SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Planning Commission Motion No. 18270

CEQA Findings

HEARING DATE: FEBRUARY 10, 2011

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Date:	January 27, 2011
Project Name:	**Parkmerced Mixed-Use Development Program**
Case Number:	2008.0021EPMTZW
Initiated by:	Seth Mallen, Parkmerced Investors, LLC 3711 – 19th Avenue San Francisco, CA 94132
Staff Contact:	Elizabeth Watty, Planner Elizabeth.Watty@sfgov.org, 415-558-6620
Reviewed By:	David Alumbaugh, Acting Director Citywide Planning David.Alumbaugh@sfgov.org, 415-558-6601
Recommendation:	**Adopt CEQA Findings**

ADOPTING PROJECT APPROVAL FINDINGS UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) TO ALLOW THE FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PARKMERCED MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM ("PROJECT"), BEING ALL OF ASSESSOR'S BLOCKS 7303-001, 7303-A-001, 7308-001, 7309-001, 7309-A-001, 7310-001, 7311-001, 7315-001, 7316-001, 7317-001, 7318-001, 7319-001, 7320-003, 7321-001, 7322-001, 7323-001, 7325-001, 7326-001, 7330-001, 7331-004, 7332-004, 7333-001, 7333-003, 7333-A-001, 7333-B-001, 7333-C-001, 7333-D-001, 7333-E-001, 7334-001, 7335-001, 7336-001, 7337-001, 7338-001, 7339-001, 7340-001, 7341-001, 7342-001, 7343-001, 7344-001, 7345-001, 7345-A-001, 7345-B-001, 7345-C-001, 7356-001, 7357-001, 7358-001, 7359-001, 7360-001, 7361-001, 7362-001, 7363-001, 7364-001, 7365-001, 7366-001, 7367-001, 7368-001, 7369-001, and 7370-001, IN THE RM-1 (RESIDENTIAL MIXED, LOW DENSITY), RM-4 (RESIDENTIAL MIXED, HIGH DENSITY), & RH-1(D) (RESIDENTIAL HOUSE, ONE-FAMILY, DETACHED) DISTRICTS.

PREAMBLE

In determining to approve the Parkmerced Project ("Project") described in Section A, Project Description below, the San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") makes and adopts the following findings of fact and decisions regarding mitigation measures and alternatives, and adopts the statement of overriding considerations, based on substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding and under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq., particularly Sections 21081 and 21081.5, the Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA ("CEQA Guidelines"), 14 California Code of Regulations Sections 15000 et seq., particularly Sections 15091 through 15093, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administration Code.

FINDINGS

The San Francisco Planning Commission hereby incorporates by reference as though fully set forth herein the findings for the Project approval of the Parkmerced Mixed-Use Development Program (hereinafter the "Project") attached hereto as **Exhibit A** pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, California Public Resources Code, Sections 21000 et seq. ("CEQA"), the Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, Title 15 California Code of Regulations Sections 15000 et. seq. ("Guidelines"), and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code ("Chapter 31"), entitled Environmental Quality:

A. Project Description

The Parkmerced Mixed-Use Development Program is a long-term (20-30 year) mixed-use development program to comprehensively replan and redevelop the Parkmerced Project Site—the "Project" identified in the Final EIR. The Project would increase residential density, provide a neighborhood core with new commercial and retail services, modify transit facilities, and improve utilities within the development site. A new site for a Pre-K-5 school and/or day care facility, a fitness center, and new open space uses, including athletic playing fields, walking and biking paths, an approximately 2-acre farm, and community gardens, would also be provided. About 1,683 of the existing apartments located in 11 tower buildings would be retained. Over an approximately 20-year period of phased construction, the remaining 1,538 existing apartments would be demolished in phases and fully replaced, and an additional 5,679 net new units would be added to the Project Site, resulting at full build-out in a total of about 8,900 units on the Project Site.

The Project includes construction of (or provides financing for construction of) a series of transportation improvements, which include rerouting the existing Muni Metro M Ocean View line from its current alignment along 19th Avenue. The new alignment, as currently envisioned and analyzed in the Final EIR, would leave 19th Avenue at Holloway Avenue and proceed through the neighborhood core in Parkmerced. The Muni M line trains would then travel alternately along one of two alignments: trains either would re-enter 19th Avenue south of Felix Avenue and terminate at the existing Balboa Park station, or they would terminate at a new station, with full layover and terminal facilities, constructed on the Project Site at the intersection of Font Boulevard and Chumasero Drive.

The Proposed Project also includes a series of infrastructure improvements, including the installation of a combination of renewable energy sources, such as wind turbines and photovoltaic cells, to meet a portion of the Proposed Project's energy demand. In addition, stormwater runoff from buildings and streets would be captured and filtered through a series of bioswales, ponds, and other natural filtration systems. The filtered stormwater would then either percolate into the groundwater that feeds the Upper Westside groundwater basin and Lake Merced or be released directly into Lake Merced.

Amendments to the San Francisco Planning Code and the San Francisco General Plan are also proposed as part of the Proposed Project. The Planning Code amendments would change the Height and Bulk District Zoning Map and would add a Special Use District (SUD) applicable to

the entire Project Site, which would include an overlay of density and uses within the SUD. A Development Agreement is also proposed as part of the Project, as well as adoption of the *Parkmerced Design Standards and Guidelines*, which contain specific development guidelines.

The Final EIR also evaluated a Project sub-variant, which would construct a right-turn ingress along 19th Avenue between Crespi Drive and Junipero Serra Boulevard at Cambon Drive. This new access location would provide ingress for southbound vehicles only and would not provide access out onto 19th Avenue.

B. Planning and Environmental Review Process

The Project Sponsor applied for environmental review on January 8, 2008. The Department determined that an Environmental Impact Report was required and provided public notice of the preparation of such on May 20, 2009, and held a public scoping meeting on June 8, 2009. The Department published a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) on May 12, 2010. The Commission held a public hearing to solicit testimony on the DEIR on June 17, 2010. The Department received written comments on the DEIR for 61-days, beginning on May 12, 2010. The Department published the Comments and Responses on October 28, 2010. The DEIR, together with the Comments and Responses document, constitute the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the Parkmerced Mixed-Use Development Program. The Commission certified the FEIR on February 10, 2011, in Motion No. 18629.

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code Section 21000 *et seq.*, (CEQA), Title 14 California Code of Regulations Section 15000 *et seq.* (CEQA Guidelines), and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, the Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the FEIR, which is available for public review at the Planning Department's offices at 1650 Mission Street.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, the Commission finds that the proposed actions before this Commission are within the scope of the project analyzed in the FEIR and (1) that no substantial changes are proposed in the Project and no substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which this Project will be undertaken that would require major revisions to the FEIR due to the involvement of any new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified effects and (2) no new information that was not known and could not have been known shows that the project will have any new significant effects not analyzed in the FEIR or a substantial increase in the severity of any effect analyzed or that new mitigation measures should be included that have not. The Commission further finds that an addendum to the FEIR is not required due to any changes in the Project or the Project's circumstances.

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

DECISION

That based upon the Record, the submissions by the Applicant, the staff of the Department and other interested parties, the oral testimony presented to this Commission at the public hearings, and all other written materials submitted by all parties, the Commission hereby adopts the CEQA Findings attached hereto as **Exhibit A** and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) attached hererto as **Exhibit B**, which are incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth.

I hereby certify that the Planning Commission ADOPTED the foregoing Motion on Thursday, February 10, 2011.

Linda D. Avery
Commission Secretary

AYES: Commissioners Antonini, Borden, Fong, and Miguel

NAYS: Commissioners Moore, Olague, and Sugaya

ABSENT:

ADOPTED: February 10, 2011

ATTACHMENT A

PARKMERCED PROJECT
CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT FINDINGS: FINDINGS OF FACT, EVALUATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES AND ALTERNATIVES, AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS
SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION

(Revised: February 3, 2011)

In determining to approve the Parkmerced Project ("Project") described in Section I, Project Description below, the San Francisco Planning Commission makes and adopts the following findings of fact and decisions regarding mitigation measures and alternatives, and adopts the statement of overriding considerations, based on substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding and under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq., particularly Sections 21081 and 21081.5, the Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA ("CEQA Guidelines"), 14 California Code of Regulations Sections 15000 et seq., particularly Sections 15091 through 15093, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administration Code.

This document is organized as follows:

Section I provides a description of the Project proposed for adoption, and, in the alternative, the No Muni Realignment Alternative, the environmental review process for the Project, the approval actions to be taken and the location of records;

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

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

Section IV identifies significant impacts that cannot be avoided or reduced to less-than-significant levels and describes any applicable mitigation measures as well as the disposition of the mitigation measures;

Section V identifies mitigation measures proposed but rejected as infeasible for economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations;

Section VI evaluates the different Project alternatives and the economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations that support approval of the Project and the rejection of the alternatives, or elements thereof, analyzed; and

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

The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") for the mitigation measures that have been proposed for adoption is attached with these findings as **Attachment B to Resolution No. _____**. The MMRP is required by CEQA Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091. Attachment B provides a table setting forth each mitigation measure listed in the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Project ("Final EIR") that is required to reduce or avoid a significant adverse impact. Attachment B also specifies the agency responsible for implementation of each measure and establishes monitoring actions and a monitoring schedule. The full text of the mitigation measures is set forth in Attachment B. These findings are based upon substantial evidence in the entire record before the Commission. The references set forth in these findings to certain pages or sections of the Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR" or "DEIR") or the Comments and Responses document ("C&R") 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.

I. APPROVAL OF THE PROJECT

A. Project Description

By this action, the San Francisco Planning Commission approves the long-term mixed-use development program to comprehensively replan and redesign the Parkmerced Project Site—the "Project" identified in the Final EIR. The Project would increase residential density, provide a neighborhood core with new commercial and retail services, modify transit facilities, and improve utilities within the development site. A new site for a Pre-K-5 school and/or day care facility, a fitness center, and new open space uses, including athletic playing fields, walking and biking paths, an approximately 2-acre farm, and community gardens, would also be provided. About 1,683 of the existing apartments located in 11 tower buildings would be retained. Over an approximately 20-year period of phased construction, the remaining 1,538 existing apartments would be demolished in phases and fully replaced, and an additional 5,679 net new units would be added to the Project Site, resulting at full build-out in a total of about 8,900 units on the Project Site.

The Project includes construction of (or provides financing for construction of) a series of transportation improvements, which include rerouting the existing Muni Metro M Ocean View line from its current alignment along 19th Avenue. The new alignment, as currently envisioned and analyzed in the Final EIR, would leave 19th Avenue at Holloway Avenue and proceed through the neighborhood core in Parkmerced. The Muni M line trains would then travel alternately along one of two alignments: trains either would re-enter 19th Avenue south of Felix Avenue and terminate at the existing Balboa Park station, or they would terminate at a new station, with full layover and terminal facilities, constructed on the Project Site at the intersection of Font Boulevard and Chumasero Drive.

The Proposed Project also includes a series of infrastructure improvements, including the installation of a combination of renewable energy sources, such as wind turbines and photovoltaic cells, to meet a portion of the Proposed Project's energy demand. In addition, stormwater runoff from buildings and streets would be captured and filtered through a series of bioswales, ponds, and other natural filtration systems. The filtered

stormwater would then either percolate into the groundwater that feeds the Upper Westside groundwater basin and Lake Merced or be released directly into Lake Merced.

Amendments to the San Francisco Planning Code and the San Francisco General Plan are also proposed as part of the Proposed Project. The Planning Code amendments would change the Height and Bulk District Zoning Map and would add a Special Use District (SUD) applicable to the entire Project Site, which would include an overlay of density and uses within the SUD. A Development Agreement is also proposed as part of the Project, as well as adoption of the *Parkmerced Design Standards and Guidelines*, which contain specific development guidelines.

The Final EIR also evaluated a Project "sub-variant", which would construct a right-turn ingress along 19th Avenue between Crespi Drive and Junipero Serra Boulevard at Cambon Drive. This new access location would provide ingress for southbound vehicles only and would not provide access out onto 19th Avenue. Although the Final EIR and these Findings refer to this as the "Project sub-variant", the Project approval documents may refer to this as the "Connect Cambon to 19th Avenue Project Variant" or "Project Variant"; both names refer to the same set of transportation improvements.

B. No Muni Realignment Alternative

The Project proposes to reroute the existing Muni Metro M Ocean View line from its current alignment along 19th Avenue, which would require the approval of the California Department of Transportation ("Caltrans") and the California Public Utilities Commission ("CPUC"). In the event that such approval is not granted, the approval granted by the San Francisco Planning Commission would permit the Project to proceed after identifying an alternate transportation improvement of equivalent value to the proposed rerouting of the existing Muni Metro M Ocean View line. In the event that Caltrans and CPUC approval is not granted, the San Francisco Planning Commission also makes and adopts the following findings of fact and decisions regarding mitigation measures and alternatives, and adopts the statement of overriding considerations, based on substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding and under CEQA, particularly Sections 21081 and 21081.5, the CEQA Guidelines, particularly Sections 15091 through 15093, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administration Code for the No Muni Realignment Alternative described in Section I.

Under the No Muni Realignment Alternative, the 152-acre site would be replanned and redesigned as it would with the Project, except that the Muni light rail line would not be routed through the Project Site, and no new Muni stops would be constructed. Under this alternative, the M Ocean View line would continue to bypass the Project Site, and would remain in its existing alignment to its terminus at the Balboa Park Station. Traffic and circulation improvements under the No Muni Realignment Alternative would be the same as those in the Project, except that there would be no northbound left-turn at the intersection of 19tgh Avenue and Crespi Drive, no fourth southbound travel lane would be constructed on 19th Avenue, and the SFSU transit stop would remain in the median of 19th Avenue.

