Park community through a series of meetings, public workshops, office hours and dialogues with individual community members from 2002-2011.

Policy 1.2 Ensure the safety and comfort of pedestrians throughout the city.

Policy 1.3 Give priority to public transit and other alternatives to the private automobile as the means of meeting San Francisco's transportation needs, particularly those of commuters.

The Project prioritizes pedestrian and transit movement within the Project Area and promotes related pedestrian safety and transit access improvements.

OBJECTIVE 2: USE THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM AS A MEANS FOR GUIDING DEVELOPMENT AND IMPROVING THE ENVIRONMENT.

OBJECTIVE 11: ESTABLISH PUBLIC TRANSIT AS THE PRIMARY MODE OF TRANSPORTATION IN SAN FRANCISCO AND AS A MEANS THROUGH WHICH TO GUIDE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPROVE REGIONAL MOBILITY AND AIR QUALITY.

Policy 11.3 Encourage development that efficiently coordinates land use with transit service, requiring that developers address transit concerns as well as mitigate traffic problems.

The Project creates a new Glen Park Neighborhood Commercial Transit Zoning District (Glen Park NCT) to recognize the proximity of the Glen Park BART Station and abundant Muni service (bus and light rail) to the commercial area. This zoning permits additional density in a transit-rich area and decouples parking from housing to support the creation of car-free housing.

Policy 14.3 Improve transit operation by implementing strategies that facilitate and prioritize transit vehicle movement and loading.

The Project includes policies supporting the implementation of transit service adjustments proposed under the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's Transit Effectiveness Project. The Project also includes recommendations to improve access to the J-Church Muni

platform, boarding and circulation around the BART station and the interface between Muni and BART.

OBJECTIVE 15: ENCOURAGE ALTERNATIVES TO THE AUTOMOBILE AND REDUCED TRAFFIC LEVELS ON RESIDENTIAL STREETS THAT SUFFER FROM EXCESSIVE TRAFFIC THROUGH THE MANAGEMENT OF TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS AND FACILITIES.

Policy 15.1 Discourage excessive automobile traffic on residential streets by incorporating traffic-calming treatments.

The Project suggests a variety of traffic calming measures to address cut-through traffic, speeding and pedestrian safety concerns. In addition, the Project proposes conducting analysis to determine the feasibility of converting the freeway-like portion of San Jose Avenue into an attractive boulevard that is better connected to surrounding neighborhoods with improved facilities for transit, pedestrians and bicycles.

OBJECTIVE 20: GIVE FIRST PRIORITY TO IMPROVING TRANSIT SERVICE THROUGHOUT THE CITY, PROVIDING A CONVENIENT AND EFFICIENT SYSTEM AS A PREFERABLE ALTERNATIVE TO AUTOMOBILE USE.

OBJECTIVE 23: IMPROVE THE CITY'S PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION SYSTEM TO PROVIDE FOR EFFICIENT, PLEASANT, AND SAFE MOVEMENT.

A major priority of the Project is to improve conditions for the high volumes of pedestrians in the Plan Area. The Project proposes improvements to a number of streets and intersections that would improve pedestrian safety and circulation.

Policy 23.6 Ensure convenient and safe pedestrian crossings by minimizing the distance pedestrians must walk to cross a street.

OBJECTIVE 27: ENSURE THAT BICYCLES CAN BE USED SAFELY AND CONVENIENTLY AS A PRIMARY MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION, AS WELL AS FOR RECREATIONAL PURPOSES.

The Project supports implementation of bicycle network improvements in the area as identified in the San Francisco Bicycle Plan.

URBAN DESIGN ELEMENT

Policy1.6 Make centers of activity more prominent through design of street features and by other means.

Policy 2.6 Respect the character of older development nearby in the design on new buildings.

The Project supports the mix of activities in Glen Park's neighborhood commercial area and near the Glen Park BART station. The Project reinforces the character of this pedestrian and transit-oriented mixed use center through streetscape improvements, a new transit-oriented zoning district (Glen Park NCT), and a height reduction in the commercial district's interior from 40-X to 30-X reflecting the existing building scale. The Project also contains policies that encourage review of new development for compatibility with the neighborhood's form and character.

AIR QUALITY ELEMENT

OBJECTIVE 2: REDUCE MOBILE SOURCES OF AIR POLLUTION THROUGH IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT OF THE GENERAL PLAN

OBJECTIVE 3: DECREASE THE AIR QUALITY IMPACTS OF DEVELOPMENT BY COORDINATION OF LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION DECISIONS

Policy 3.2 Encourage mixed land use development near transit lines and provide retail and other types of service oriented uses within walking distance to minimize automobile dependent development.

Policy 3.6 Link land use decision making policies to the availability of transit and consider the impacts of these policies on the local and regional transportation system.

These Objectives and Policies are satisfied in that the Project reinforces the compact mixed use development form surrounding the Glen Park BART Station. The Project supports existing and future commercial activity and allows increased density within Glen Park's walkable and transit-oriented commercial core. The concentration of uses supported by the Project creates a more sustainable transportation and land use pattern that promotes public transit and contributes to a reduction in emissions linked to private vehicle travel.

2. **The Project formalizes a community vision for Glen Park in official City policy**. Since 2002, the Planning Department has worked extensively with the Glen Park community to craft a shared vision for the Project Area as contained in the Glen Park Community Plan. The Project has broad community support from neighborhood constituents who desire to see the Plan implemented. The Project would establish the Glen Park Community Plan as an individual Area Plan within the City's General Plan. The General Plan serves as a basis for decisions affecting the allocation of public resources and provides long-term guidance regarding public infrastructure improvements and private development within San Francisco. In addition, the Plan creates customized land use controls tailored to the neighborhood's needs that can be updated over time to suit unique neighborhood conditions.

3. **The Project promotes the City's Transit-First policy by restoring a more balanced street environment that prioritizes public transit, walking and bicycling over private vehicle movement**. Glen Park sits at the center of a major transportation interchange. Regional freeway traffic, local traffic, public transit and high volumes of pedestrians all converge here. The location of the Glen Park BART Station, Muni bus and light rail stops, and the nearby neighborhood commercial district make downtown Glen Park a major intermodal transit center for the city and the region. Over 9,000 transit riders use the Glen Park BART station area each day with over half (56%) arriving by walking. Conflicts between vehicle traffic, pedestrians and public transit threaten the area's important transportation function. The Project emphasizes movement by transit, biking and walking and contains a series of recommendations for street improvements benefitting these modes (see #4, below).

4. **Implementation of the Project will improve quality of life in Glen Park through a variety of transportation, pedestrian safety and open space improvements**. Key infrastructure and streetscape improvements identified by the community and the Planning Department in the Glen Park Community Plan include:

- Open space improvements including a linear greenway connection to Glen Canyon Park, redesign of the underused BART station plazas, and streetscape improvements in the commercial core.
- Transit improvements related to accessibility, service reliability and circulation.
- Pedestrian and traffic calming improvements at the following locations:

  a) Diamond/Bosworth Streets, Joost/Monterey Boulevard, Arlington/Wilder/Natick Streets, Bosworth/Arlington/I-280 on-ramp, and Bosworth/Lyell Streets;

  b) San Jose Avenue near and long-term traffic calming, pedestrian and bicycle improvements including the completion of a traffic engineering study to determine the feasibility of redesigning San Jose Avenue as an attractive boulevard that is integrated into surrounding communities, and

  c) Bicycle network projects including bike lanes and shared lane markings.

5. **The Project provides a more effective means to protect and enhance Glen Park's character and function than existing land use controls**. The unique character and special qualities of Glen Park include its vibrant, walkable, and human-scaled neighborhood commercial district. The Project proposes replacing the existing NC-2 Small-scale Neighborhood Commercial Zoning district with a new Glen Park Neighborhood Commercial Transit District (Glen Park NCT). The Glen Park NCT district more closely resembles the historic building pattern found in the district. These updated controls prohibit curb cuts on key commercial streets and require ground floor retail with generous ceiling heights to preserve the district's walkable commercial character. The revised controls relax minimum parking requirements and density limits to allow an increment of new housing to that supports retail activity, transit service and public safety. The Glen Park NCT district's family housing requirements also encourages the introduction of housing for families within the commercial district. In addition, the Project reduces building heights in the sensitive interior of the district from 40-X to 30-X in recognition of the established building pattern.