A design variant studied under the No Muni Realignment Alternative is an analysis of the Project without Muni or any of the improvements identified along 19th Avenue. There would be minimal land use changes from the No Muni Realignment Alternative as a result of having no transit improvements implemented along 19th Avenue.

As with the Project, implementation of a sustainability plan would provide for a variety of new infrastructure improvements intended to reduce the alternative's per-unit use of electricity, natural gas, water, and the City's wastewater conveyance and treatment systems. A combination of renewable energy sources, including wind turbines and photovoltaic cells, would be used to meet a portion of this alternative's energy demand. In addition, stormwater runoff from buildings and streets would be captured and filtered through a series of bioswales, ponds, and other natural filtration systems. As with the Proposed Project, the filtered stormwater would then either percolate into the groundwater that feeds the Westside groundwater basin and Lake Merced or be released directly into Lake Merced.

The Commission approves the No Muni Realignment Alternative in the alternative to the Project, in the event that any non-City agency (such as Caltrans and the CPUC) disapproves the realignment of the M Ocean View line in the manner proposed by the Project. Although the Project is preferable to the No Muni Realignment Alternative, the Commission makes such approval in the alternative, because, overall, the Muni realignment is not a mitigation measure, the No Muni Realignment Alternative is identical to the Project in all other respects and therefore provides all the other major public benefits of the Project, and the Project Development Agreement requires that an alternate transportation improvement of equivalent economic value be identified and implemented if the Project's proposed realignment of the M Ocean View light rail line is not approved by all necessary non-City agencies.

C. Project Objectives

The Final EIR discusses several Project objectives identified by the Project Sponsor. The objectives are as follows:

- Adopt a land use program for Parkmerced that provides an innovative model of environmentally sustainable design practices, to, among other things maximize walking, bicycling and use of public transportation, and minimize the impacts and use of private automobiles by implementing a land use program with increased residential density and a commercial neighborhood core located within comfortable walking distance of transit service and residences.
- Increase the supply of housing near a new neighborhood core containing new neighborhood-serving retail, office, transit,
- Reconfigure the existing open space at Parkmerced to provide larger and more usable open spaces such as a major new park, athletic playing fields, organic farm, walking and bicycling paths, and community gardens.

- Reconnect Parkmerced to the Lake Merced watershed by restoring the pre-development hydrology.
- Provide high-density, mixed-income housing, including below-market rate units, with a variety of housing types consistent with transit-oriented development to attract a diversity of household types, especially families.
- Protect and enhance the diversity of Parkmerced by protecting existing residents from displacement through a phasing plan designed to ensure that all existing residents will be able to remain at Parkmerced while having to relocate once only and into a new apartment, if necessary, and that this new apartment would be rented at the same rent-controlled rate as the resident's existing apartment prior to demolition (and also subject to the existing protections against rent increases of the San Francisco Rent Control Ordinance).
- Make possible the construction of affordable below market rate units.
- Provide housing in an urban infill location to help alleviate the effects of suburban sprawl and protect the green belt.
- Create a circulation and transportation system designed to reduce the amount of future automobile traffic originating from Parkmerced and to improve traffic flow on adjacent roadways such as 19th Avenue and Brotherhood Way, and that emphasizes transit-oriented development, and promotes the use of public transportation and car-sharing, through an innovative and comprehensive demand management program.
- Construct major infrastructure improvements intended to demonstrate leadership in sustainable engineering and to reduce the neighborhood's per capita use of the City's electrical, natural gas, water, and wastewater infrastructure while demonstrating pioneering leadership in sustainable design and through providing new benchmarks for sustainable development practices in accordance with the Project's Sustainability Plan, such as orienting street grids and open spaces to optimize solar exposure and to reduce winds; installing efficient light and HVAC systems; installing low-flow plumbing; and planting drought-tolerant species to minimize irrigation demands
- Create a development that is financially feasible, that allows for the delivery of the proposed level of infrastructure, public benefits, protections for existing tenants, and affordable housing, and that can fund the Project's capital costs and on-going operation and maintenance costs relating to the redevelopment and long-term operation of the Property.
- Create a level of development sufficient to support the costs of relocating and protecting existing tenants and sufficient to support the costs of the infrastructure improvements.

D. Environmental Review

The Project Sponsor applied for environmental review on January 8, 2008. Pursuant to and in accordance with the requirements of Section 21094 of the Public Resources and in accordance with Sections 15063

and 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, the San Francisco Planning Department, as lead agency, prepared a Notice of Preparation ("NOP") on May 20, 2009, and held a Public Scoping Meeting on June 8, 2009.

The NOP was distributed to the State Clearinghouse and mailed to: governmental agencies with potential interest, expertise, and/or authority over the project; interested members of the public; and occupants and owners of real property surrounding the project area. The Public Scoping Meeting was held at the YMCA Annex, 3150 20th Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94132. Twenty-seven individuals spoke at the Public Scoping Meeting. During the public review period, 26 comment letters were submitted to the Planning Department by public agencies and other interested parties. The Public Scoping Summary Report is included as Appendix A of the Draft EIR. Commenters identified the following topics to be evaluated in the Draft EIR: Land Use; Aesthetics; Population and Housing; Historic Resources/Preservation; Transportation; Air Quality; Wind; Recreation and Open Space; Utilities (Water, Stormwater) and Sustainability; Biological Resources; Geology; Hazards; Hydrology and Water Quality; Hazards; and Alternatives.

The San Francisco Planning Department then prepared the Draft EIR, which describes the Project and the environmental setting, identifies potential impacts, presents mitigation measures for impacts found to be significant or potentially significant, and evaluates Project Alternatives. In assessing construction and operational impacts of the Project, the Draft EIR considers the impact of the Project and the cumulative impacts associated with the proposed Project in combination with other past, present, and future actions with potential for impacts on the same resources. Each environmental issue presented in the Draft EIR is analyzed with respect to significance criteria that are based on the San Francisco Planning Department Major Environmental Analysis Division ("MEA") guidance regarding the environmental effects to be considered significant. MEA guidance is, in turn, based on CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, with some modifications.

The Department published the Draft EIR on May 12, 2010. The Draft EIR was circulated to local, state, and federal agencies and to interested organizations and individuals for review and comment beginning on May 12, 2010 for a 61-day public review period, which ended on July 12, 2010. The San Francisco Planning Commission held a public hearing to solicit testimony on the Draft EIR on June 17, 2010. A court reporter was present at the public hearing, transcribed the oral comments verbatim, and prepared written transcripts. The Planning Department also received written comments on the Draft EIR, which were sent through mail, fax, or email.

The San Francisco Planning Department then prepared the Comments and Responses ("C&R"). This document, which provides written response to each comment received on the Draft EIR, was published on October 28, 2010 and included copies of all of the comments received on the Draft EIR and individual responses to those comments. The C&R provided additional, updated information and clarification on issues raised by commenters, as well as Planning Department staff-initiated text changes. This Commission reviewed and considered the Final EIR, which includes the Draft EIR, the C&R document and any Errata Sheets, and all of the supporting information and certified the Final EIR on February 10, 2010. In certifying the Final EIR, this Planning Commission determined that the Final EIR does not add

significant new information to the Draft EIR that would require recirculation of the Final EIR under CEQA because the Final EIR contains no information revealing (1) any new significant environmental impact that would result from the Project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented, (2) any substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified environmental impact, (3) any feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed that would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the Project, but that was rejected by the Project's proponents, or (4) that the Draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

D. Approval Actions

1. Planning Commission Actions

The Planning Commission is taking the following actions and approvals:

- Review and recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to approve an ordinance adopting a Development Agreement.
- Review and recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to approve an ordinance adopting a new Parkmerced SUD setting forth heights, bulk, density and uses.
- Review and recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to adopt an ordinance amending the San Francisco Zoning Map Height and Bulk Maps.
- Review and approval of amendments to the *General Plan* Urban Design Element height map for consistency with the proposed SUD.

2. Zoning Administrator Actions

- Determination of consistency with the Local Coastal Program and approval of a Coastal Zone Permit.

3. San Francisco Board of Supervisors Actions

The Planning Commission's certification of the Final EIR may be appealed to the Board of Supervisors. If appealed, the Board of Supervisors will determine whether to uphold the certification or to remand the Final EIR to the Planning Department for further review.

Additional actions to be taken by the Board of Supervisors include:

- Review and approval of an ordinance adopting a Development Agreement.
- Approval of amendments to the Planning Code Height and Bulk Maps and the *General Plan* Urban Design Element height map.
- Approvals to vacate existing streets and accept dedication of new streets.
- Review and approval of an ordinance adopting a new Parkmerced SUD setting forth heights, bulk, density and uses.

- Review of the proposed improvements to Brotherhood Way and other City streets and approval of those improvements.
- Request for amendment of the Local Coastal Program by the California Coastal Commission.

4. Other—Federal, State, and Local Agencies

Implementation of the Project will involve consultation with or required approvals by other local, state and federal regulatory agencies, including, but not limited to, the following:

- Department of Public Works (Approval of a subdivision map).
- Executive Director and Board of Directors of the Municipal Transit Agency (SFMTA) (Approval of the proposed realignment of the Muni M Ocean View light rail line through Parkmerced and other potential changes to the Municipal Railway system).
- California Department of Transportation [Caltrans] District 4, California Public Utilities Commission [CPUC] and San Francisco State University [SFSU] (Approval of the proposed realignment of the Muni M Ocean View light rail tracks across 19th Avenue into and out of the Project Site and other modifications to State Route 1 (Junipero Serra Boulevard), including installation of additional travel and turn lanes and reconfiguration of median landscaping).
- Department of Public Works and Planning Department (Review of the proposed improvements to Brotherhood Way and other City streets and approval of those improvements).
- SFMTA and the Transportation Advisory Staff Committee (TASC) (Coordination of all roadway and transit changes).
- California Department of Fish and Game (Issuance of an incidental take permit, if necessary, pursuant to Section 2081 of the California Endangered Species Act for operation of 51 wind turbines).

- California Coastal Commission approval of Coastal Zone Permits and for amendment of the Local Coastal Program.

U. S. Army Corps of Engineers (Issuance of a Section 404 Permit pursuant to the Clean Water Act for construction of an on-site stormwater filtration system and discharge of the filtered water to Lake Merced, if necessary).To the extent that the identified mitigation measures require consultation with or approval by these other agencies, the Planning Commission urges these agencies to assist in implementing, coordinating, or approving the mitigation measures, as appropriate to the particular measure.

E. Findings About Significant Environmental Impacts And Mitigation Measures

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

redundancy, and because the Planning Commission agrees with, and hereby adopts, the conclusions in the Final EIR, these findings will not repeat the analysis and conclusions in the Final EIR, but instead incorporates them by reference herein and relies rely upon them as substantial evidence supporting these findings.

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

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

As set forth below, the Planning Commission adopts and incorporates the mitigation measures set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP, except as to mitigation measures specifically rejected in Section V below, to substantially lessen or avoid the potentially significant and significant impacts of the Project. The Planning Commission intends to adopt the mitigation measures proposed in the Final EIR, with the exception of those specifically rejected in Section V below. Accordingly, in the event a mitigation measure recommended in the Final EIR has inadvertently been omitted in these findings or the MMRP, such mitigation measure is hereby adopted and incorporated in the findings below by reference. In addition, in the event the language describing a mitigation measure set forth in these findings or the MMRP fails to accurately reflect the mitigation measures in the Final EIR due to a clerical error, the language of the policies and implementation measures as set forth in the Final EIR shall control. The impact numbers and mitigation measure numbers used in these findings reflect the information contained in the Final EIR.

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

F. Location and Custodian of Records

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. The Planning Commission Secretary, Linda Avery, is the custodian of records for the Planning Department and the Planning Commission.

II. IMPACTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT AND THUS DO NOT REQUIRE MITIGATION

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.). Based on the evidence in the whole record of this proceeding, the Planning Commission finds that implementation of the Proposed Project will not result in any significant impacts in the following areas and that these impact areas therefore do not require mitigation:

Land Use

- Physically divide an established community or have a substantial adverse impact on the character of the vicinity.
- Create incompatible cumulative land use impacts on established communities.

Aesthetics

- Transform the visual character of the Project Site.
- Affect scenic vistas from publicly accessible areas.
- Be a prominent new visual feature at the western perimeter of the Project Site (wind turbines).
- Increase the lighting requirements within the Project Site and the potential for glare.
- Contribute to cumulative impacts on visual quality and scenic vistas.

Population and Housing

- Induce substantial direct temporary population growth during project construction.
- Induce substantial employment growth in an area either directly or indirectly.
- Displace substantial numbers of people and/or existing housing units or create demand for additional housing, necessitating the construction the construction of replacement housing.
- Induce substantial project-level or cumulative population growth in the area either directly or indirectly.

Transportation and Circulation

- Create significant traffic impacts at four study intersections *(19th Avenue/Juniper Serra Boulevard; 19th Avenue/Ocean Avenue; Brotherhood Way/West Driveway Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox and Open Bible Churches; John Muir Drive/Lake Merced Boulevard)* that operate at LOS E or LOS F under Existing Conditions.