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.

EXHIBIT 1
GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Action	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
CULTURAL and PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES					
Mitigation Measure M-CP-1: Verification of Compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.					
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), in cooperation with BART and any other agency that may have jurisdiction, will prepare materials describing and depicting the widening of Diamond Street variant, pedestrian connectivity improvements, BART Station plaza improvements, and bus loop improvement at the BART Station, including but not limited to plans, drawings, and photographs of existing conditions. Prepared materials will be submitted to the Planning Department for review by staff who meet the Secretary of Interior's professional qualification standards. Such staff will review and the Historic Preservation Commission shall approve the project for compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. If any aspect of the design of the widening of Diamond Street variant, pedestrian connectivity improvements, BART Station plaza improvements, or bus loop improvement at the BART Station is determined to be inconsistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction shall pursue and implement a redesign of those elements, consistent with the goals and objectives of the project, such that consistency with the standards is achieved.	SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction over construction/development of pedestrian and transit connections to the Glen Park BART Station; Planning Department; Historic Preservation Commission.	Prior to any demolition or construction activities.	SFMTA, BART, and any other applicable agency shall prepare materials describing and depicting the widening of Diamond Street variant, pedestrian connectivity improvements, BART Station plaza improvements, and bus loop improvement at the BART Station and shall submit those materials to the Planning Department. Planning Department staff who meet the Secretary of the Interior's professional qualification standards shall review the project for compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and approve the project if it complies. The Historic Preservation Commission shall review	SFMTA, BART, and other agencies with jurisdiction over construction/ development of pedestrian and transit connections to the Glen Park BART Station; Planning Department.	Prior to any demolition or construction activities.

MITIGATION MEASURES					
Mitigation Measures	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Mitigation Schedule**	**Mitigation Action**	**Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility**	**Monitoring Schedule**
			the project for compliance with the Standards and approve the project if it complies. If any aspect of the project design is determined to be inconsistent with the Standards, SFMTA, BART, and any other applicable agency shall pursue and implement a redesign of those elements, consistent with the goals and objectives of the project, such that consistency with the standards is achieved. Entities responsible for implementation shall ensure that the contractor follows the approved plans.		
Mitigation Measure M-CP-2A: Protection of Historic Resources during Construction.					
To protect the Glen Park BART Station from direct or indirect impacts during construction activities (e.g., due to damage from operation of construction equipment, vibration, staging, and material storage), SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction shall, prior to any construction activities, including any ground-disturbing work, prepare a plan establishing procedures to protect these resources. SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction, shall ensure that the contractor follows this plan while working near these	SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction over construction/development of pedestrian and transit connections to the Glen Park BART Station; Architectural historian; Planning Department.	Prior to any construction activities, including any ground disturbing work.	SFMTA, BART, and any other applicable agency shall submit a plan prepared by a qualified architectural historian establishing procedures to protect historical resources to the Planning Department.	SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction over construction/development of pedestrian and transit connections to the	Prior to any construction activities, including any ground disturbing work.

MITIGATION MEASURES					
Mitigation Measures	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Mitigation Schedule**	**Mitigation Action**	**Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility**	**Monitoring Schedule**
resources. The plan shall be prepared by a qualified architectural historian who meets the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards. At a minimum, the plan shall include: • A requirement for the placement of perimeter fencing and/or signs around the historical resource to identify it as a sensitive resource; • Guidelines for operation of construction equipment adjacent to the historical resource; • Guidelines for storage of construction materials away from the resource; • Requirements for monitoring and documenting compliance with the plan; and • Education/training of construction workers about the significance of the historical resource around which they would be working.			Planning Department shall ensure that that the plan is prepared by a qualified architectural historian who meets that Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards and that the plan contains the items enumerated in the mitigation measure. Entities responsible for implementation shall ensure that the contractor follows the plan.	Glen Park BART Station; Planning Department.	
Mitigation Measure M-CP-2B: Historic Resource Documentation and Protection.					
Prior to construction, a historic preservation architect and a structural engineer shall undertake an existing condition study of the Glen Park BART Station. The purpose of the study would be to establish the baseline condition of the building and plazas prior to construction. The documentation shall take the form of written descriptions and visual illustrations, including those physical characteristics of the resource that convey its historic significance and that justify its inclusion on, or eligibility for inclusion on, the California Register. The documentation shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department. The structural engineer shall make periodic site visits to monitor the condition of the resource, including monitoring of any instruments such as crack gauges. The structural engineer shall consult with the historic preservation architect, to ensure that character-defining features are	SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction over construction/ development at the Glen Park BART Station; Historic Preservation Architect; Structural Engineer; Planning Department	Prior to construction for existing conditions study; during construction for monitoring.	Existing conditions study of the Glen Park BART Station shall be submitted to the Planning Department. The Planning Department shall review documentation of the existing conditions and approve the documentation if found to be adequate. During construction, the structural engineer shall	SFMTA, BART, and other agencies with jurisdiction over construction/ development at the Glen Park BART Station; Planning Department.	Prior to and during construction.

MITIGATION MEASURES					
Mitigation Measures	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Mitigation Schedule**	**Mitigation Action**	**Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility**	**Monitoring Schedule**
protected, especially if any problems with character-defining features of the historic resource are discovered. If in the opinion of the structural engineer, in consultation with the historic preservation architect, substantial adverse impacts to the historic resource related to construction activities are found during construction, the monitoring team shall so inform the SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction, or designated representative responsible for construction activities. The SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction, shall adhere to the monitoring team's recommendations for corrective measures, including halting construction in situations where construction activities would imminently endanger the historic resource. The monitoring team shall prepare site visit reports and submit them for review by the Planning Department. All documentation shall be made available to the public by request.			make periodic site visits to monitor the condition of the resource and prepare site visit reports. If substantial adverse impacts are found during construction, the monitoring team shall inform the entities responsible for implementation and make recommendations for corrective measures. Entities responsible for implementation shall adhere to monitoring team's recommendations.		
Mitigation Measure M-CP-2C: Verification of Historic Preservation.					
Upon completion of construction activities at the Glen Park BART Station, a qualified architectural historian shall document (e.g., with photographs and other appropriate means) the level of success in meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and in preserving the character-defining features of the BART Station. The SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction shall ensure repairs occur if any damage has occurred to the Glen Park BART Station during construction. Repair work shall occur in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and shall restore the character-defining features in a manner that does not affect the eligibility of the	SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction over construction/ development at the Glen Park BART Station; Architectural historian.	Upon completion of construction activities.	Entities responsible for implementation shall ensure repairs occur if any damage has occurred to the Glen Park BART Station during construction. Architectural historian shall submit a verification report to the Planning Department.	SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction over construction/ development at the Glen Park BART Station; Planning Department.	Upon completion of construction activities.