- Add transit trips to the Downtown Screenlines in excess of available capacity (Project). (Downtown Screenlines examine the overall utilization of Muni transit capacity into and out of downtown San Francisco from the northeast, northwest, and southwest of San Francisco.)
- Add transit trips to the Downtown Screenlines, but would not increase demands in excess of available capacity (Project sub-variant).
- Add transit trips to the Regional Screenlines in excess of available capacity and contribute significantly to Regional Screenlines where overall ridership is projected to exceed available capacity (Project). (Regional Screenlines examine regional transit service for the locations where different regional transit services enter San Francisco.)
- Add transit trips to the Regional Screenlines, but would not increase demands in excess of available capacity (Project sub-variant).
- Create a significant impact due to the construction of bicycle facilities within the Project Site to serve additional users.
- Create a significant impact due to the construction of pedestrian facilities within the Project Site to serve additional users.
- Create a significant impact due to an increase the need for loading spaces.
- Affect air traffic.
- Create hazards due to any proposed design features.
- Result in significant emergency access impacts.
- Significantly contribute traffic at six study intersections (*Junipero Serra Boulevard/Ocean Avenue/Eucalyptus Drive; 19th Avenue/Junipero Serra Boulevard; 19th Avenue/Ocean Avenue; 19th Avenue/Eucalyptus Drive; Brotherhood Way/West Driveway Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox and Open Bible Churches; and Holloway Avenue/Varela Avenue*) that would operate at LOS E or F under 2030 cumulative conditions.
- Contribute to cumulative increases in transit ridership at the Downtown Screenlines so as to exceed available capacity.
- Contribute to cumulative increases in transit ridership at the Downtown Screenlines so as to exceed available capacity (Project sub-variant).
- Contribute to cumulative increases in transit ridership at the Regional Screenlines so as to increase demand in excess of available capacity or contribute significantly to Regional Screenlines where overall cumulative ridership is projected to exceed available capacity.
- Contribute to cumulative increases in transit trips to the Regional Screenlines so as to increase demand in excess of available capacity or contribute significantly to Regional Screenlines where overall cumulative ridership is projected to exceed available capacity (Project sub-variant).

Air Quality

- Result in localized construction dust-related air quality impacts.
- Affect regional air quality due to Project construction (*But see Impact AQ-11, regarding 2010 BAAQMD Guidelines, Significant and Unavoidable Impact).*

- Result in a substantial amount of vehicle trips that could cause or contribute to an exceedance of the CO ambient air quality standards due to Project operation.
- Expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of toxic air contaminants due to Project operation *(But see Impact AQ-12 and Impact AQ-15, regarding 2010 BAAQMD Guidelines, Significant and Unavoidable Impact)*.
- Result in operation-related impact to CO ambient air quality standards under 2010 BAAQMD Guidelines.
- Generate significant odors.
- Conflict with adopted plans related to air quality.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- Result in a substantial contribution to global climate change by increasing GHG emissions in a manner that conflicts with the state goal of reducing GHG emissions in California to 1990 levels by 2020 (e.g., a substantial contribution to global climate change.
- Conflict with San Francisco's Climate Action Plan or impede implementation of the local GHG reduction goals established by the San Francisco 2008 Greenhouse Gas Reduction Ordinance.

Wind and Shadow

- Result in an increase in the number of hours that the 26-mph wind hazard criterion is exceeded or an increase in the area that is subjected to winds greater than 26 mph (Representative project only, not the proposed SUD).
- Would not result in a cumulative increase in the number of hours that the 26-mph wind hazard criterion is exceeded or an increase in the area that is subjected to winds greater than 26 mph (Representative project only, not the proposed SUD).
- Adversely affect the use of any park or open space under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission.
- Create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas.
- Cumulatively adversely affect the use of any park or open space under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission or create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas.

Recreation

- Increase the use of existing park and recreational facilities to such an extent that there would be a significant adverse effect on these facilities.
- Significantly contribute to cumulative impacts on recreational use to existing public parks or recreational facilities.

Utilities and Services Systems

- Increase the demand for water to such an extent that there would be a significant adverse impact.

- Contribute considerably to significant cumulative impacts on water supply.
- Require new water delivery infrastructure to adequately serve the Project Site.
- Cumulatively result in for a need for new water delivery infrastructure.
- Require new or expansion of wastewater collection or treatment facilities to adequately serve the Project Site.
- Contribute considerably to cumulative impacts on wastewater conveyance and treatment due to Project operation.
- Exceed the solid waste disposal capacity of the Project-serving landfill.
- Contribute considerably to cumulative impacts on solid waste disposal facilities.

Public Services

- Result in a need for new or physically altered facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for police protection.
- Cumulatively result in a need for new or physically altered facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for police protection.
- Result in a need for new or physically altered facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection and emergency medical services.
- Cumulatively result in a need for new or physically altered facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection and emergency medical services.
- Result in additional demand for educational facilities, either at the project-level or cumulatively.
- Cumulatively result in the additional demand for educational facilities.

Biological Resources

- Conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.
- Result in substantial adverse cumulative effects to biological resources.

Geology and Soils

- Expose people or structures to potential adverse effects due to ground shaking, ground failure, or liquefaction.
- Be located on unstable soil, or could become unstable as a result of the Proposed Project, and potentially result in soil instability or soil corrosivity.
- Be located on corrosive soils.
- Result in significant cumulative impacts with respect to geology, soils or seismicity.

Hydrology and Water Quality

- Result in an increase of combined sewer overflows from the City’s combined sewer system.
- Result in depletion of groundwater or reduction of groundwater levels.

- Contribute runoff water due to Project operation that would exceed the capacity of the existing stormwater drainage system or create substantial additional sources of polluted runoff due to Project operation.
- Place housing or structures within a 100-year flood hazard area or expose people or structures to a significant risk involving flooding.
- Be susceptible to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.
- Contribute significantly to cumulative impacts on hydrology and water quality due to Project construction.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- Create a hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.
- Result in hazardous emissions or use of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.
- Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- Expose people or structures to a risk of loss, injury or death involving fires.
- Result in cumulative hazardous materials impacts.

Mineral and Energy Resources

- Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource and/or a locally important mineral resource recovery.
- Encourage activities that could result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use these in a wasteful manner.

Agricultural Resources and Forest Lane

- Result in the conversion of farmland, or involve other changes that would result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.
- Result in conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use or Williamson Act contracts.
- Negatively affect forests or timberland.

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

CEQA requires agencies to adopt mitigation measures that would avoid or substantially lessen a project's identified significant impacts or potential significant impacts if such measures are feasible (unless mitigation to such levels is achieved through adoption of a project alternative). The findings in this Section III and in Section IV concern mitigation measures set forth in the EIR. These findings discuss mitigation measures and improvement measures as identified in the Final EIR for the Proposed Project. The full text of the mitigation measures and improvement measures is contained in the Final EIR and in Attachment B, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. The Planning Commission finds that

the impacts identified in this Section III would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of the mitigation measures contained in the Final EIR, included in the Proposed Project, or imposed as conditions of approval and set forth in Attachment B.

This Commission recognizes that some of the mitigation measures are partially within the jurisdiction of other agencies. The Commission urges these agencies to assist in implementing these mitigation measures, and finds that these agencies can and should participate in implementing these mitigation measures.

Impact CR-3: Project construction activities could disturb significant archaeological resources, if such resources are present within the Project Site.

There is a reasonable presumption that significant subsurface archaeological features are present within the Project Site. For example, Lake Merced would have provided resources for native Ohlone people, resulting in the possibility of subsurface artifacts. Historical accounts indicate that the Mission San Francisco de Asis used the Lake Merced area as a corral for mission-owned livestock. Following Mission ownership, a Spanish cattle rancher may have had a corral in the vicinity of the Project Site. The Spring Valley Water company operated a pump station at Lake Merced, and two dwellings associated with this pump station were reported to be located on the Project Site. If subsurface artifacts encountered during construction of the Proposed Project were not appropriately handled, it could be a significant impact.

Mitigation Measure M-CR-3a: Archaeological Testing, Monitoring, Data Recovery, and Reporting for Phase I

Mitigation Measure M-CR-3b: Archaeological Treatment Plan for Subsequent Project Phases

Impact CR-4: Project construction activities could disturb human remains, if such resources are present within the Project Site.

Prehistoric human burials could be encountered if Native Americans used the area near Lake Merced. Loss of these materials during construction would be a significant impact.

Mitigation Measure M-CR-3a: Archaeological Testing, Monitoring, Data Recovery, and Reporting for Phase I

Mitigation Measure M-CR-3b: Archaeological Treatment Plan for Subsequent Project Phases

Impact CR-5: Project construction activities could disturb paleontological resources.

Project construction activities could disturb significant paleontological resources, if such resources are present within the site in the sedimentary Colma Formation, which has yielded vertebrate fossils in other locations on the San Francisco peninsula. This would be a significant impact.

Mitigation Measure M-CR-5: Paleontological Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Program

Impact CR-6: Disturbance of archaeological and paleontological resources within the Project Site could contribute to a cumulative loss in the ability of the site to yield significant historic and scientific information.

When considered with other past and proposed development projects along and near the San Francisco shoreline, the disturbance of archaeological and paleontological resources within the Project Site could contribute to this cumulative loss.

Mitigation Measure M-CR-3a: Archaeological Testing, Monitoring, Data Recovery, and Reporting for Phase I

Mitigation Measure M-CR-3b: Archaeological Treatment Plan for Subsequent Project Phases

Mitigation Measure M-CR-5: Paleontological Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Program

Impact TR-2: Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in significant traffic impacts at study intersections (Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation for the intersection at 19th Avenue/Crespi Drive only)

The project's impacts at the intersection of 19th Avenue/Crespi Drive would be due primarily to the new northbound left-turn lane from 19th Avenue to Crespi Drive, proposed as part of the Project.

Mitigation Measure M-TR-2A: Do not construct the proposed northbound left-turn lane from 19th Avenue onto Crespi Drive

Impact TR-3b: Implementation of the Proposed Project would contribute to significant cumulative traffic impacts at 14 study intersections (Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation for the intersection at 19th Avenue/Crespi Drive only)

The project's contribution to a cumulative impact at the intersection of 19th Avenue/Crespi Drive would be due primarily to the new northbound left-turn lane from 19th Avenue to Crespi Drive, proposed as part of the Project.

Mitigation Measure M-TR-2A: Do not construct the proposed northbound left-turn lane from 19th Avenue onto Crespi Drive

Impact TR-21: The Proposed Project would reroute the M Ocean View light rail line into the Project Site, extending its route and imparting an additional five minutes of travel time to complete each run. Without additional light rail vehicles, Muni could not operate this longer route at current headways.

The Proposed Project's extension of the light rail route into Parkmerced would make the route longer, reducing transit capacity. This would be a significant impact. Although this impact was identified in the Draft EIR as significant and unavoidable due to uncertainty with regard to whether the proposed

mitigation measures were feasible, (see DEIR p. V.E.88) the SFMTA has subsequently determined that Mitigation Measure M-TR-21A is feasible.

M-TR-21A: Purchase an additional two-car light rail vehicle for the M Ocean View.

Or

M-TR-21B: Install Transit Signal Priority (TSP) treatments to improve transit travel times on the M Ocean View such that M-TR-21A (an additional vehicle) is not required.

Implementing either mitigation measure would maintain transit headways and reduce the impact to less-than-significant levels. Although implementation of M-TR-21A is feasible, implementation of measure M-TR-21B is preferred because it would maintain transit headways and improve travel times for riders. Implementation of measure M-TR-21B would require feasibility studies and discretionary actions by SFMTA and Caltrans and is therefore uncertain at this time. Because either mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level, and because it is known at this time that M-TR-21A is feasible, this impact can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Because M-TR-21B appears preferable, the Commission urges SFMTA and Caltrans to perform feasibility studies and implement measure M-TR-21B if feasible, and if not feasible, requires implementation of M-TR-21A.

Impact NO-1: Project-related construction activities would increase noise levels above existing ambient conditions.

Construction noise would be substantially greater than existing ambient noise levels and would have the potential to result in significant impacts to existing sensitive receptors. Although proposed construction activities would occur over a period of approximately 20 years, the activities that would impact sensitive receptors in any one location would be temporary. Construction contractors would be required to comply with the San Francisco Noise Ordinance. Additional mitigation would be needed to reduce noise levels to a less than significant level.

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

Mitigation Measure M-NO 1b: Pile Driving Noise-Reducing Techniques and Muffling Devices

Impact NO-2: Construction activities could expose persons and structures to excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels.

Impact activities such as pile driving could produce detectable vibration within nearby buildings during construction, and could be detectable by sensitive receptors. This could be a significant impact.

Mitigation Measure M-NO-2: Pre-construction Assessment to Minimize Vibration Levels Associated with Impact Activities.

Impact NO-6: Proposed residences and other sensitive uses would be located in incompatible noise environments.

Existing noise levels exceed 65 dBA (Ldn) in some locations. The Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Community Noise (see Figure V.F.2) indicate that any new residential construction in areas with noise levels above 65 dBA (Ldn) must have a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements is made and needed noise insulation features are included in the design. The Land Use Compatibility Guidelines indicate that analysis of noise reduction features should occur for the proposed Pre-K-5 school and day care facility. Without adequate design, these uses could be subject to significant impacts due to traffic-generated noise.

Mitigation Measure M-NO-6: Residential Use Plan Review by Qualified Acoustical Consultant

Impact NO-8: Garbage collection would occur at different locations and could increase associated noise levels at elevated receivers.

When garbage is collected, the residences nearest and overlooking refuse containers would experience higher noise levels than the more distant units. In some locations this would be a significant noise impact unless it is accounted for in building design.

Mitigation Measure M-NO-8: Residential Building Plan Review by Qualified Acoustical Consultant

Impact BI-1: Construction of an outfall for discharge of stormwater runoff into the willow basin could affect the habitat of San Francisco gumplant and other special-status plant species.

Construction activities in the willow basin south of Brotherhood Way where stormwater from the Project Site may flow prior to discharge to Lake Merced could impact an existing population of San Francisco gumplant, which is considered rare or endangered in California and elsewhere. Impacting the designated gumplant would be significant.

Mitigation Measure M-BI-1a: Pre-construction Survey for Gumplant

Mitigation Measure M-BI-1b: Avoidance During Construction

Mitigation Measure M-BI-1c: Restoration and Expansion of Gumplant Population That Is Not Avoided in Measure M-BI-1b

Impact BI-2: Construction of an outfall for stormwater runoff into Lake Merced could affect habitats of special-status animal species.