MITIGATION MEASURES					
Mitigation Measures	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Mitigation Schedule**	**Mitigation Action**	**Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility**	**Monitoring Schedule**
historic property for the California Register. The architectural historian shall prepare a verification report for review and approval by the Planning Department.					
Mitigation Measure M-CP-3: Accidental Discovery of Archaeological Resources					
The SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction shall distribute the Planning Department archaeological resource "ALERT" sheet to the project prime contractor; to any project subcontractor (including demolition, excavation, grading, foundation, pile driving, etc. firms); or utilities firm involved in soil-disturbing activities within the project site. Prior to any soil-disturbing activities being undertaken, each contractor is responsible for ensuring that the "ALERT" sheet is circulated to all field personnel, including machine operators, field crew, pile drivers, supervisory personnel, etc. The project sponsor shall provide the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) with a signed affidavit from the responsible parties (prime contractor, subcontractor(s), and utilities firm) to the ERO confirming that all field personnel have received copies of the Alert Sheet.	SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction over construction/ development in the Glen Park plan area; Project Sponsor; contractor.	Prior to issuance of any permit for soil-disturbing activities.	Entities responsible for implementation shall distribute Planning Department Archeological Resource "ALERT" sheet to Prime Contractor, sub-contractors and utilities firms. Project Sponsor shall provide the ERO with a signed affidavit that copies of the sheet have been distributed.	Project Sponsor, ERO.	Prior to issuance of any permit for soil-disturbing activities. Following distribution of "ALERT" sheet but prior to any soil-disturbing activities.
Should any indication of an archaeological resource be encountered during any soil-disturbing activity of the project, the project Head Foreman and/or project sponsor shall immediately notify the ERO and shall immediately suspend any soil-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the discovery until the ERO has determined what additional measures should be undertaken.	Head Foreman and/or Project Sponsor.	During construction.	Soil-disturbing activity shall be suspended.	Project Sponsor, ERO.	Upon discovery of archaeological resource.
If the ERO determines that an archaeological resource may be present within the project site, the project sponsor shall retain the services of a qualified archaeological consultant as provided by the Planning Department's List of Qualified Archeological Consultants. The archaeological consultant shall advise the ERO as to whether the discovery is an archaeological resource, retains sufficient integrity, and is	ERO, Project Sponsor, Archaeological consultant.	During construction.	If ERO determines an archeological resource may be present, Project Sponsor shall retain the services of a qualified archaeological consultant.	Archaeologist, ERO.	Upon discovery of archaeological resource.

MITIGATION MEASURES					
Mitigation Measures	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Mitigation Schedule**	**Mitigation Action**	**Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility**	**Monitoring Schedule**
of potential scientific/historical/cultural significance. If an archaeological resource is present, the archaeological consultant shall identify and evaluate the archaeological resource. The archaeological consultant shall make a recommendation as to what action, if any, is warranted. Based on this information, the ERO may require, if warranted, specific additional measures to be implemented by the project sponsor.			Archaeologist shall submit documentation to the ERO of the significance of the resource and recommendations to protect the resource if warranted.		
Measures might include preservation in situ of the archaeological resource; an archaeological monitoring program; or an archaeological testing program. If an archaeological monitoring program or archaeological testing program is required, it shall be consistent with the Major Environmental Analysis (MEA) division guidelines for such programs. The ERO may also require that the project sponsor immediately implement a site security program if the archaeological resource is at risk from vandalism, looting, or other damaging actions.	ERO, Project Sponsor, Archaeological consultant.	During construction.	Project Sponsor shall implement archaeological measures required by ERO.	Archaeologist, ERO.	After determination by the ERO of appropriate action to be implemented following evaluation of accidental discovery.
The project archaeological consultant shall submit a Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archaeological resource and describe the archaeological and historical research methods employed in the archaeological monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archaeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the final report.	ERO, Project Sponsor, Archaeological consultant.	During construction.	Archaeologist shall submit Draft/Final FARR to ERO.	Archaeologist, ERO.	Following completion of any required archaeological field program.
Copies of the Draft FARR shall be sent to the ERO for review and approval. Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one copy and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Major Environmental Analysis division of the Planning Department shall receive three copies of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for	ERO, Project Sponsor.	During construction.	Project Sponsor shall distribute FARR.	ERO.	Following completion of any required archaeological field program.

MITIGATION MEASURES					
Mitigation Measures	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Mitigation Schedule**	**Mitigation Action**	**Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility**	**Monitoring Schedule**
nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest or interpretive value, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.					
Mitigation Measure M-CP-4: Paleontological Resources Monitoring Plan.					
If excavation in the plan area is expected to extend into previously undisturbed soil or rock, the SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction shall retain the services of a qualified paleontological consultant having expertise in California paleontology to design and implement a monitoring and mitigation program. The program shall include a description of when and where construction monitoring would be required; emergency discovery procedures; sampling and data recovery procedures; procedures for the preparation, identification, analysis, and curation of fossil specimens and data recovered; preconstruction coordination procedures; and procedures for reporting the results of the monitoring program. If potentially important paleontological resources (fossilized invertebrate, vertebrate, plant, or micro-fossil) are encountered during excavation, work shall cease within 25 feet of the feature, the ERO shall be notified, and the paleontologist shall identify and evaluate the significance of the potential resource, documenting the findings in an advisory memorandum to the ERO. If it is determined that avoidance of effect to a significant paleontological resource is not feasible, the paleontologist shall prepare an excavation plan that may include curation of the paleontological resource in a permanent retrieval paleontological research collections facility such as the University of California Museum of Paleontology or California Academy of Sciences. The MEA division of the Planning Department shall receive two copies of a final paleontological excavation and recovery report. The paleontologist's work shall be conducted in accordance with this measure and at the direction of the ERO. Plans and reports prepared by the paleontologist shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for	SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction over construction/development in the Glen Park plan area; Project Sponsor; Paleontological consultant.	Prior to issuance of any permit for soil-disturbing activities for submittal of monitoring plan; during construction for monitoring plan implementation.	Paleontologist shall design and implement a monitoring and mitigation program, subject to ERO approval.	Paleontologist, ERO.	Prior to and ongoing during construction.

MITIGATION MEASURES					
Mitigation Measures	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Mitigation Schedule**	**Mitigation Action**	**Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility**	**Monitoring Schedule**
review and comment, and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Paleontological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction for a maximum of four weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of construction could be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce to a less-than-significant level potential effects on a significant paleontological resource as previously defined.					
Mitigation Measure M-CP-5: Treatment of Human Remains.					
The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and federal laws. This shall include immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the Coroner's determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the NAHC who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (Public Resource Code Section 5097.98). The SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction shall direct the archaeological consultant, in coordination with the MLD, to make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of, with appropriate dignity, human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5(d)). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects.	SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction over construction/ development in the Glen Park plan area; Project Sponsor; contractor.	During construction.	Upon discovery of human remains, Coroner shall be notified immediately. If Coroner determines that the remains are Native American remains, the NAHC shall be notified and efforts to contact MLD shall be made. If MLD contacted, archaeological consultant of the entities responsible for implementation shall seek to reach agreement with MLD for disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects.	Archaeologist, ERO.	In case of accidental discovery.

MITIGATION MEASURES					
Mitigation Measures	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Mitigation Schedule**	**Mitigation Action**	**Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility**	**Monitoring Schedule**
TRANSPORTATION					
Mitigation Measure M-TR-1A: Signal Timing Modifications at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street Intersection without Transportation Improvements.					
SFMTA shall monitor intersection operations at this location as the plan area builds out. Once the intersection LOS deteriorates to LOS E, SFMTA shall optimize the signal and increase the cycle length from 80 to 90 seconds. This signal timing modification would improve the intersection operations to acceptable conditions (LOS D) during both the weekday AM and PM peak hours under Existing plus Infill Development Conditions, and would therefore reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. No secondary impacts would occur as a result of this increase in cycle length, because this intersection is not coordinated with an adjacent signalized intersection.	SFMTA.	During plan buildout, when LOS reaches LOS E.	SFMTA shall optimize the signal and increase the cycle length from 85 to 90 seconds.	SFMTA.	As the plan area builds out.
Mitigation Measure M-TR-1B: Bosworth Street/Diamond Street Intersection Signal Timing Modifications with Transportation Improvements.					
SFMTA shall monitor intersection operations at this location as the plan area builds out and transportation improvements occur. Once the intersection LOS deteriorates to LOS E, if feasible, SFMTA shall re-optimize the signal and increase the cycle length to 140 seconds (compared to 90 seconds as recommended by M-TR-1A if the transportation improvements are not implemented). This measure would improve traffic operations during both the weekday AM and PM peak hours under Project Conditions, but the intersection would continue to operate at unacceptable conditions, and therefore the project's impact at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection during both AM and PM weekday peak hours would remain significant and unavoidable. A secondary effect of this mitigation, although less than significant, would be that lengthening the cycle would cause pedestrians and vehicles to wait longer before being able to cross and access the intersection. Given the undesirable	SFMTA.	During plan buildout, when LOS reaches LOS E.	SFMTA shall re-optimize the signal and increase the cycle length to 140 seconds.	SFMTA.	As the plan area builds out.