If discharge of treated stormwater to Lake Merced is implemented, construction of a new outfall or restoration of an existing outfall into the Lake could impact the habitat of the salt marsh common yellowthroat or the western pond turtle, both California Species of Special concern, which would be a significant impact.

Mitigation Measure M-BI-2a: Pre-construction Survey for Common Yellowthroat Nesting Activities and Buffer Area

Mitigation Measure M-BI-2b: Monitoring for Western Pond Turtles During Construction

Mitigation Measure M-BI-2c: SWPPP Design Details for Site Drainage and Water Quality Control in Outfall Construction Area

Impact BI-3: Construction of a new stormwater outfall, or restoration of an existing one, would affect freshwater marsh and other riparian habitat along the shore of Lake Merced and in the willow basin.

To repair the existing stormwater outfall(s) at the shoreline of Lake Merced, or to install a new one(s), marsh and riparian vegetation, such as willow and wax myrtle trees, would be removed from the construction zone. This is a potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measure M-BI-2c: SWPPP Design Details for Site Drainage and Water Quality Control in Outfall Construction Area

Mitigation Measure M-BI-3a: Restrict Vegetation Removal Activities in Wetland and Riparian Areas During Outfall Construction

Mitigation Measure M-BI-3b:Vegetation Restoration in Outfall Construction Area

Impact BI-4: Removing trees and shrubs could remove migratory bird habitat and impede the use of nesting (nursery) sites.

Vegetation removal and/or building demolition during the breeding season (approximately March through August) could remove trees, shrubs, and/or buildings that support active nests. This is a potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measure M-BI-4: Breeding Bird Pre-construction Surveys and Buffer Areas

Impact BI-5: The Proposed Project could have an adverse effect on wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

To repair the existing stormwater outfall(s) at the shoreline of Lake Merced or to install a new one(s), marsh and riparian vegetation would be removed from a construction zone and directing stormwater from the Project Site to the willow basin prior to discharge to Lake Merced could affect riparian vegetation, including wetlands, which would be a significant impact.

Mitigation Measure M-BI-2c: SWPPP Design Details for Site Drainage and Water Quality Control in Outfall Construction Area

Mitigation Measure M-BI-3a: Restrict Vegetation Removal Activities in Wetland and Riparian Areas During Outfall Construction

Mitigation Measure M-BI-3b: Vegetation Restoration in Outfall Construction Area

Impact BI-7: Maintenance of the proposed stormwater treatment system (bioswales, constructed stream, wetlands, and ponds) could affect special-status animal species.

The proposed on-site stormwater treatment bioswales, stream, wetlands, and ponds would be planted with native wetland and riparian vegetation that would support native wildlife, including special-status species such as western pond turtle, and protected nesting birds. Although this would be considered a beneficial impact and an enhancement of habitat values, periodic vegetation or sediment removal for maintenance of the treatment system could adversely impact those species, which is a potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measure M-BI-7a: Pre-maintenance Surveys for Active Bird Nests and Buffer Areas

Mitigation Measure M-BI-7b: Monitoring During Maintenance Activities

Impact BI-9: Construction of new building towers could adversely impact bird or bat movement and migration.

The proposed new high-rise towers could result in bird injuries and death from collisions with glass panels or windows. This would be a significant impact.

Mitigation Measure M-BI-9: Bird-Safe Design Practices

Impact BI-10: Changes in duration and depth of inundation in the willow basin from stormwater runoff could impact riparian vegetation.

The large specimens of wax myrtle growing in the bottom of the willow basin may not be able to withstand an increase in inundation depth or duration. Although wax myrtle is not a special-status plant species, these trees provide a locally unique component of the sensitive riparian habitat in the willow basin and an increase in inundation depth and duration may adversely affect them, which could be a significant impact.

Mitigation Measure M-BI-10: Study and Modification to Willow Basin To Control Water Level and Duration of Inundation

Impact GE-1: The Proposed Project could result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil during construction.

Existing ground coverings would be removed during construction, exposing soil to wind and rainwater runoff erosion. This is a potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measure HY-1: Best Management Practices for SWPPP

Impact HY-1: The Proposed Project could violate a water quality standard or a waste discharge requirement, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.

During construction of the Proposed Project, existing vegetation and pavements would be temporarily removed and surface soils would be disturbed due to excavation and grading activities on the Project Site. Stormwater runoff could cause erosion and entrainment of sediments from the exposed soils. If not managed properly, the sediments would be carried in watercourses and cause sediments to be discharged to the sewer system where they would reduce the capacity of the sewer lines, potentially causing sewer overflows. The potential for releases of fuels, oils, paints, and solvents is present at most construction sites. Once released, these chemicals would flow or be carried by stormwater runoff, wash water, and dust control water to the sewer, potentially reducing the quality of the receiving waters. This would be a significant impact.

Mitigation Measure M-HY-1: Best Management Practices for SWPPP

Impact HY-4: The Proposed Project could alter the existing drainage patterns on the Project Site, resulting in substantial erosion or siltation or localized flooding.

Excavation and grading of the Project Site during the construction phases of the Proposed Project would remove existing vegetation and pavements, thus exposing the sandy soil of the Project Site to erosion by runoff, which could be a significant impact.

Mitigation Measure M-HY-1: Best Management Practices for SWPPP

Impact HZ-2: The Proposed Project could create a hazard to the public or the environment through the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment.

A limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment investigation was conducted, and soil samples showed minimal evidence of chemical releases from the former maintenance activities in the vicinity of the Maintenance Building and the fan room at the Higuera parking garage. The concentrations of chemicals detected do not pose a threat to human health or the environment based on U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region IX health-based screening values. Further, the concentrations are below levels that typically may lead to a requirement for cleanup by regulatory agencies, and thus are not considered significant environmental concerns. Although soil contamination in significant amounts is not expected, if previously unidentified soil contaminants exist, hazardous materials could be released into the environment, resulting in a significant impact.

Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2A: Hazardous Materials – Testing for and Handling of Contaminated Soil

Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2B: Hazards – Decontamination of Vehicles

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

Based on substantial evidence in the whole record of these proceedings, the Planning Commissions finds that, where feasible, changes or alterations have been required, or incorporated into, the Proposed Project to reduce the significant environmental impacts as identified in the Final EIR and listed below. The Commission finds that the mitigation measures in the Final EIR and described below are appropriate, and that changes have been required in, or incorporated into, the Proposed Project that, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21002 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, may substantially lessen, but do not avoid (i.e., reduce to less-than-significant levels), the potentially significant environmental effects associated with implementation of the Proposed Project that are described below. The Commission adopts all of the mitigation measures and improvement measures set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP), attached as Attachment B. The Commission further finds, however, for some of the impacts listed below, despite the implementation of feasible mitigation measures and improvement measures, the effects remain significant and unavoidable.

Based on the analysis contained within the Final EIR, other considerations in the record, and the significance criteria identified in the Final EIR, the Planning Commission finds that because some aspects of the Proposed Project could cause potentially significant impacts for which feasible mitigation measures are not available to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level, those impacts are significant and unavoidable. The Planning Commission recognizes that although mitigation measures are identified in the Final EIR that would reduce some significant impacts, the measures are uncertain or infeasible for reasons set forth below, and therefore those impacts remain significant and unavoidable or potentially significant and unavoidable.

The Planning Commission 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 Commission 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.

Impact AE-1: The proposed demolition of the existing garden apartment buildings and the proposed removal of the existing landscaping would eliminate a visual/scenic resource of the built environment.

To implement the Proposed Project, all of the two-story garden apartment buildings within the Project Site (170 buildings) would be demolished, along with existing landscaping and mature trees throughout most of the Project Site, thereby eliminating a visual/scenic resource of the built environment. Due to extensive reconstruction and regrading on the Project Site, about 82 percent of trees would be removed from the Project Site or relocated throughout the planned 20-year phased construction period. These changes are significant impacts.

No feasible mitigation is available that would preserve most of the existing visual character of the Project Site yet allow the Proposed Project to be substantially implemented. Demolition of most of this visual/scenic resource is necessary to implement the Proposed Project and realize its objectives, which include provision of high-density housing and implementation of environmentally sustainable design practices. The Proposed Project could not be implemented without demolition of most of the existing visual/scenic resource. Therefore, this impact remains significant and unavoidable and no mitigation measures are available.

Impact CR-1: The proposed demolition of the existing garden apartment buildings and removal of existing landscape features on the Project Site would impair the historical significance of the Parkmerced historic district historical resource.

The Parkmerced residential complex is eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources as a historic district. Demolition of all of the two-story garden apartment buildings and removal of all of the interior landscaping on the Project Site would be a significant impact.

Mitigation Measure M-CR-1: Documentation and Interpretation

Implementation of this mitigation measure would not be sufficient to reduce the significant impact to less-than-significant levels. The impact remains significant and unavoidable. No feasible mitigation is available that would preserve the essential integrity of the Parkmerced complex and still allow the Proposed Project to be implemented, as demolition of most of the historical resource is necessary for implementation.

Impact CR-2: The proposed demolition of the existing garden apartment buildings and removal of existing landscape features on the Project Site would contribute to a cumulative impact on the historic significance of the Parkmerced historic district historical resource.

The Parkmerced historic district resource encompasses the entire original Parkmerced complex, including the Project Site and three properties owned by others. The owners of the other three properties are planning for future redevelopment of their respective parcels, which, in combination with the Proposed Project, would result in a significant cumulative impact.

Mitigation Measure M-CR-1: Documentation and Interpretation

Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce the contribution of the Proposed Project to significant cumulative impacts on historical resources, but not to a less-than-significant level. No feasible mitigation is available that would preserve the integrity of the Parkmerced complex. Therefore, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

Impact TR-1: Construction of the Proposed Project (with or without the proposed sub-variant) would result in transportation impacts in the Proposed Project vicinity due to construction vehicle traffic and road construction associated with the realignment of the existing light rail tracks.

The primary construction truck routes in the Project Study Area would be Lake Merced Boulevard, Brotherhood Way, 19th Avenue, and Junipero Serra Boulevard. During the construction period, temporary and intermittent disruption to existing and proposed transit routes and bus stops may occur, and some bus routes may need to be temporarily rerouted. In addition, temporary and intermittent interference with transit operations caused by increased truck movements to and from the construction sites may occur. Due to the reduction in travel lanes, the remaining travel lanes would become more congested with automobiles, trucks and buses, which would pose a greater challenge for bicycle travel in the area. Given the magnitude of development proposed for the area, the Proposed Project's prolonged construction period, and the lack of certainty about the timing of other development projects in the area, significant Project-related and significant Project contributions to cumulative traffic and circulation impacts could occur on some roadways, such as Lake Merced Boulevard, Brotherhood Way, 19th Avenue, and Junipero Serra Boulevard. Implementation of individual traffic control plans would minimize impacts associated with each project and reduce each project's contribution to cumulative impacts in the Study Area.

Mitigation Measure M-TR-1: Parkmerced Construction Traffic Management Program

Given the magnitude of the proposed development and the duration of the construction period, some disruptions and increased delays could still occur even with implementation of M-TR-1, and it is possible that significant construction-related transportation impacts on local San Francisco and regional roadways could still occur. Construction-related transportation impacts therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

Impact TR-2: Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in significant traffic impacts at study intersections.

Of the 34 study intersections, 13 are projected to operate at unacceptable levels of service (LOS) under existing conditions with the Proposed Project during at least one peak hour. At 6 of the 13 study intersections with unacceptable operations, the Proposed Project would result in project-specific impacts:

- 19th Avenue/Sloat Boulevard – LOS E to LOS F in the AM peak hour;
- 19th Avenue/Winston Drive – LOS D to LOS E in the weekend midday peak hour;
- Sunset Boulevard/Lake Merced Boulevard – LOS C to LOS E in the PM peak hour;
- Lake Merced Boulevard/Winston Drive – LOS C to LOS E in the AM peak hour and LOS D to LOS F in the PM peak hour;
- Lake Merced Boulevard/Font Boulevard – LOS D to LOS F in the AM peak hour and LOS C to LOS F in the PM peak hour; and
- Lake Merced Boulevard/Brotherhood Way – LOS D to LOS E in the AM peak hour, LOS C to LOS F in the PM peak hour, and LOS C to LOS E in the weekend midday peak hour.

Mitigation measures to reduce significant impacts at the intersections of 19th Avenue/Sloat Boulevard and 19th Avenue/Winston Drive are infeasible. Additional travel lanes would be needed along 19th Avenue at both intersection, requiring acquisition of substantial additional right-of-way and demolition of existing occupied structures. In addition, 19th Avenue is under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and outside of the jurisdiction or control of the Planning Commission.

Widening the 19th Avenue roadway would increase the pedestrian crossing distance at both intersections, which is inconsistent with San Francisco's goal of improving pedestrian circulation and safety in the Parkmerced Study Area. At the 19th Avenue/Winston Drive intersection, restriping the eastbound shared through-left-turn lane as a dedicated left-turn lane would result in a dual left-turn lane configuration; and would improve LOS to acceptable levels without widening the roadway and would improve LOS. However, it would present a pedestrian safety conflict by providing a dual left-turn lane operating on the same phase as a conflicting crosswalk with high pedestrian volumes at the entrance to a major shopping center. Therefore, implementation of such a measure would be inconsistent with the City's goals of promoting walking and bicycling and is infeasible.

Mitigation measures are available to reduce significant impacts to less-than-significant levels at the remainder of the identified intersections. However, in a number of cases the mitigation measure is infeasible or the feasibility of mitigation is uncertain and requires additional discretionary actions by other agencies and/or additional feasibility studies by other agencies outside of the City's jurisdiction prior to implementation.

Mitigation Measure M-TR-2B: Install a traffic signal at Sunset Boulevard/Lake Merced Boulevard

Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce significant impacts at the intersection of Sunset Boulevard/Lake Merced Boulevard to less-than-significant levels; however, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) has evaluated the feasibility of this measure and has found that it is infeasible due to specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations, as more fully set forth in Section V below. Because this mitigation measure is infeasible, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure M-TR-2C: Construct a dedicated northbound right-turn lane from Lake Merced Boulevard to eastbound Winston Drive

Full implementation of this measure is uncertain due to the adjacent unsignalized intersection, approximately 75 feet south of Winston Drive, which would conflict with the northbound right-turn lane. Further study by SFMTA is required to determine whether full implementation of this mitigation measure is feasible. If feasible, implementation of this measure would reduce significant impacts at the intersection of Lake Merced Boulevard/Winston Drive to less-than-significant levels. Because the efficacy of this measure to fully reduce the impact to less-than-significant levels is currently uncertain, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure M-TR-2D: Provide a third northbound through lane and a second southbound left-turn lane at the Lake Merced Boulevard/Font Boulevard intersection

The measure would improve operations at the intersection of Lake Merced Boulevard/Font Boulevard to acceptable levels and the impact would be less than significant. The feasibility of this measure is uncertain, as substantial roadway restriping and signal optimization and coordination at multiple additional intersections would be necessary. In addition, provision of dual left-turn lanes against a pedestrian signal may be considered a safety hazard for pedestrians. Further study by SFMTA is required

to determine feasibility of full implementation of this measure. Because the feasibility of this measure is currently uncertain, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

> *Mitigation Measure M-TR-2E: Reconfigure the westbound right-turn and southbound left-turn as the primary movements of the intersection at the Lake Merced Boulevard/Brotherhood Way*

The SFMTA has determined that this mitigation measure is feasible; however, the intersection would continue to operate at an unacceptable LOS F during both the AM and PM peak hours even with implementation of this measure. Therefore, although operations would be substantially improved, this impact remains significant and unavoidable even with mitigation.

Impact TR-3: Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in considerable traffic contributions at study intersections that operate at LOS E or LOS F under Existing Conditions

Vehicle trips generated by the Proposed Project would contribute significantly to critical movements at two intersections that currently operate at unacceptable LOS E or F. This is a significant traffic impact.

- Junipero Serra Boulevard/Sloat Boulevard/St. Francisco Boulevard/Portola Drive – LOS F during the weekday PM peak hour and weekend midday peak hour.
- Junipero Serra Boulevard/John Daly Boulevard/I-280 Northbound On-Ramp/I-280 Southbound Off-Ramp/SR 1 Northbound On-Ramp – LOS F during the weekday PM peak hour

No feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce the Proposed Project's contribution to unacceptable levels of service at these intersections. At the Junipero Serra/Sloat/St. Francis/Portola complex intersection, the presence of the M Ocean View and K Ingleside light rail tracks in the center median and the constrained right-of-way makes addition of more travel lanes infeasible. Acquisition of substantial right-of-way and demolition of existing privately-owned and occupied structures, reducing the City's tax base, would be required. In addition, a wider intersection would increase pedestrian crossing distances across Junipero Serra Boulevard, which is inconsistent with the City's goal of improving pedestrian circulation and safety. Therefore, the impact at this intersection is significant and unavoidable.

At the Junipero Serra/I-280 Ramps/SR-1 Ramp intersection, the complex geometry of the intersection and constrained environment make additional lanes infeasible. Considerable additional right-of-way would be necessary, requiring acquisition of private property and demolition of occupied structures. In addition, this location is in Daly City, and the I-280 Ramps are under the jurisdiction of Caltrans; both are outside the jurisdiction of the City and County of San Francisco. Therefore, the impact at this intersection is significant and unavoidable.

Impact TR-6: Implementation of the sub-variant in conjunction with the Proposed Project would result in the same traffic impacts at study intersections as identified in Impacts TR-2, TR-3, and TR-4 for conditions with the Proposed Project.

The sub-variant would include a right-turn ingress from 19th Avenue into the Project Site at Cambon Drive for southbound vehicles; no access from the Project Site to 19th Avenue would be provided. Impact TR-4 would be less-than-significant with the Proposed Project, as listed in Section II above. With the sub-variant, impacts TR-2 and TR-3 remain significant and unavoidable as discussed above.

Impact TR-8: Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in significant traffic impacts on one freeway segment.

The freeway mainline segment on southbound State Route 1 (SR 1, Junipero Serra Boulevard) between the on-ramp from Brotherhood Way and the off-ramp to John Daly Boulevard would deteriorate from LOS E in the PM peak hour to LOS F with the addition of project-generated traffic. No feasible mitigation is available to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Additional mainline capacity would be necessary, requiring acquisition of considerable additional right-of-way and demolition of existing occupied structures. In addition, a portion of this segment is located in Daly City, and the freeway is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans; therefore, any mitigation would be outside the jurisdiction of the City and County of San Francisco. The impact remains significant and unavoidable.

Impact TR-9: Implementation of the Proposed Project would have significant traffic impacts at two freeway segments that operate at LOS E or LOS F under Existing Conditions.

The Proposed Project would result in a significant increase in traffic volumes in the PM peak hour on the freeway segment of northbound SR 1 (Juniper Serra Boulevard) between the on-ramp from Brotherhood Way and the off-ramp to Brotherhood Way, contributing significantly to an existing LOS F operating condition. The Proposed Project would result in a significant increase in traffic volumes in the AM and PM peak hours on the freeway segment of southbound State Route 1 (Junipero Serra Boulevard) between the on-ramp from Brotherhood Way and the direct off-ramp at John Daly Boulevard.

> *Mitigation Measure M-TR-9: Eliminate the weaving segment between the loop on-ramp from Brotherhood Way and the loop off-ramp to Brotherhood Way by reconfiguring the interchange*

This mitigation measure would affect northbound SR1 ramps, and would improve the weaving section operations to acceptable LOS in the AM and PM peak hours. The feasibility of measure is uncertain because it requires discretionary action Caltrans to approve a design exception, which is outside the jurisdiction of the City. Therefore, because the feasibility of this mitigation measure is uncertain and outside the jurisdiction of the City, the impact remains significant and unavoidable. The Planning Commission urges CalTrans to implement this measure.

Impact TR-11: Implementation of the sub-variant, either in conjunction with the Proposed Project or the Project Variant would have significant traffic impacts at the same freeway segments expected to experience significant traffic impacts associated with the Proposed Project, as identified in Impacts TR-8 and TR-9.

The sub-variant would not change travel demand or traffic volumes generated by the Proposed Project, and the impacts would be the same as those identified for the Proposed Project. See findings for Impacts TR-8 and TR-9, above.

Impact TR-12: Implementation of the Proposed Project would exceed the available transit capacity of transit routes serving the Project Study Area.

Project-related transit trips would cause the Study Area northeast screenline to exceed Muni's capacity utilization standard of 85 percent in the outbound (toward Parkmerced) direction during the PM Peak

Hour. (The Study Area northeast screenline examines Muni capacity utilization for the M Ocean View at the perimeter of the Study Area.) This would be a significant Project impact.

Mitigation Measure M-TR-12: Contribute fair share toward purchase of additional transit vehicles (and maintenance and operating costs associated with those additional vehicles) to increase capacity on the M Ocean View

Providing additional capacity by adding additional cars to the M Ocean View line during the PM peak hour would all the M Ocean View to operate under 85 percent capacity utilization. A potentially feasible means of increasing capacity would be to increase the frequency of service on the M Ocean View by allocating additional trains; however, the subway along Market Street currently operates at capacity and it may not be feasible to increase frequency of service on the M Ocean View without impacting service levels on other transit lines. Such a change would require a revised service plan, which is outside the scope of the impact caused by the Proposed Project. Additionally, even if it were determined to be physically possible to increase service capacity on the M Ocean View, doing so would require a funding commitment in perpetuity from the SFMTA and the Board of Supervisors. Accordingly, full implementation and the effectiveness of this measure are uncertain and this impact remains significant and unavoidable.

Impact TR-14: Implementation of the sub-variant would result in significant impacts on the same Muni Study Area Screenlines as identified in Impact TR-12 for the Proposed Project.

The sub-variant would not change travel demand or transit capacity compared to the Proposed Project. See the findings under Impact TR-12, above.

Impact TR-22: Implementation of the Proposed Project would contribute traffic to existing traffic volumes at intersections along the Lake Merced Boulevard corridor, which would increase travel times and impact operations of the 18 46th Avenue bus line.

Project-related transit delays due to congestion along Lake Merced Boulevard and passenger loading delays associated with increased ridership would result in significant impacts on the operation of the 18 46th Avenue bus line during the AM and PM peak hours. Although the 18 46th Avenue route may change in the future, it would be replaced in part by the 17 Parkmerced, with the same significant impact. Therefore, mitigation measures would apply to whichever bus route is in place at the time.

Mitigation Measure M-TR-22A: Construct intersection mitigations to reduce congestion caused by vehicular delay.

Mitigation measure M-TR-22A would construct the intersection improvements identified in measures M-TR-2C, M-TR-2D, and M-TR-2E, above. This measure alone would improve conditions but would not reduce the impact to less-than-significant levels and the impact would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

Mitigation Measure M-TR-22B: Maintain the proposed headways of the 18 46th Avenue

Feasibility of this measure is uncertain due to the need for further study. In addition, it would conflict with mitigation measure M-TR-2C. Thus, even if the conflict with M-TR-2C were resolved and this

measure fully implemented, the its success at reducing the impact to less-than-significant levels remains uncertain and the impact remains significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

> *Mitigation Measure M-TR-22C: Purchase additional transit vehicles as necessary to mitigate the Project impacts to headways on the 18 46th Avenue.*

Although this measure appears feasible, implementation of this measure alone, without either measure M-TR-2A or M-TR-2B, may not reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. Accordingly, because implementation of this mitigation measure may not reduce the impact to less-than-significant, the feasibility and efficacy of the other mitigation measures is uncertain at this time, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

Impact TR-23: Implementation of the Proposed Project would contribute traffic to existing traffic volumes at intersections along the 19th Avenue corridor, which would increase travel times and affect operations of the 17 Parkmerced.

Project-related transit delays due to congestion on 19th Avenue between Holloway Avenue and Winston Drive and passenger loading delays associated with increased ridership would result in significant impacts on the operation of the 17 Parkmerced bus route during the PM peak hour.

> *Mitigation Measure M-TR-23: Maintain the proposed headways of the 17 Parkmerced, by implementing transit-only lanes along the length of 19th Avenue between Holloway Avenue and Winston Drive if feasible.*

Implementation of measure M-TR-23 would require substantial study and public outreach and would result in secondary traffic impacts associated with removal of a traffic lane. For this and other specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations, as more fully set forth in Section V below, the SFMTA has determined that this measure is infeasible. Because this mitigation measure is infeasible, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

Impact TR-24: Implementation of the Proposed Project would contribute traffic to existing traffic volumes at intersections along the 19th Avenue corridor, which would increase travel times and affect operations of the 28 19th Avenue and 28L 19th Avenue Limited.

Project-related transit delays due to congestion on 19th Avenue and passenger loading delays associated with increased ridership would result in significant impacts on the operation of the 28 19th Avenue and 28L 19th Avenue Limited bus lines.

> *M-TR-24: Implement the Project Variant (i.e., conversion of the fourth southbound lane to high-occupancy vehicle, toll, and transit-only use).*

Implementation of the Project Variant would require substantial additional study and public outreach, and would result in secondary traffic impacts associated with the removal of a mixed-flow traffic lane on 19th Avenue. Additionally, implementation would require discretionary approval by Caltrans. For this and other specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations, as more fully set forth in Section V below, the SFMTA has determined that this measure is infeasible. Because this mitigation measure is infeasible, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

Impact TR-25: Implementation of the Proposed Project would contribute traffic to existing traffic volumes at intersections along the Sunset Boulevard, Lake Merced Boulevard, Winston Drive, and 19th Avenue corridors, which would increase travel times and affect operations of the 29 Sunset.

Project-related transit delays due to congestion along sunset Boulevard, Lake Merced Boulevard, Winston Drive, and 19th Avenue, and passenger loading delays associated with increased ridership would result in significant impacts to the operation of the 29 Sunset bus line in the PM peak hour.

> *Mitigation Measure M-TR-25A: Implement mitigation measure M-TR-23, which addresses transit improvements (i.e. transit-only lanes) along 19th Avenue from Holloway Avenue to Winston Drive*
>
> *Mitigation Measure M-TR-25B: Maintain the proposed headways of the 29 Sunset*
>
> *Mitigation Measure M-TR-25C: Purchase additional transit vehicles as necessary to mitigate the Project impacts to headways on the 29 Sunset.*

As noted above, Mitigation Measure M-TR-23, called for in Mitigation Measure M-TR-25A, was found to be infeasible; this finding also applies to M-TR-25A. In addition, implementation of M-TR-25A alone is not expected to eliminate the need for an additional transit vehicle in the PM peak hour. Therefore, the impact remains significant and unavoidable even if Mitigation Measure M-TR-25A were feasible.

Implementation of measure M-TR-25B requires further study by the SFMTA to determine its feasibility, which is not known at this time. Implementation of measure M-TR-25C alone, without M-TR-25A or M-TR-25B, may not be sufficient to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. In summary, implementation of measures that together would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level are infeasible or uncertain at this time. Therefore, impacts on the 29 Sunset bus line remain significant and unavoidable.

Impact TR-26: Implementation of the Proposed Project would contribute traffic to existing traffic volumes at intersections along the Lake Merced Boulevard corridor, which would increase travel times and affect operations of a SamTrans bus line along this facility.

SamTrans Route 122 would experience substantial delays at key intersections along Lake Merced Boulevard, including at Brotherhood Way, Higuera Avenue, and Font Boulevard. This would be a significant impact in the AM and PM peak hours.