MITIGATION MEASURES					
Mitigation Measures	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Mitigation Schedule**	**Mitigation Action**	**Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility**	**Monitoring Schedule**
consequences of a signal cycle length increase of this magnitude, SFMTA has expressed strong reservations about the feasibility of this mitigation measure. For this reason, implementation of this mitigation measures is considered uncertain.					
Mitigation Measure M-TR-2A: Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps Intersection Signal Timing Modifications.					
SFMTA shall monitor intersection operations at this location as the potential infill development builds out and transportation improvements occur. Once intersection LOS deteriorates to LOS E, SFMTA shall increase the cycle length to 90 seconds. This signal timing modification would improve the intersection operations to acceptable conditions (LOS D) during the weekday AM peak hour. No secondary impacts would occur as a result of this increase in cycle length, because this intersection is not coordinated with an adjacent signalized intersection.	SFMTA.	During plan buildout, when LOS reaches LOS E.	SFMTA shall increase the cycle length to 90 seconds.	SFMTA.	As the plan area builds out.

MITIGATION MEASURES					
Mitigation Measures	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Mitigation Schedule**	**Mitigation Action**	**Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility**	**Monitoring Schedule**
Mitigation Measure M-TR-12A: Construction Transportation Management Plan.					
In the event that two or more major proposed transportation improvements (specifically the bus loop, roundabout, or widening of the northbound approach of Diamond Street) are constructed simultaneously, SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction shall develop and implement a Construction Transportation Management Plan (TMP) to anticipate and minimize impacts of potentially overlapping construction activities. The TMP would coordinate construction activities to minimize disruptions and ensure that overall circulation is maintained to the extent possible, with particular focus on ensuring pedestrian, transit, and bicycle connectivity. The TMP would supplement and expand, rather than modify or supersede, any existing regulations and requirements. The TMP shall be submitted to SFMTA Traffic Engineering Division, the Department of Public Works (DPW) and presented as part of review by the Transportation Advisory Staff Committee.	SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction over transportation construction/ development in the Glen Park plan area, Project Sponsor.	During plan buildout, if two or more major proposed transportation improvements are constructed simultaneously.	Entities responsible for implementation shall develop and implement a Construction Transportation Management Plan (TMP). The TMP shall be submitted to SFMTA Traffic Engineering Division and the Department of Public Works. The TMP shall be presented to the Transportation Advisory Staff Committee.	SFMTA, BART, Department of Public Works.	As the plan area builds out.
Mitigation Measure M-C-TR-13B: Bosworth Street/Diamond Street Intersection Signal Timing Modifications.					
MTA shall monitor intersection operations at this location as the plan area infill development and transportation improvements occur. Once the transportation improvements are complete and/or the intersection LOS deteriorates to LOS E, if feasible, SFMTA shall re-optimize the signal and increase the cycle length to 150 seconds. This measure would be expected to improve traffic operations during both the weekday AM and PM peak hours under 2030 Cumulative plus Project Conditions, but the intersection would likely continue to operate at unacceptable conditions, and therefore the project's impact at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection during both AM and PM weekday peak hours would remain significant and unavoidable. A secondary effect of this mitigation, although less than significant, would be that lengthening the cycle would cause	SFMTA.	During plan buildout, when LOS reaches LOS E.	SFMTA shall increase the cycle length to 150 seconds.	SFMTA.	As the plan area builds out.

MITIGATION MEASURES					
Mitigation Measures	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Mitigation Schedule**	**Mitigation Action**	**Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility**	**Monitoring Schedule**
pedestrians and vehicles to wait longer before being able to cross and access the intersection. Given the undesirable consequences of a signal cycle length increase of this magnitude, SFMTA has expressed strong reservations about the feasibility of this mitigation measure. For this reason, implementation of this mitigation measures is considered uncertain.					
NOISE					
Mitigation Measure M-NO-4: BART Infill Site Vibration Assessment					
Prior to the submittal of a building permit application for the infill site, BART or BART's developer shall obtain a qualified vibration consultant to complete a site-specific vibration assessment. The vibration assessment shall measure the vibration levels at the existing BART parking lot within 200 feet of the underground BART alignment. If vibration levels exceed the FTA 72 VdB criteria for "frequent" vibration events impacting a residential use (i.e., more than 70 vibration events from the same source per day, which is typical of most rail rapid transit vibration sources), the vibration assessment shall recommend measures to reduce vibration levels to 72 VdB or less. Examples of such measures that have been very successfully used, separately or in combination, to avoid vibration impacts to other residential projects located near rail transit vibration sources include: • Building Foundation Mats – the use of increased mass in the foundation of the building to increase the effective vibration reduction that occurs at the boundary between the soil and the building foundation structure. • Vibration Isolation – after provision of a break or gap in the structure between the first floor concrete slab and the top of the basement walls/columns, isolation would be achieved by placing rubber pads between the top of the basement	BART.	Prior to the submittal of a building permit application for the vibration assessment; prior to occupancy for implementation of the measures; post-construction for the verification of the measures' effectiveness.	BART or BART's developer shall complete a site-specific vibration assessment. If the vibration levels exceed FTA criteria for frequent vibration events, the assessment shall include recommended vibration reduction measures for incorporation into the design and construction of the proposed project. BART or BART's developer shall provide evidence to the ERO that the measures have been implemented. Following occupancy, the measures' effectiveness shall be verified by vibration monitoring	BART, Planning Department.	Prior to and after construction of the proposed infill project.

MITIGATION MEASURES					
Mitigation Measures	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Mitigation Schedule**	**Mitigation Action**	**Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility**	**Monitoring Schedule**
walls/columns and the first floor structure. Recommended vibration reduction measures provided by the site-specific assessment shall be incorporated into the design and construction of the proposed infill development project and their effectiveness shall be verified by vibration monitoring measurements after construction. BART or BART's developer shall provide the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) documentation demonstrating compliance with this measure for review and approval once construction has been completed, but prior to occupancy of the building(s).			measurements after construction.		
AIR QUALITY					
Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3A: Construction Vehicle Emissions Minimization.					
To reduce the potential health risk resulting from project construction activities, the project sponsor shall include in contract specifications a requirement for the following measures: • Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to two minutes; • The project shall develop a construction plan demonstrating that the off-road equipment (more than 50 horsepower) to be used in the construction project (i.e., owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles) would achieve a project wide fleet-average 20 percent NOX reduction and 45 percent PM reduction compared to the most recent ARB fleet average (as specified in California Code of Regulations Article 4.8, Section 2449 General Requirements for In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets). Acceptable options for reducing emissions include the use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit	SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction over construction/ development in the Glen Park plan area; Project Sponsor.	Prior to construction activities.	Project Sponsor shall design a construction plan with measures to reduce construction vehicle emissions and include ensure that these measures are incorporated into the contract specifications.	Project Sponsor, ERO.	Prior to construction.

MITIGATION MEASURES					
Mitigation Measures	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Mitigation Schedule**	**Mitigation Action**	**Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility**	**Monitoring Schedule**
technology, after-treatment products, add-on devices such as particulate filters, and/or other options as such become available; • All construction equipment, diesel trucks, and generators shall be equipped with Best Available Control Technology for emission reductions of NOx and PM; • Use of Interim Tier 4 or equivalent equipment for all uses where such equipment is available; • Use of Tier 3 equipment with Best Available Control Technology (BACT) or alternative fuel vehicles for applications where Tier 4 Interim engines are not available; and • Prohibition of diesel generators for construction purposes where feasible alternative sources of power are available.					
Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3B Construction Phasing.					
Prior to construction of development at the infill sites, any transportation improvements, or any open space improvements, the project sponsor shall coordinate with the Planning Department to determine: (1) whether any concurrent construction activities identified in the 2010 Community Plan is occurring, (2) whether concurrent construction activities could exceed the BAAQMD's criteria air pollutant thresholds, and (3) whether project phasing could reduce criteria air pollutant to below BAAQMD's significance thresholds. The Planning Department may require additional criteria air pollutant analysis that includes implementation of the mitigation measures described in M-AQ-3A or more refined construction details.	Project Sponsor, Planning Department.	Prior to construction activities.	The Planning Department shall review any concurrent construction activities identified in the *2010 Community Plan*, and determine whether the construction activities could exceed the BAAQMD's criteria air pollutant thresholds, and whether project phasing could reduce criteria air pollutant to below BAAQMD's significance thresholds.	Project Sponsor, Planning Department.	Prior to construction activities.