> *Mitigation Measure M-TR-26: Maintain proposed headways on SamTrans Route 122 by implementing mitigation measures M-TR-22A (land modifications at intersections along Lake Merced Boulevard) and M-TR-22B (implementation of transit priority treatment on Lake Merced Boulevard).*

See findings above regarding mitigation measures M-TR-22A and M-TR-22B.

Impact TR-28: Implementation of the sub-variant would contribute traffic to existing traffic volumes at intersections along key transit corridors, which would cause congestion and increase travel times and impact operations of transit lines. With implementation of the sub-variant, the

Proposed Project would have the same significant impacts as identified for the Proposed Project in Impacts TR-21 to TR-26.

With implementation of the sub-variant, the impacts on transit travel times would be nearly identical to the Proposed Project and remain significant and unavoidable.

See findings above regarding Impacts TR-21 to TR-26 and related mitigation measures.

Impact TR-36: Implementation of the Proposed Project would contribute to significant cumulative traffic impacts at 14 study intersections.

Of the 34 study intersections, 20 intersections would operate at unacceptable LOS E or F in at least one peak hour under 2030 cumulative conditions. Of those intersections, the Proposed Project would contribute considerably to critical congested movements at the following 14 intersections and the Project's contribution to cumulative impacts would be significant:

- Junipero Serra Boulevard/Sloat Boulevard/St. Francis Boulevard/Portola Drive
- Junipero Serra Boulevard/John Daly Boulevard/I-280 Northbound On-Ramp/I-280 Southbound Off-Ramp/SR 1 Northbound On-Ramp
- 19th Avenue/Sloat Boulevard
- 19th Avenue/Winston Drive
- 19th Avenue/Holloway Avenue
- 19th Avenue/Crespi Drive
- Brotherhood Way/Chumasero Drive
- Sunset Boulevard/Lake Merced Boulevard
- Lake Merced Boulevard/Winston Drive
- Lake Merced Boulevard/Font Boulevard
- Lake Merced Boulevard/Brotherhood Way
- Lake Merced Boulevard/John Muir Drive
- John Daly Boulevard/Lake Merced Boulevard
- Lake Merced Boulevard/Gonzalez Drive

Mitigation measures for the Proposed Project's contribution to significant cumulative impacts at these intersections are infeasible for the reasons set forth here:

- Junipero Serra Boulevard/Sloat Boulevard/St. Francis Boulevard/Portola Drive
- Junipero Serra Boulevard/John Daly Boulevard/I-280 Northbound On-Ramp/I-280 Southbound Off-Ramp/SR 1 Northbound On-Ramp

Mitigation measures to reduce significant cumulative impacts and the Proposed Project's contribution to the cumulative impacts at these locations are infeasible for the same reasons identified in the finding for Impact TR-3, above. Therefore, the Project's contribution to the cumulative impacts at these intersections is significant and unavoidable.

- 19th Avenue/Sloat Boulevard
- 19th Avenue/Winston Drive

Mitigation measures to reduce the Proposed Project's contribution to significant cumulative impacts at these locations are infeasible for the same reasons identified in the finding for Impact TR-2, above. Therefore, the Proposed Project's contribution to the cumulative impacts at these intersections is significant and unavoidable.

- 19th Avenue/Holloway Avenue

  Mitigation Measure M-TR-36A: Retime signal at 19th Avenue/Holloway Avenue to allocate more green time to the east-west movements.

Implementation of this measure would achieve acceptable operations at the intersection of 19th Avenue / Holloway Avenue. However, 19th Avenue is a coordinated corridor with closely spaced intersections where the traffic signal timing is interconnected. Traffic progression relies on the interconnectivity between each signal. Retiming the signal at this intersection would require evaluation of the entire corridor, and is the responsibility of the SFMTA. The efficacy of this measure is uncertain at this time, and will require SFMTA's evaluation of the entire corridor. Therefore, the ability of this measure to mitigate the impact is uncertain at this time, and the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- Brotherhood Way/Chumasero Drive

  M-TR-36B: Construct a dedicated westbound right-turn lane and convert the shared westbound through/right-turn lane to a dedicated westbound through lane at the Brotherhood Way/Chumasero Drive intersection.

Although implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce the Proposed Project's significant cumulative impact to a less-than-significant level, it may not be feasible. If the existing pedestrian overcrossing across Brotherhood Way at this intersection were to remain, widening the roadway to implement this measure may not be feasible due to conflicts with structural support columns for the overcrossing. Therefore, the ability of this measure to mitigate the impact is uncertain at this time, and the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- Sunset Boulevard/Lake Merced Boulevard

  Mitigation Measure M-TR-2B: Install a traffic signal at Sunset Boulevard/Lake Merced Boulevard

Implementation of this measure is infeasible for the same reasons as identified in the finding related to Impact TR-2, Mitigation Measure M-TR-2B, above. Therefore, the Proposed Project's contribution to the significant impact at this intersection remains significant and unavoidable.

- Lake Merced Boulevard/Winston Drive

  Mitigation Measure M-TR-2C: Construct a dedicated northbound right-turn lane from Lake Merced Boulevard to eastbound Winston Drive

The effectiveness of this measure is uncertain for the same reasons as identified in the finding related to Impact TR-2, Mitigation Measure M-TR-2C, above. In addition, implementation would improve operations but would remain at an unacceptable LOS E in the PM peak hour. Therefore, the Proposed Project's contribution to cumulative impacts at this intersection remains significant and unavoidable.

- Lake Merced Boulevard/Font Boulevard

  Mitigation Measure M-TR-2D: Provide a third northbound through lane and a second southbound left-turn lane at the Lake Merced Boulevard/Font Boulevard intersection

Implementation of this measure would improve operations at this intersection, but not such that operations would improve to an acceptable LOS D or better under 2030 cumulative conditions. Additional capacity would be necessary, including providing a dual right-turn lane in the westbound direction. However, a dual right-turn lane against a pedestrian signal is considered a safety hazard and would be inconsistent with the City's goals of promoting walking and bicycling. Therefore, in addition to the finding of infeasibility for Mitigation Measure M-TR-2D presented above, other potential mitigation measures to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level would be infeasible for pedestrian safety reasons, and the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- Lake Merced Boulevard/Brotherhood Way

  Mitigation Measure M-TR-2E: Reconfigure the westbound right-turn and southbound left-turn as the primary movements at the intersection of Lake Merced Boulevard and Brotherhood Way

Implementation of this measure would improve operations at this intersection, but it would continue to operate at LOS F during both the AM and PM peak hours. A second northbound left-turn lane would be needed in addition to this mitigation measure to reduce the Proposed Project's contribution to significant cumulative impacts to a less-than-significant level and provide an acceptable LOS. However, provision of dual northbound left-turn lanes would present a pedestrian safety conflict with the crosswalk on the northern leg of the intersection. Implementation of such a measure would be inconsistent with the City's goals of promoting walking and bicycling. Therefore, because Mitigation Measure M-TR-2E alone would not reduce the impact to less-than-significant levels, and additional mitigation measures to reduce the impacts at this intersection are infeasible for pedestrian safety reasons, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- Lake Merced Boulevard/John Muir Drive

  Mitigation Measure M-TR-36C: Install a traffic signal at Lake Merced Boulevard/John Muir Drive

Implementation of this measure would improve intersection operations to acceptable levels, reducing significant cumulative impacts to a less-than-significant level. Project Sponsor shall contribute a fair share toward funding this mitigation measure; however, full funding, for this measure is uncertain at this time. Therefore, the feasibility of this mitigation measure to fully mitigate the impact is uncertain, and the impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

- John Daly Boulevard/Lake Merced Boulevard

Mitigation Measure M-TR-36D: Convert the dedicated southbound through lane into a dedicated left-turn lane at John Daly Boulevard/Lake Merced Boulevard

Implementation of this measure would improve intersection operations to acceptable levels, reducing significant cumulative impacts to a less-than-significant level. Project Sponsor shall contribute a fair share toward funding this mitigation measure. Full funding is uncertain, and implementation of this measure is under the jurisdiction of the City of Daly City. Therefore, the feasibility of this mitigation measure is uncertain and thus currently considered infeasible because it is outside the jurisdiction of the City and County of San Francisco. The impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- Lake Merced Boulevard/Gonzalez Drive

  Mitigation Measure M-TR-36E: Install and auxiliary lane from Brotherhood Way through the Lake Merced Boulevard/Gonzalez Drive intersection to provide three northbound through lanes

Implementation of this measure would improve intersection operations to acceptable levels, reducing significant cumulative impacts in the PM peak hour. The SFMTA has determined that further study is required to determine feasibility of this measure, and thus the ability of this measure to fully mitigate the impact is uncertain at this time. The Proposed Project's contribution to cumulatively significant impacts remains significant and unavoidable.

- 19th Avenue/Holloway Avenue

  Mitigation Measure M-TR-36A: Retime signal at 19th Avenue/Holloway Avenue to allocate more green time to the east-west movements

The efficacy of this mitigation measure is uncertain for the same reasons as identified in the discuss of M-TR-36A, above. Therefore the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

Impact TR-39: Implementation of the sub-variant in conjunction with the Proposed Project would result in the same significant cumulative traffic impacts at study intersections as identified in Impacts TR-35 and TR-36 for cumulative conditions with the Proposed Project.

The sub-variant would involve constructing a right-turn ingress along 19th Avenue between Crespi Drive and Junipero Serra Boulevard at Cambon Drive. The anticipated impact of this sub-variant in conjunction with the Proposed Project is minor. Mitigation measures identified for Impacts TR-35 and TR-36 would be the same for Impact TR-39 and the findings made above are applicable to this impact and related mitigation measures.

Impact TR-41: Implementation of the Proposed Project would contribute to significant cumulative traffic impacts at four freeway segments.

The four freeway segments that would be significantly affected by project-generated traffic in 2030 cumulative conditions are:

- Southbound SR 1 (Junipero Serra Boulevard): Weaving Segment Between Direct On-Ramp from Brotherhood Way and Direct Off-ramp to John Daly Boulevard

- Northbound SR 1 (Junipero Serra Boulevard): Basic segment between Off-Ramp to Northbound I-280 and On-Ramp from John Daly Boulevard
- Northbound SR 1 (Junipero Serra Boulevard): Weaving Segment between On-Ramp from John Daly Boulevard and Off-Ramp to Alemany Boulevard

These three freeway segments are located in Daly City and would require creating additional lanes on the freeway. Because they are in Daly City and the freeway is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans, any mitigation measures that would improve service levels to acceptable levels are uncertain and currently considered infeasible as outside the jurisdiction of the City and County of San Francisco. Therefore, the Proposed Project's contribution to significant cumulative impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

- Northbound SR 1 (Junipero Serra Boulevard): Weaving Segment Between Loop On-Ramp from Brotherhood Way and Loop Off-ramp to Brotherhood Way

The Proposed Project would increase volumes on this segment of SR 1 by over 40 percent in the PM peak hour. This is a cumulatively considerable contribution and is a significant impact.

> *Mitigation Measure M-TR-9: Eliminate the weaving segment between the loop on-ramp from Brotherhood Way and the loop off-ramp to Brotherhood Way by reconfiguring the interchange*

Although this mitigation measure would reduce the Proposed Project's contribution to significant cumulative impacts to less-than-significant levels, it is infeasible for the same reasons provided in the discussion of Impact TR-9, above, and the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

Impact TR-43: Implementation of the sub-variant would contribute to significant cumulative traffic impacts at four freeway segments expected to experience significant cumulative traffic impacts under future conditions with the Proposed Project, as identified in Impact TR-41.

The sub-variant would not affect travel demand or roadway configurations at Study Area freeway facilities. Therefore, the findings presented for Impact TR-41 are applicable to Impact TR-43.

Impact TR-44: The Proposed Project would contribute transit ridership to Study Area screenlines expected to exceed available capacity under 2030 cumulative conditions.

For the northeast screenline, the Proposed Project would contribute considerably to ridership demand that would exceed the capacity utilization threshold of 85 percent in both the AM peak hour (inbound, toward downtown) and the PM peak hour (outbound, toward Parkmerced). (The northeast screenline examines Muni capacity utilization for the M Ocean View at the perimeter of the Study Area.) Mitigation that would reduce this contribution to a significant cumulative impact is infeasible for the same reasons as discussed in Impact TR-12, above. Therefore, the contribution to cumulatively significant impacts on this screenline is significant and unavoidable.

For the south and north screenlines, the Proposed Project would contribute to capacity utilization greater than 85 percent in the PM peak hour; the Proposed Project would also contribute to capacity utilization greater than 85 percent in the AM peak hour on the 28 19th Avenue bus line at the south screenline. (The south screenline examines Muni capacity utilization for the 28 19th Avenue and the 28L 19th Avenue

Limited. The north screenline examines Muni capacity utilization for the 18 46th Avenue, the 28 19th Avenue, the 28L 19th Avenue Limited and the 29 Sunset). This would be a significant cumulative impact.

> *Mitigation Measure M-TR-44: Provide additional capacity on the south and north screenlines by adding additional buses to the 28 19th Avenue and 28L 19th Avenue Limited lines.*

Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce cumulative impacts on the south and north screenlines to less-than-significant levels. Although San Francisco has a transit impact fee funding mechanism, it does not apply to residential projects. Therefore, while the project sponsor would be responsible for a fair share contribution toward the measure, full funding is not available to implement the measure, and the measure is infeasible. In addition, further feasibility and capacity studies by SFMTA would be required prior to implementation. Therefore, the mitigation measure is outside the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission. The impacts remain significant and unavoidable.

Impact TR-46: Implementation of the sub-variant would result in significant impacts on the same Muni Study Area Screenlines as identified in Impact TR-44 for the Proposed Project.