MITIGATION MEASURES					
Mitigation Measures	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Mitigation Schedule**	**Mitigation Action**	**Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility**	**Monitoring Schedule**
Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7 Health Risk Review for Future Sensitive Receptors.					
To reduce the potential health risk to new sensitive receptors within the plan area, new residential or open space development proposed under the 2010 Community Plan that is within 500 feet of Bosworth Street, San Jose Avenue, or I-280 shall, as part of its CEQA review, include an analysis of toxic air contaminants, including PM2.5, diesel particulate matter (DPM), and total organic gases (TOGs), and shall, if warranted based on the results, develop a plan to minimize exposure of future sensitive receptors to TACs (which includes PM2.5, DPM, and TOGs). The analysis shall employ either site-specific modeling of TAC concentrations or BAAQMD methodology to determine whether the average annual concentration of PM2.5 from the roadway sources within 500 feet would exceed the threshold, or action level of 0.3 µg/m3, or if the TAC exposure of PM2.5, DPM, and TOGs would result in an increased cancer risk greater than 10 in a million or a hazard index greater than 1.0. The health risk analysis shall be submitted to the Planning Department and shall identify measures to reduce exposure of new sensitive receptors in the plan area. These measures may include redesigning the project site plan to provide greater separation between the sensitive receptors and pollutant sources, installation of a filtered air supply system for residential uses, or placement of air intakes for the ventilation system at greater horizontal and/or vertical distances from pollutant sources.	Project Sponsor, Planning Department.	Prior to residential or open space development.	CEQA review for future sensitive projects within 500 feet of Bosworth Street, San Jose Avenue, or I-280 shall include an analysis of toxic air contaminants. The health risk analysis shall be submitted to the Planning Department for review.	Project Sponsor, Planning Department.	As part of CEQA review for future projects.
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (the following measure is from the Initial Study prepared for the Community Plan)					
Mitigation Measure M-BI-1: Pre-Construction Nesting Bird Survey.					
Any construction pursuant to the Community Plan, including development of the infill sites, transportation improvements, and creek daylighting, shall avoid the February 1 through August 31 bird	SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction over	Prior to construction.	Project Sponsor shall avoid construction during the bird nesting period.	Planning Department, wildlife biologist.	Prior to construction.

MITIGATION MEASURES					
Mitigation Measures	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Mitigation Schedule**	**Mitigation Action**	**Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility**	**Monitoring Schedule**
nesting period to the extent feasible. If it is not feasible to avoid the nesting period, a survey for nesting birds shall be conducted by a qualified wildlife biologist no earlier than 14 days prior to the construction. The area surveyed shall include all clearing/construction areas, as well as areas within 150 feet of the boundaries of these areas, or as otherwise determined by the biologist. In the event that an active nest is discovered, clearing/construction shall be postponed within 1 feet of the nest until a wildlife biologist has determined the nesting avian species and consulted on further measures with the California Department of Fish and Game. If the avian species present is protected under the MBTA, further mitigation could entail postponement of clearing or construction activities within 150 feet of the active nest until the young have fledged (left the nest), the nest is vacated, and there is no evidence of second nesting attempts. If the avian species is not protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), no further action is required and construction activities may proceed.	construction/ development in the Glen Park plan area; Project Sponsor.		If not feasible to avoid the bird nesting period, Project Sponsor shall retain qualified wildlife biologist to perform preconstruction survey. If active nests are detected, Project Sponsor shall comply with recommendations of the wildlife biologist and possibly the California Department of Fish and Game.		
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY (the following measure is from the Initial Study prepared for the Community Plan)					
Mitigation Measure M-HY-1 Daylighted Streambed and Bank Stabilization.					
Prior to daylighting Islais Creek, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission shall prepare a Hydraulics and Hydrology Study to determine the expected flow rates for the daylighted creek, for up to the 200-year storm event. The daylighted portion shall be designed by a qualified engineer, erosion control the highest expected flow-through rate without causing or contributing to bed or bank erosion. This can be accomplished by off-site detention of peak flows, by-passing peak flow rates in excess of stabile velocity, channel configuration (e.g., longitudinal slope, side slopes, check dams, and others) to reduce flow rates, and bed and bank stabilizing structures. It is recommended that bio-engineering processes be maximized and	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission.	Prior to daylighting Islais Creek.	A qualified engineer shall prepare a Hydraulics and Hydrology Study that contains expected flow rates and recommendations to reduce erosion and maintain bank and bed stabilization. Recommendations shall be incorporated into the	Planning Department, qualified engineer.	Prior to construction at Islais Creek.

MITIGATION MEASURES					
Mitigation Measures	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Mitigation Schedule**	**Mitigation Action**	**Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility**	**Monitoring Schedule**
that hard engineering structures, if used, be vegetated (e.g., vegetated gabion, riprap, GEOWEB™, or geogrid structures) to comply with other design principles.			contract specifications for daylighting Islais Creek.		
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS (the following measure is from the Initial Study prepared for the Community Plan)					
Mitigation Measure M-HZ-1 Hazardous Building Materials.					
The City shall condition future development approvals to require that the subsequent project sponsors ensure that any equipment containing PCBs or Di-Ethylhexyl Phthalate (DEPH), such as fluorescent light ballasts, are removed and properly disposed of according to applicable federal, State, and local laws prior to the start of demolition, and that any fluorescent light tubes, which could contain mercury, are similarly removed and properly disposed of. Any other hazardous materials identified, either before or during construction, shall be abated according to applicable federal, State, and local laws.	Project Sponsor, Planning Department.	As plan build outs.	Prior to project approval, City shall ensure hazardous building components are removed and other hazardous materials shall be abated according to applicable laws, before or during construction.	Project Sponsor, Planning Department.	As plan builds out.

General Plan Amendments Resolution

SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING COMMISSION

RESOLUTION NO. _____

WHEREAS, Section 4.105 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco mandates that the Planning Commission shall periodically recommend to the Board of Supervisors for approval or rejection of proposed amendments to the General Plan.

In 2002, the Planning Department initiated a public planning process to create t*he Glen Park Community Plan.* The Plan presents a vision and a set of objectives and policies that recognize Glen Park's unique character and seek to enhance the neighborhood's special quality and function.

The Plan's policies generally seek to protect and reinforce the character of the neighborhood commercial district, resolve challenges caused by the area's massive vehicle infrastructure, enhance pedestrian and transit movement, improve the area's mix of open spaces, and restore connections to Glen Canyon Park and surrounding neighborhoods. The Plan recommends modifications to the neighborhood commercial zoning to support a transit-oriented commercial district, identifies streetscape and pedestrian amenities, suggests open space opportunities and encourages review of future development for compatibility with the neighborhood's scale and distinctive character. An accompanying Implementation Program outlines projects, actions, funding opportunities and interagency coordination the City must pursue to implement the Area Plan. Further description of the Area Plan's proposals and recommendations is contained in the Plan document.

The Area Plan supports the General Plan's vision of strengthening neighborhood-serving commercial areas; encouraging travel by public transit, walking and bicycling; preserving historic buildings; and providing and improving open space, streets and transportation in the Plan Area. The Plan lays the policy foundation for additional changes that are detailed in the Planning Code and Zoning Map amendments.

The Planning Commission proposes to amend the General Plan, adding the Glen Park Community Plan as a new Area Plan, and making related amendments to the General Plan's Recreation and Open Space Element, Commerce and Industry Element, Urban Design Element and Land Use Index.

Overall, policies envisioned for the Glen Park Community Plan would be consistent with the General Plan. However, amendments to the General Plan, including the addition of the Glen Park Community Plan and revisions to the Recreation and Open Space Element, Commerce and Industry Element, Urban Design Element and Land Use Index are required to achieve the goals of the Glen Park Community Plan (the "General Plan Amendments"). The City Attorney's Office has reviewed the draft ordinance and approved it as to form.

On October 20, 2011, the Planning Commission by Motion No. 18472, initiated the above referenced General Plan Amendments and, pursuant to Planning Code Section 340, authorized the Department to provide appropriate notice for a public hearing to consider these amendments.

On November 10, 2011, by Motion No. _____ the Commission certified the Environmental Impact Report for the Glen Park Community Plan as accurate, complete, and in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). In Motion No. _____, the Commission adopted findings that various actions related to the adoption of the proposed Glen Park Community Plan were in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.). As part of this Motion, the Commission adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations and a mitigation monitoring and reporting program. Said findings are on file with the Secretary of the Commission and are incorporated herein by reference. Said findings remain valid for the actions contemplated in this Resolution and are made part of this Resolution by reference herein.

Staff recommends adoption of the draft resolution adopting amendments to the General Plan, which includes adding the Glen Park Community Plan, and making conforming amendments to various elements of the General Plan, and making conforming changes to applicable maps of the General Plan. These amendments are attached in the *Glen Park Community Plan Initiation Package*, dated October 20, 2011 and incorporated for reference.

Planning Code Section 101.1(b) establishes eight priority policies and is a basis by which differences between competing policies in the General Plan are resolved. The project is consistent with the eight priority policies in that:

1. **That existing neighborhood serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in or ownership of such businesses enhanced.**

The Plan strengthens Glen Park's existing neighborhood commercial area while expanding opportunities for new retail uses, employment and local business ownership. The Plan protects neighborhood serving retail uses by requiring ground floor commercial uses and limiting curb cuts to

preserve continuous retail and pedestrian frontages on Diamond & Chenery Streets. The Plan proposes a new Glen Park Neighborhood Commercial Transit Zoning District that incorporates existing non-conforming commercial uses and reclassifies a small number of residential parcels across from the BART station to allow for future retail opportunities.

2. **That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods.**

The Plan's policies and objectives are focused on reinforcing the area's most cherished features – a walkable neighborhood commercial district, human-scaled built environment, strong pedestrian and transit orientation, and connections to Glen Canyon Park. Additionally, the Plan proposes height controls that are consistent with the established development pattern in the area.

3. **That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced.**

The Plan preserves the existing affordable housing supply in the neighborhood. The Plan proposes no demolition or redevelopment of the existing housing stock. Mixed-use infill development on select sites within the neighborhood commercial district that is compatible with the surrounding area and meets the City's inclusionary housing requirement is encouraged. Given the area's rich local and regional transit access (BART and Muni), the Plan's proposed Glen Park NCT District eliminates minimum parking requirements for residential units. Allowing some units to be built without parking will help increase affordability.

4. **That commuter traffic not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking.**

The Plan would not result in commuter traffic impeding Muni transit service or overburdening the streets or neighborhood parking. A primary objective of the Plan is to sustain Glen Park's role as an intermodal transit center for the city and the region. The Plan supports the design and implementation of transit service improvements to increase Muni's speed, reliability and ridership. New parking requirements are designed to discourage private automobile trips and support transit. In addition, the Plan contains policies and recommendations to reduce congestion by promoting walking, bicycling, and car-sharing. The Plan also proposes

traffic calming and street design opportunities to improve circulation in the area.

5. **That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced.**

The Plan would not impact the industrial or service sectors. The Plan area is composed primarily of residential, neighborhood commercial and public uses.

6. **That the City achieves the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.**

The Plan would not adversely affect preparedness against injury and loss of life in an earthquake and would comply with applicable safety standards. New residential buildings would be subject to the City's Building Code, Fire Code and other applicable safety standards.

7. **That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved.**

The Plan supports the preservation of historic buildings by discouraging demolition and adverse alteration. As part of the planning process, a survey of historic resources within the Plan area was conducted and adopted by the Historic Preservation Commission. The Plan recommends the use of the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards and Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties* for projects involving historic resources.

8. **That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.**

The Plan would have a positive effect on parks and open space and would not adversely affect existing open spaces or their access to sunlight and vistas. The Plan supports the creation of a linear greenway connecting downtown Glen Park and Glen Canyon Park. Additionally, the Plan recommends opportunities to create new and improved public open spaces within the neighborhood commercial district.

The Glen Park Community Plan reflects the vision of the City & County of San Francisco's overall General Plan. Review of applicable General Plan Objectives and Policies has determined that the proposed action is, on balance, consistent with the General Plan as it is proposed to be amended. The proposed actions offer a compelling

articulation and implementation of many of the concepts outlined in the General Plan, especially the Housing, Commerce and Industry, Recreation and Open Space, Urban Design, and Transportation Elements. Below are specific General Plan policies and objectives that support the Glen Park Community Plan's policy framework and proposed actions.

NOTE: General Plan Objectives are in ***CAPITAL, BOLDED ITALICS***
General Plan Policies are in Arial standard font
Staff comments are in *italics*

HOUSING ELEMENT

OBJECTIVE 1
IDENTIFY AND MAKE AVAILABLE FOR DEVELOPMENT ADEQUATE SITES TO MEET THE CITY'S HOUSING NEEDS, ESPECIALLY PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

Policy 1.4
Ensure community based planning processes are used to generate changes to land use controls.

OBJECTIVE 11
SUPPORT AND RESPECT THE DIVERSE AND DISTINCT CHARACTER OF SAN FRANCISCO'S NEIGHBORHOODS.

Policy 11.7
Respect San Francisco's historic fabric, by preserving landmark buildings and ensuring consistency with historic districts.

OBJECTIVE 12
BALANCE HOUSING GROWTH WITH ADEQUATE INFRASTRUCTURE THAT SERVES THE CITY'S GROWING POPULATION.

Policy 12.1
Encourage new housing that relies on transit use and environmentally sustainable patterns of movement.

OBJECTIVE 13
PRIORITIZE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN PLANNING FOR AND CONSTRUCTING NEW HOUSING.

Policy 13.3
Promote sustainable land use patterns that integrate housing with transportation in order to increase transit, pedestrian, and bicycle mode share.

The Area Plan contains policies and proposes land use controls that would retain and enhance existing housing; encourage well-designed mixed use infill development that is

compatible with neighborhood character; provide opportunities for housing near transit; and reduce the cost of housing by allowing units to be built without parking requirements.

COMMERCE & INDUSTRY ELEMENT

OBJECTIVE 6
MAINTAIN AND STRENGTHEN VIABLE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL AREAS EASILY ACCESSIBLE TO CITY RESIDENTS.

Policy 6.1
Ensure and encourage the retention and provision of neighborhood-serving goods and services in the city's neighborhood commercial districts, while recognizing and encouraging diversity among the districts.

Policy 6.2
Promote economically vital neighborhood commercial districts which foster small business enterprises and entrepreneurship and which are responsive to economic and technological innovation in the marketplace and society.

Policy 6.7
Promote high quality urban design on commercial streets.

Policy 6.8
Preserve historically and/or architecturally important buildings or groups of buildings in neighborhood commercial districts.

The Area Plan strongly supports the protection and enhancement of Glen Park's neighborhood commercial district as a focus of local economic activity, neighborhood-serving retail and pedestrian activity. The Glen Park Neighborhood Commercial Transit District proposed by the Plan promotes active ground floor retail and expands opportunities for some additional commercial uses in the district. Historic buildings in the district are protected and new mixed use development that is compatible with the surrounding area is encouraged.

RECREATION & OPEN SPACE ELEMENT

OBJECTIVE 4
PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR RECREATION AND THE ENJOYMENT OF OPEN SPACE IN EVERY SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOOD.

Policy 4.7
Provide open space to serve neighborhood commercial districts.

The Plan promotes open space in Glen Park by supporting improvements to existing open spaces and creation of new open space. The Plan proposes serving the needs of Glen Park's busy commercial core with a linear greenway connection to Glen Canyon Park, the redesign of the BART station plazas and enhanced streetscape amenities.

TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

OBJECTIVE 1
MEET THE NEEDS OF ALL RESIDENTS AND VISITORS FOR SAFE, CONVENIENT AND INEXPENSIVE TRAVEL WITHIN SAN FRANCISCO AND BETWEEN THE CITY AND OTHER PARTS OF THE REGION WHILE MAINTAINING THE HIGH QUALITY LIVING ENVIRONMENT OF THE BAY AREA.