The Project sub-variant would not affect cumulative travel demand or transit capacity at Study Area screenlines, compared to the Proposed Project. Therefore, mitigation for this impact is infeasible for the same reasons as provided in Impact TR-44 and the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

Impact NO-3: Project-related traffic would increase noise levels above existing ambient conditions.

The Parkmerced Project would contribute to significant weekday traffic noise level increases along Gonzalez Drive, on the new roadway segment connecting Lake Merced Boulevard to the interior of the Project Site, in existing residences that remain unchanged and occupied when the new road is placed into service. The impact would occur until these residences were demolished and replaced with new, high-density residential buildings in a later phase of development

No feasible mitigation is available that would reduce traffic noise level increases along the affected portion of Gonzalez Drive. Relocating all tenants in existing buildings that remain along this new portion of Gonzalez Drive would reduce the impact to less-than-significant levels; however, relocation opportunities for these existing residents are not assured at this time. Therefore, while temporary, this impact is significant and unavoidable.

Impact NO-4: Increases in traffic from the project in combination with other development would result in cumulative noise increases.

Based on baseline and future traffic projections developed as part of the transportation analysis for the Proposed Project, the Proposed Project would contribute to significant cumulative roadside noise levels along Gonzalez Drive along the new roadway segment connecting Lake Merced Boulevard to the interior of the Project Site in existing residential units that remain occupied when the new roadway is in use. The significant cumulative noise impact would continue until these residences were demolished and replaced with new, high-density residential buildings in a later phase of development.

No feasible mitigation is available that would reduce cumulative traffic noise level increases along the affected portion of Gonzalez Drive. Relocating all tenants in existing buildings that remain along this new portion of Gonzalez Drive would reduce the impact to less-than-significant levels; however, relocation opportunities for these existing residents are not assured at this time. Therefore, this impact is significant and unavoidable.

Impact NO-5: Project-related light rail noise and vibration levels would increase above existing ambient conditions.

Light rail noise and vibration would have the potential to result in a significant increase in ambient noise and vibration conditions at the nearest sensitive receptor locations.

Mitigation Measure M-NO-5: Light Rail Noise and Vibration Reduction Plan

Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-5 would ensure that the proposed realignment of the light rail line and its operations would be designed in a manner that would reduce the potentially significant noise and vibration impacts to a less-than-significant level. However implementation requires discretionary approval actions by the SFMTA, is outside the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission, and is therefore considered uncertain. Therefore, this mitigation measure is currently considered infeasible and thus impact remains significant and unavoidable. The Planning Commission urges the SFMTA to implement this measure.

Impact NO-7: Operation of stationary noise sources (e.g., district energy system, wind, turbines, fire station and police and fire substation(s), etc.) would increase existing noise levels, potentially exceeding noise level standards.

Operation of these noise sources would cause potentially significant impacts to the adjacent land uses including residences and other noise sensitive uses within the Project Site and near the Project Site boundaries.

Mitigation Measure M-NO-7: Stationary Operational Noise Sources

Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-7 would achieve compliance with the noise level limits of the San Francisco Noise Ordinance and achieve acceptable levels at the property lines of nearby residences or other noise sensitive uses, as determined by the San Francisco Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Community Noise standards. However, shielding the wind turbines and other stationary noise sources from noise sensitive land uses may diminish the utility or efficiency of the systems. In addition, specific information about the design of the stationary noise sources is not available and the feasibility and effectiveness of the noise attenuation that could be featured with the final designs are not known at this time. Therefore, this impact remains significant and unavoidable.

Impact AQ-3: Construction of the Proposed Project could expose persons to substantial levels of toxic air contaminants, which may lead to adverse health effects.

The Proposed Project could increase cancer risk from exposure to emissions of DPM and other TACs associated with off-road construction equipment and on-road haul trucks used during construction of the Proposed Project. Although most residents would have limited exposure either because construction would be occurring at substantial distances from their units or because construction activities would occur for about five years or less in any one location, there is potential for some residents to remain and relocate in such a way that their exposure could result in significant health risks.

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3: Construction Exhaust Emissions

Implementation of construction emission control measures would reduce DPM exhaust emissions by implementing feasible controls and requiring up-to-date equipment, but the potential remains for receptors closest to the construction to be exposed. Therefore this impact remains significant and unavoidable.

Impact AQ-4: The Proposed Project's operations could affect regional air quality.

The Proposed Project would result in an increase in criteria pollutant emissions that would be considered significant under BAAQMD significance thresholds.

No feasible mitigation measures are available beyond the extensive transportation demand management (TDM) program and other features of the proposed Sustainability Plan minimizing energy use that would reduce emissions below the BAAQMD significance thresholds. Therefore, this impact is significant and unavoidable.

Impact AQ-9: The Proposed Project could result in cumulative air quality impacts.

The Proposed Project would exceed BAAQMD significance thresholds for criteria pollutants, resulting in significant contributions to air quality impacts in the region.

No feasible mitigation is available that would reduce cumulative air quality impacts, as discussed above under Impact AQ-4 regarding the Proposed Projects effects on regional air quality. Therefore, this impact is significant and unavoidable.

Impact AQ-11: The Proposed Project could result in construction-related impacts to regional air quality under the 2010 guidelines.

The 2010 BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines specifies that average daily construction emissions greater than 54 pounds per day of ROG, NOx, and $PM_{2.5}$, or 82 pounds per day PM_{10}, would be a significant increase. Because of the considerable levels of construction activities, the construction emissions under the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines would be significant and unavoidable and no additional mitigation measures are available.

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3: Construction Exhaust Emissions

Given current technologies, Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3 would achieve a feasible level of NOx and ROG reductions, but this measure is unlikely to achieve a sufficient reduction in emissions to bring construction activities to a level below the daily thresholds for ROG, NOx, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$. Construction

emissions of PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ would be significant according to the 2010 Guidelines, after incorporating dust control strategies (see Impact AQ-1) and feasible strategies to reduce emissions in construction equipment exhaust (Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3). Therefore, the impacts of the Proposed Project with respect to the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines would be significant and unavoidable, even with implementation of mitigation.

Impact AQ-12: The Proposed Project could result in construction-related impacts of toxic air contaminants and adverse health effects under the 2010 guidelines.

The Proposed Project could increase cancer risk from exposure to emissions of DPM and other TACs associated with off-road construction equipment and on-road haul trucks used during construction of the Proposed Project, as these emissions would occur within 1,000 feet of existing residential units and educational facilities within and adjacent to the Project Site. The 2010 BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines thresholds for TACs are similar to the current recommendations, with the addition of $PM_{2.5}$ as a pollutant of health risk concern.

Emissions of $PM_{2.5}$ from construction activities would occur at regionally significant levels. Additionally, health risks due to $PM_{2.5}$ emissions would be considered significant under 2010 BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines for construction activities causing concentrations of $PM_{2.5}$ over an annualized threshold of 0.3 micrograms per cubic meter ($\mu g/m^3$). Existing residential units and educational facilities within 1,000 feet of construction activities would be most likely to experience this impact.

According to the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines' "Draft Construction Health Risk Screening Table", the minimum offset distance (buffer distance) to ensure that a sensitive receptor would have a less than significant impact would be 300 meters (984 feet). Existing and planned residential units and educational facilities within this distance would experience a significant impact due to construction-related TAC and $PM_{2.5}$.

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3: Construction Exhaust Emissions

Although implementation of the construction emission control measures (including Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3) would reduce TAC, including DPM, exhaust emissions by implementing feasible controls and requiring up-to-date equipment, adverse TAC and $PM_{2.5}$ health effects during construction would remain. Due to the high-density surroundings, individuals would occasionally be essentially adjacent to construction activity. It would be practically impossible to phase construction or restrict public access in such a manner to eliminate the potential risks to individuals occupying and visiting areas within 1,000 feet of the proposed construction activities. Due to uncertainty in quantifying the construction-related incremental cancer risk and non-cancer health impacts, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

Impact AQ-13: The Proposed Project could result in operation-related impacts to regional air quality under the 2010 guidelines.

The Proposed Project would result in an increase in criteria pollutant emissions that would be considered significant according to the 2010 BAAQMD significance thresholds of ROG, NOx, or $PM_{2.5}$ greater than

54 pounds per day or PM_{10} greater than 82 pounds per day. This impact would occur with the project incorporating feasible emission reduction measures within its extensive TDM program and Sustainability Plan. As such, this impact would be significant and unavoidable and no further mitigation is available.

Impact AQ-15: The Proposed Project could result in operation-related impacts to sensitive receptors and substantial pollutant concentrations of toxic air contaminants under 2010 guidelines.

Operation of the Proposed Project operation would cause increases in traffic emitting DPM, other TACs, and $PM_{2.5}$ and would increase the density of residential uses in an area exposed to these emissions. The 2010 BAAQMD Thresholds include screening tables identifying potential cancer risk and non-cancer health hazards experienced by sensitive receptors along Highway 1 (Junipero Serra Boulevard and 19th Avenue). According to the new BAAQMD screening tables, sensitive receptors are exposed to potentially significant concentrations of TAC and $PM_{2.5}$ (exceeding 0.3 $\mu g/m^3$) within 200 feet east or west of Highway 1. The new BAAQMD screening tables also indicate that the estimated incremental lifetime

cancer risk (70-year lifespan) due to traffic on Highway 1 is greater than 10 cases per million people for

locations within 192 feet east or west of the roadway. Health risks from all roadways are dominated by the effects of DPM, a TAC, and $PM_{2.5}$.

The Proposed Project would include new residential uses within 1,000 feet of existing stationary sources of TACs and within 200 feet of Highway 1, which could expose new sensitive receptors to concentrations of DPM, other TACs, and $PM_{2.5}$ considered significant under the 2010 guidelines.

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-15: Mechanical Ventilation Systems for New Residential Uses

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-15 requires that new residential uses within 200 feet from the edge of the Project Site boundary along Junipero Serra Boulevard, including ramps on Brotherhood Way, 19th Avenue, or Brotherhood Way incorporate mechanical ventilation systems. Although this would reduce the impact of exposing new receptors to elevated concentrations near roadways, it would not avoid the impact of placing new receptors near Highway 1 and other existing sources of TACs typical of urban environments. Because of uncertain effectiveness and feasibility of implementing this measure, the impact under the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines would remain significant and unavoidable.

Impact AQ-18: The Proposed Project could result in cumulative construction impacts under the 2010 guidelines.

Impact AQ-2 identifies the emission increases attributable to construction of the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project would exceed the BAAQMD's adopted significance thresholds for construction-related ROG, NOx, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$. Consequently, under the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, the project construction would result in a significant cumulative impact with regard to these emissions. This impact is significant and unavoidable.

Impact AQ-19: The Proposed Project could result in cumulative criteria pollutant impacts under 2010 guidelines.

According to the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, the Proposed Project operational emissions would be cumulatively considerable, resulting in significant adverse air quality impacts to the region's existing air quality conditions. Additional analysis to assess cumulative impacts is deemed unnecessary by BAAQMD, and the Proposed Project would result in a significant cumulative impact with regard to ROG, NOx, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions. This impact is significant and unavoidable.

Impact AQ-20: The Proposed Project could result in cumulative DPM, $PM_{2.5}$, and TAC impacts under the 2010 guidelines.

Impact AQ-6 shows that, according to the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, the operational impacts due to exposure of receptors to DPM and TACs would be significant and unavoidable because the Proposed Project would expose planned receptors to substantial concentrations of DPM or other TACs. With no additional foreseeable sources of DPM or TACs identified for the cumulative conditions, the cumulative impact would be similar to that described for the Proposed Project. Roadside $PM_{2.5}$ exposure levels found by the analysis performed by the DPH would not exceed the 2010 BAAQMD significance threshold for a cumulatively considerable contribution of $PM_{2.5}$. No additional $PM_{2.5}$ impacts are identified for the cumulative conditions. Cumulative projects in the area are not anticipated to contribute considerable emissions in addition to the project. However, due to health risks caused by existing sources of TACs including nearby major roadways (Highway 1), the project-related DPM, $PM_{2.5}$, and TAC exposures would result in a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact. This impact is significant and unavoidable.

Impact WS-1: The phased construction of the Proposed Project could result in a temporary increase in the number of hours that the 26-mph wind hazard criterion is exceeded or an increase in the area that is subjected to winds greater than 26 mph.

Although the Proposed Project, in its entirety, would not result in significant wind impacts and would in fact improve wind conditions on the Project Site, some potentially significant interim wind impacts may occur prior to the completion of construction.

> *Mitigation Measure M-WI-1A: Wind Impact Analysis for Proposed Buildings Over 100 feet in Height.*
>
> *Mitigation Measure M-WI-1B: Wind Tunnel Testing for Proposed Buildings Over 50 feet in Height.*

Implementation of Mitigation Measures M-WS-1a and M-WS-1b would reduce some, but possibly not all, potentially significant wind impacts to less-than-significant levels during the interior period prior to project build-out. No other mitigation measures have been identified that would feasibly reduce the potentially significant impact to less-than-significant levels during the construction period. Therefore this impact remains potentially significant and unavoidable.

Impact WS-3: The proposed Special Use District could result in increases in the number of hours that the 26-mph wind hazard criterion is exceeded or increases in the area that is subjected to winds greater than 26 mph.

Maximizing building heights and/or building footprints in certain locations on the Project Site would have the potential to change the wind impacts that were predicted by the wind tunnel.

Mitigation Measure M-WI-1A: Wind Impact Analysis for Proposed Buildings Over 100 feet in Height.

Mitigation Measure M-WI-1B: Wind Tunnel Testing for Proposed Buildings Over 50 feet in Height.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures M-WS-1a and M-WS-1b, would reduce some, but possibly not all, potentially significant hazardous wind impacts to less-than-significant levels. No other feasible measures have been identified that would reduce potential hazardous wind conditions to less-than-significant levels. Therefore this impact remains potentially significant and unavoidable.