Policy 1.1
Involve citizens in planning and developing transportation facilities and services, and in further defining objectives and policies as they relate to district plans and specific projects.

Policy 1.2
Ensure the safety and comfort of pedestrians throughout the city.

Policy 1.3
Give priority to public transit and other alternatives to the private automobile as the means of meeting San Francisco's transportation needs, particularly those of commuters.

Policy 1.5
Coordinate regional and local transportation systems and provide for interline transit transfers.

OBJECTIVE 11
ESTABLISH PUBLIC TRANSIT AS THE PRIMARY MODE OF TRANSPORTATION IN SAN FRANCISCO AND AS A MEANS THROUGH WHICH TO GUIDE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPROVE REGIONAL MOBILITY AND AIR QUALITY.

Policy 11.3
Encourage development that efficiently coordinates land use with transit service, requiring that developers address transit concerns as well as mitigate traffic problems.

OBJECTIVE 15
ENCOURAGE ALTERNATIVES TO THE AUTOMOBILE AND REDUCED TRAFFIC LEVELS ON RESIDENTIAL STREETS THAT SUFFER FROM EXCESSIVE TRAFFIC THROUGH THE MANAGEMENT OF TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS AND FACILITIES.

Policy 15.1
Discourage excessive automobile traffic on residential streets by incorporating traffic-calming treatments.

OBJECTIVE 20
GIVE FIRST PRIORITY TO IMPROVING TRANSIT SERVICE THROUGHOUT THE CITY, PROVIDING A CONVENIENT AND EFFICIENT SYSTEM AS A PREFERABLE ALTERNATIVE TO AUTOMOBILE USE.

Policy 20.1
Give priority to transit vehicles based on a rational classification system of transit preferential streets.

OBJECTIVE 21
DEVELOP TRANSIT AS THE PRIMARY MODE OF TRAVEL TO AND FROM DOWNTOWN AND ALL MAJOR ACTIVITY CENTERS WITHIN THE REGION.

Policy 21.9
Improve pedestrian and bicycle access to transit facilities.

OBJECTIVE 23
IMPROVE THE CITY'S PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION SYSTEM TO PROVIDE FOR EFFICIENT, PLEASANT, AND SAFE MOVEMENT.

Policy 23.2
Widen sidewalks where intensive commercial, recreational, or institutional activity is present, sidewalks are congested, where sidewalks are less than adequately wide to provide appropriate pedestrian amenities, or where residential densities are high.

OBJECTIVE 24
IMPROVE THE AMBIENCE OF THE PEDESTRIAN ENVIRONMENT.

Policy 24.2
Maintain and expand the planting of street trees and the infrastructure to support them.

Policy 24.3
Install pedestrian-serving street furniture where appropriate.

Policy 24.4
Preserve pedestrian-oriented building frontages.

OBJECTIVE 27
ENSURE THAT BICYCLES CAN BE USED SAFELY AND CONVENIENTLY AS A PRIMARY MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION, AS WELL AS FOR RECREATIONAL PURPOSES.

Policy 27.1
Expand and improve access for bicycles on city streets and develop a well-marked, comprehensive system of bike routes in San Francisco.

OBJECTIVE 34
RELATE THE AMOUNT OF PARKING IN RESIDENTIAL AREAS AND NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS TO THE CAPACITY OF THE CITY'S STREET SYSTEM AND LAND USE PATTERNS.

Policy 34.1
Regulate off-street parking in new housing so as to guarantee needed spaces without requiring excesses and to encourage low auto ownership in neighborhoods that are well served by transit and are convenient to neighborhood shopping.

The Plan seeks to capitalize on the area's rich local and regional transit service and walkability to encourage travel by non-auto modes. The Plan supports improvements to the existing transit infrastructure and encourages a number of proposed improvements to the pedestrian realm. The Plan also contains policies and recommendations aimed at restoring a more balanced street environment by calming traffic and promoting walking, bicycling, and carsharing.

URBAN DESIGN ELEMENT

OBJECTIVE 1
EMPHASIS OF THE CHARACTERISTIC PATTERN WHICH GIVES TO THE CITY AND ITS NEIGHBORHOODS AN IMAGE, A SENSE OF PURPOSE, AND A MEANS OF ORIENTATION

Policy 1.3
Recognize that buildings, when seen together, produce a total effect that characterizes the city and its districts.

OBJECTIVE 3
MODERATION OF MAJOR NEW DEVELOPMENT TO COMPLEMENT THE CITY PATTERN, THE RESOURCES TO BE CONSERVED, AND THE NEIGHBORHOOD ENVIRONMENT

Policy 3.5
Relate the height of buildings to important attributes of the city pattern and to the height and character of existing development.

The Area Plan emphasizes and reinforces the existing scale and character of the neighborhood. Proposed height and land use controls are designed to acknowledge the neighborhood's established pattern and support new compatible mixed use development. The Plan includes policies to protect historic resources and improve the area's public realm.

AIR QUALITY ELEMENT

OBJECTIVE 2
REDUCE MOBILE SOURCES OF AIR POLLUTION THROUGH IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT OF THE GENERAL PLAN.

OBJECTIVE 3
DECREASE THE AIR QUALITY IMPACTS OF DEVELOPMENT BY COORDINATION OF LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION DECISIONS.

Policy 3.2
Encourage mixed land use development near transit lines and provide retail and other types of service oriented uses within walking distance to minimize automobile dependent development.

The Area Plan contains a number of policies that would lower negative impacts on air quality by encouraging the use of public transit, walking and bicycling over driving. The Plan's policies support the existing compact development pattern whereby public transit, shopping and services are located in close proximity to residences alleviating the need for some automobile trips.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Commission adopts the CEQA findings in Commission Resolution No. _____;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that pursuant to Planning Code Section 340(d), the Planning Commission finds from the facts presented that the public necessity, convenience and general welfare require the proposed amendments and therefore adopt amendments to the General Plan contained in the draft ordinance, approved as to form by the City Attorney in the *Glen Park Community Plan Initiation Package*, dated October 20, 2011, and directs staff to make corresponding updates to the Land Use Index of the General Plan.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Commission finds the General Plan amendments as proposed for amendment to be consistent with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1 as specified above.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission specifically authorizes the following additional changes to the General Plan Amendments legislation and directs staff to work with the City Attorney's Office to prepare a new version of the General Plan Amendment legislation to reflect these changes and submit the new version to the Board of Supervisors for its consideration: 1) add technical changes to address typographical errors, insert Area Plan language adopted prior to approval, and similar technical changes; 2) revise the General Plan maps identified and approved for amendments to reflect the Commission's action on the Glen Park Community Plan; 3)

incorporate any additional changes to the Glen Park Community Plan or the General Plan that the Planning Commission specifically identifies as part of its approval action on November 10, 2011;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission hereby **RECOMMENDS to the Board of Supervisors ADOPTION** of the amendments to the General Plan, and the Glen Park Community Plan as presented in the draft ordinance signed by the City Attorney dated ----------, and attached to this resolution.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED by the Planning Commission on November 10, 2011.

Linda Avery
Commission Secretary

AYES:
NOES:

EXCUSED:

ADOPTED:

Planning Code Amendments Resolution

SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING COMMISSION

RESOLUTION NO. _____

WHEREAS, Section 4.105 of the City and County of San Francisco Charter mandates that the Planning Commission shall periodically recommend amendments to the Planning Code to the Board of Supervisors; and

The San Francisco Planning Department is proposing to amend the Planning Code, including the Zoning Map, to implement the Glen Park Community Plan and to bring the Planning Code regulations governing this area into consistency with the Glen Park Community Plan ("the Plan".)

In 2002, the Planning Department initiated a public planning process to create t*he Glen Park Community Plan.* The Plan presents a vision and a set of objectives and policies that recognize Glen Park's unique character and seek to enhance the neighborhood's special quality and function.

The Plan's policies generally seek to protect and reinforce the character of the neighborhood commercial district, resolve challenges caused by the area's massive vehicle infrastructure, enhance pedestrian and transit movement, improve the area's mix of open spaces, and restore connections to Glen Canyon Park and surrounding neighborhoods. The Plan recommends modifications to the neighborhood commercial zoning to support a transit-oriented commercial district, identifies streetscape and pedestrian amenities, suggests open space opportunities and encourages review of future development for compatibility with the neighborhood's scale and distinctive character. An accompanying Implementation Program outlines projects, actions, funding opportunities and interagency coordination the City must pursue to implement the Area Plan. Further description of the Area Plan's proposals and recommendations is contained in the Plan document.

The Planning Commission proposes to amend the General Plan, adding the Glen Park Community Plan as a new area plan, and making related amendment to the General Plan. The Planning Code governs permitted land uses and planning standards in the area. Thus, conforming amendments to the Planning Code are required in order to implement the Plan.

An ordinance, incorporated for reference, has been drafted in order to make revisions to the Planning Code necessary to implement the proposed "Glen Park Area Plan" and its related documents. This ordinance adds Planning Code section 738.1 – The Glen Park Neighborhood Commercial Transit District, and amends Planning Code sections 121.1, 121.2, 124, 134, 135, 145.4, 151.1, 155, 201, 263.20, 607.1, 702.1 to implement the Glen Park Area Plan. The City Attorney's Office has reviewed the draft ordinance and approved it as to form.

Prior to considering the relevant amendments to the Planning Code, and related General Plan and Zoning Map amendments on November 10, 2011, the Planning Commission adopted Motion No. _____. In that action, the Commission certified the Glen Park Community Plan Environmental Impact Report. The Planning Commission also adopted Motion No. _____, adopting California Environmental Quality Act Findings related to the Glen Park Community Plan. Said motions are incorporated herein by reference.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Commission adopts the CEQA findings in Commission Resolution No. _____;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That pursuant to Planning Code Section 302 (b), the Planning Commission finds from the facts presented that the public necessity, convenience and general welfare require the approval of the proposed Planning Code amendments;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, The Planning Commission finds that the Planning Code Amendments are, on balance, in conformity with the eight Priority Policies of the Planning Code Section 101.1 and with the General Plan as proposed to be amended for the reasons set forth in Planning Commission Resolution No. _____ which accompanies this Resolution, and incorporates said findings herein by reference.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Planning Commission wishes to adopt amendments to the Planning Code, including but not limited to those related to land use, density, and parking. Proposed Planning Code Amendments are contained in the draft ordinance approved as to form by the City Attorney in the *Glen Park Community Plan Initiation Package*, date October 20, 2011. The Commission also recommends this legislation to the Board of Supervisors;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission specifically authorizes the following additional changes to the Planning Code Amendments legislation and directs staff to work with the City Attorney's Office to prepare a new version of the Planning Code Amendment legislation to reflect these changes and submit the new version to the Board of Supervisors for its consideration: 1) add technical changes to address typographical errors, insert Planning Code language adopted prior to approval, and similar technical changes; 2) revise the Planning Code amendments to reflect the Commission's action on the Glen Park Community Plan Planning Code Amendments; 3) incorporate any additional changes that the Planning Commission specifically identifies as part of its approval action on November 10, 2011;

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED by the City Planning Commission on November 10, 2011.

Linda Avery
Commission Secretary

Zoning Map Amendments Resolution

SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING COMMISSION

RESOLUTION NO. _____

WHEREAS, Section 4.105 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco mandates that the Planning Commission shall periodically recommend to the Board of Supervisors proposed amendments to the Zoning Maps; and

The San Francisco Planning Department is seeking to implement the Glen Park Community Plan and proposes to amend the Zoning Map, to implement the Glen Park Community Plan ("the Plan".)

In 2002, the Planning Department initiated a public planning process to create t*he Glen Park Community Plan.* The Plan presents a vision and a set of objectives and policies that recognize Glen Park's unique character and seek to enhance the neighborhood's special quality and function.

The Plan's policies generally seek to protect and reinforce the character of the neighborhood commercial district, resolve challenges caused by the area's massive vehicle infrastructure, enhance pedestrian and transit movement, improve the area's mix of open spaces, and restore connections to Glen Canyon Park and surrounding neighborhoods. The Plan recommends modifications to the neighborhood commercial zoning to support a transit-oriented commercial district, identifies streetscape and pedestrian amenities, suggests open space opportunities and encourages review of future development for compatibility with the neighborhood's scale and distinctive character. An accompanying Implementation Program outlines projects, actions, funding opportunities and interagency coordination the City must pursue to implement the Area Plan. Further description of the Area Plan's proposals and recommendations is contained in the Plan document.

As a means to implement both the goals of the General Plan that are specific to the Glen Park Community Plan, the Department is proposing Zoning Map amendments that would add and amend districts as outlined in the proposed Area Plan and related proposed Planning Code Amendments. These changes correspond to conforming amendments to Sectional Maps ZN11 and HT11 of the Zoning Maps of the City and County of San Francisco. The amendments would include changes to permitted land use and height and bulk controls and reclassifying properties into a newly created Glen Park Neighborhood Commercial District.

The Zoning Map governs land use and height and bulk permitted in the area and a number of changes are proposed. Thus, conforming amendments to the Zoning Map would be required in order for development to proceed in the area consistent with the Glen Park Area Plan of the General Plan.

The proposed Zoning Maps amendments specify the application of Planning Code amendments to specific parcels. These amendments contain proposals for changes to standards from those currently established by the Planning Code, including but not limited to those for land use, height and bulk, density, and parking.

The Proposed Zoning Map Amendments would include:

- Changes to the height and bulk sectional maps.
- One new zoning district as listed below:

1. Glen Park Neighborhood Commercial Transit District (Glen Park NCT)

The proposed zoning map changes to land use and height and bulk districts are included in a draft Ordinance, attached hereto as Exhibit IV-3 in the *Glen Park Community Plan Initiation Package*, dated October 20, 2011. The City Attorney's Office has reviewed the draft ordinance and approved it as to form.

In related actions, the Department is proposing amendments to the Planning Code and to the General Plan, which include adding the Glen Park Area Plan, and amending various General Plan Elements, to implement the Glen Park Community Plan.

Prior to considering the relevant amendments to the Planning Code, and related General Plan and Zoning Map amendments on November 10, 2011, the Planning Commission adopted Motion No. _____. In that action, the Commission certified the Glen Park Community Plan Environmental Impact Report. The Planning Commission also adopted Motion No. _____, adopting California Environmental Quality Act Findings related to the Glen Park Community Plan project. Said motions are incorporated herein by reference.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Commission adopts the CEQA findings in Commission Resolution No. _____;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That pursuant to Planning Code Section 302 (b), the Planning Commission finds from the facts presented that the public necessity, convenience and general welfare require the approval of the proposed Zoning Map Amendments;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, The Planning Commission finds that the Glen Park Community Plan Zoning Map Amendments are, on balance, in conformity with the General Plan and the eight Priority Policies of Planning Code Section 101.1 and with the General Plan as proposed to be amended for the reasons set forth in Planning Commission Resolution No. _____ which accompanies this Resolution, and incorporates said findings herein by reference.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Planning Commission wishes to adopt amendments to the Zoning Maps, making changes height and bulk districts as described in the Glen Park Community Plan Initiation Package, dated October 20, 2011. Proposed Zoning Map

amendments are contained in the draft ordinance approved as to form by the City Attorney. The Commission also recommends this legislation to the Board of Supervisors;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission specifically authorizes the following additional changes to the Zoning Map Amendments legislation and directs staff to work with the City Attorney's Office to prepare a new version of the Zoning Map Amendment legislation to reflect these changes and submit the new version to the Board of Supervisors for its consideration: 1) add technical changes to address typographical errors, insert Zoning Map language adopted prior to approval, and similar technical changes; 2) revise the Zoning Map amendments to reflect the Commission's action on the Glen Park Community Plan Zoning Map Amendments; 3) incorporate any additional changes that the Planning Commission specifically identifies as part of its approval action on November 10, 2011;

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED by the City Planning Commission on November 10, 2011.

Linda Avery
Commission Secretary