Impact BI-8: Operation of the 51 proposed wind turbines on the western periphery of the Project Site could have a substantial adverse effect on special-status species, interfere substantially with bird or bat movement and migration corridors, and interfere substantially with raptor nest sites.

The wind turbine site meets two of the four criteria for a high or uncertain potential for wildlife impacts (for both birds and bats). Bi-weekly pre-permitting surveys of a turbine site for at least two years before project approval may be necessary in such cases to determine the level of impacts because of considerable seasonal and annual variation in bird populations.

Mitigation Measure M-BI-8a: Pre-permitting Surveys for Birds and Bats.

Mitigation Measure M-BI-8b: Operations Monitoring Program.

Mitigation Measure M-BI-8c: Implementation of Management Strategies.

Mitigation Measure M-BI-8d: Design Elements to Minimize Bird and/or Bat Strikes.

Mitigation Measure M-BI-8e: Incidental Take Permit.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures M-BI-8a through M-BI-8e may reduce the significant impacts. However, without data from pre-permitting studies, it is not feasible to design a mitigation program that can be demonstrated to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. Incidental Take Permits are issued by the California Department of Fish and Game and are outside the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission. Therefore, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

Impacts Associated with the No Muni Realignment Alternative

The No Muni Realignment Alternative would remove the significant impact at the intersection of 19th Avenue and Crespi Drive, because the northbound left-turn lane would not be added. However, the alternative would result in a new significant impact at the intersection of 19th Avenue and Junipero Serra Boulevard during the weekend midday peak hour and a new cumulative impact at this intersection during the weekday PM peak hour. These impacts would be significant and unavoidable. Thus, the total number of intersections impacted would remain the same with this alternative. The alternative would reduce significant impacts on Muni in that it would have significant impacts due to travel time delays on two fewer transit routes than the Proposed Project. The SFSU light rail station would remain in the 19th Avenue median and would experience substantial overcrowding compared to the proposed new station in the Proposed Project; thus this alternative would result in a significant and unavoidable impact on pedestrians and transit patrons at this location.

Although significant noise and vibration impacts from operation of the Muni M Ocean View line adjacent to new residential and commercial uses would be reduced under the No Muni Alternative, other noise impacts identified under the Proposed Project would essentially be the same. All other impacts identified under the Proposed Project for aesthetics, historic architectural resources, transportation, air quality, wind, and biological resources would remain under this alternative, and all mitigation measures apply to this Alternative.

V. MITIGATION MEASURES REJECTED AS INFEASIBLE

This Section describes the reasons for rejecting certain mitigation measures as infeasible pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 150919a)(3). Although CEQA requires that all feasible mitigation measures be imposed to address the significant impacts of a proposed project, mitigation measures may be rejected if they are found to be infeasible for specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations. The following mitigation measures described in the Final EIR are rejected for the reasons set forth below and as supported by substantial evidence in the record.

Mitigation Measure M-TR-2B: Install a traffic signal at Sunset Boulevard/Lake Merced Boulevard

Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce certain significant impacts at the intersection of Sunset Boulevard/Lake Merced Boulevard to less-than-significant levels; however, the SFMTA has evaluated the feasibility of this measure and has found that it is infeasible. Specifically, the SFMTA's analysis shows that a signal at this location would increase delay for every "major" movement (Northbound and Southbound Sunset Boulevard) through the intersection, including transit, in order to reduce delays on a "minor" movement (Lake Merced Boulevard to Sunset Boulevard). Thus, creating delays on a major thoroughfare to reduce delays on a less utilized movement is not feasible for social and other policy considerations, including transit-priority. Accordingly, this mitigation measure is rejected as infeasible.

Mitigation Measure M-TR-23: Maintain the proposed headways of the 17 Parkmerced, by implementing transit-only lanes along the length of 19th Avenue between Holloway Avenue and Winston Drive if feasible.

Implementation of measure M-TR-23 would require substantial study and public outreach and would result in secondary traffic impacts associated with removal of a traffic lane. SFMTA has determined that the benefits of implementing this measure (and uncertainty of those benefits) are outweighed by the considerable trade-off for auto traffic in this location. Additionally, SFMTA has determined that implementation of transit-only lanes along this portion of 19th Avenue between Holloway Avenue and Winston Drive is too short or discontinuous to add value or to effectively enforce. These specific social and policy concerns render Mitigation Measure M-TR-23 infeasible and, accordingly, this mitigation measure is rejected.

M-TR-24: Implement the Project Variant (i.e., conversion of the fourth southbound lane to high-occupancy vehicle, toll, and transit-only use).

Implementation of the Project Variant would require substantial additional study and public outreach, and would result in secondary traffic impacts associated with the removal of a mixed-flow traffic lane on 19th Avenue. As for M-TR-23, discussed above, SFMTA has determined that the benefits of implementing this measure (and uncertainty of those benefits) are outweighed by the considerable trade-off for auto traffic in this location. Additionally, SFMTA has determined that implementation of transit-only lanes along this segment of 19th Avenue is too short or discontinuous to add value or to effectively enforce. These specific social and policy concerns render Mitigation Measure M-TR-23 infeasible and, accordingly, this mitigation measure is rejected.

Mitigation Measure M-TR-25A: Implement mitigation measure M-TR-23, which addresses transit improvements (i.e. transit-only lanes) along 19th Avenue from Holloway Avenue to Winston Drive

Because Mitigation Measure M-TR-25A implements M-TR-23, it is rejected as infeasible for the same reasons set forth for M-TR-23, above.

VI. EVALUATION OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

This Section describes the reasons for approving the Proposed Project and the reasons for rejecting the alternatives. CEQA mandates that an EIR evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the Proposed Project or the project location that substantially reduce or avoid potentially significant impacts of the Proposed Project. CEQA requires that every EIR also evaluate a "No Project" alternative. Alternatives provide the decision maker with a basis of comparison to the Proposed Project in terms of their significant impacts and their ability to meet project objectives. This comparative analysis is used to consider reasonably, potentially feasible options for minimizing environmental consequences of the Proposed Project.

A. Reasons for Approving Proposed Project

The Parkmerced Project will provide the following benefits:

- Add up to approximately 5,679 housing units to the City's housing stock.
- Provide a range of types of housing units, including market-rate and affordable units.
- One for one replacement of the 1,538 rent-controlled dwelling units currently existing on the Project Site. Although none of the Existing Units have washer or dryers, each Replacement Unit will have a washer and a dryer and a dish washer installed by Developer prior to occupancy.
- Relocation by Developer of Existing Tenants from their Existing Units to the Replacement Units, with, under the terms of the proposed Project Development Agreement, an initial rent and pass through charges equal to the rent and pass through charges charged to the Existing Tenant for their Existing Unit at the time of relocation to the Replacement Unit.
- Construction of two new transit stations, relocation of an existing transit station, and a new alignment for the MUNI Metro M-Oceanview, integrated into the SFMTA transit system, that will leave 19th Avenue at Holloway Avenue and proceed through the neighborhood core in Parkmerced as further described in the Transportation Plan, and the provision of a low emissions shuttle bus from Parkmerced to the Daly City BART station and to the Stonestown retail center;
- Reconfiguration of the street grid within the Project Site to conform with San Francisco's Better Streets design guidelines, including the realignment of existing streets and the creation of new publicly-owned streets and publicly-accessible streets that accommodate bicycles, pedestrians and motor vehicles;
- Improvement and reconfiguration of streets and intersections on the periphery of the Project Site to improve access and safety for all modes of transportation;
- Creation and implementation of a Transportation Demand Management ("TDM") program, including but not limited to transit pass subsidies for residents and employees in the Project Site, to facilitate and encourage the use of transportation modes other than the private automobile, to minimize the amount of automobile traffic originating from Parkmerced and to improve traffic flow on adjacent roadways such as 19th Avenue and Brotherhood Way, as further described in the Transportation Plan
- Reconfiguration of the existing open space at Parkmerced to provide more usable open spaces and related public benefits such as a new park, athletic fields, an organic farm, walking and bicycling paths, and community gardens;
- Construction of a series of bioswales, ponds, and other natural filtration systems to capture and filter stormwater runoff from buildings and streets in accordance with the Infrastructure Plan and the Sustainability Plan. The filtered stormwater will either percolate into the groundwater that feeds the Upper Westside groundwater basin and Lake Merced or be released directly into Lake Merced. This feature of the Proposed Project will reduce the amount of stormwater flows directed to the Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant and reduce combined sewage overflows to the ocean.

- Exclusive zoning of a parcel for the construction of an elementary school.
- Addition of neighborhood-serving retail and office uses within walking distance of residential units where little or no retail exists.
- Provision of infrastructure improvements that will increase sustainability, including use of energy-efficient lighting and HVAC equipment, planting drought-tolerant landscaping, and providing urban infill in an underused area.
- Provision of opportunities to reduce water demand by using recycled water for landscape irrigation.

B. Alternatives Rejected and Reasons for Rejection

The Planning Commission rejects the Alternatives set forth in the Final EIR and listed below because the Commission finds that there is substantial evidence, including evidence of economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations described in this Section in addition to those described in Section VI below under CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(44), that make these alternatives infeasible. In making these determinations, the Commission is aware that CEQA defines "feasibility" to mean "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors." The Commission is also aware that under CEQA case law the concept of "feasibility" encompasses (i) the question of whether a particular alternative promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project; and (ii) the question of whether an alternative is "desirable" from a policy standpoint to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors.

1. No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, the site would remain in its existing condition, no existing buildings or landscaping would be demolished and no new buildings would be constructed. No on- or off-site infrastructure improvements would be constructed. The physical impacts identified in the Final EIR for the Proposed Project would not occur.

The No Project Alternative would not provide additional density in an underutilized area of the City, would not add up to 5,679 additional residential units to the City's housing stock, would not help reduce the shortage of affordable housing in the City, would not help the City meet its regional housing needs allocation, would not improve transit service and facilities in the southwest quadrant of the City, would not reduce wet-weather flows in the City's combined wastewater collection and treatment system, would not provide employment opportunities either during construction or in new retail and office space in the neighborhood core, and would not provide opportunities for renewable energy generation.

Further, this alternative would not improve the City's revenues by adding new residential and commercial space to the City's inventories.

For these reasons, the Commission finds that, on balance, the Proposed Project is preferable to the No Project Alternative and that the No Project alternative is rejected as infeasible.

2. Buildout Under Current Zoning Regulations Alternative

Under this alternative, the existing 3,221 residential units would be demolished and 10,500 new residential units would be constructed (7,279 net new units). No retail or commercial uses would be provided. As with the Proposed Project, the Buildout Under Current Zoning Regulations Alternative includes construction of (or provides financing for construction of) a series of traffic and transportation improvements designed to minimize the amount of automobile traffic originating from Parkmerced, and to improve traffic flow on adjacent roadways such as 19th Avenue and Brotherhood Way. This alternative would not include a separated stormwater collection and treatment system, unlike the Proposed Project. This alternative would include about 6 fewer acres of open space than in the Proposed Project; however, the open space in this alternative would be located between buildings and would not be as contiguous as that in the Proposed Project. No athletic fields or organic farm would be built. No wind turbines would be constructed on the Project Site.

There would be significant traffic impacts at the same locations as those identified for the Proposed Project under this alternative, although they would be somewhat exacerbated because more vehicle trips would be generated. There would be additional significant impacts at the intersections of Lake Merced Boulevard/Higuera Avenue and Lake Merced Boulevard/Gonzalez Drive. The impacts at the latter intersection would remain significant and unavoidable because mitigation would involve a double westbound left-turn lane and an additional northbound through lane, resulting in pedestrian safety issues. Under 2030 cumulative conditions, this alternative would contribute to significant cumulative impacts at four additional intersections compared to the Proposed Project's impacts.

Stormwater runoff from the site under the Buildout under Current Zoning Regulations Alternative would flow into the City's combined sewer system. Therefore, this alternative would not reduce the average annual number of combined sewer overflows, although it would not result in a significant increase in overflows and therefore would not result in a new significant impact on water quality.

Impacts on birds and bats from installation and operation of wind turbines identified as significant and unavoidable for the Proposed Project would not occur with this alternative, because no wind turbines are included in the alternative.

Other impacts of the Buildout under Current Zoning Regulations Alternative would be nearly the same as or similar to those identified for the Proposed Project, although in most cases the impacts would be slightly greater.

This alternative would provide more housing units than the Proposed Project and, thus, would further add to the City's housing stock and assist in meeting the City's share of the regional housing need. The alternative would reduce a significant impact on birds and bats by removing one of the renewable energy features included in the Proposed Project.

The Commission rejects the Buildout under Current Zoning Regulations Alternative because it would not reduce any of the other significant and unavoidable impacts of the Proposed Project; would not

reconfigure the Project Site's streets in accordance with the Better Streets Plan, would not provide new and more usable open spaces such as a park; would not provide a more fine-grained system of streets and pathways and therefore correct the deficiencies of the current site plan; would not provide neighborhood-serving retail and commercial uses in close proximity to residential uses, and therefore would not provide the same opportunities to reduce automobile use; it would increase the severity of traffic impacts on local intersections; it would not reduce stormwater flows in the City's combined sewer collection and treatment system; and it would not provide open space in such usable configurations as that in the Proposed Project and therefore would not provide high-quality open space to serve the residents within walking distance.

For these reasons, the Commission finds that, on balance, the Proposed Project is preferable to the Buildout under Current Zoning Regulations Alternative, and that alternative is rejected as infeasible.

3. Retention of the Historic District Central Core Alternative

Under the Retention of the Historic District Central Core Alternative, 2,567 existing units located around the inner core of the site and in the 11 existing tower buildings would remain, and approximately 3,000 new units would be constructed primarily around the western and southern portions of the site, for a total of 5,567 units on the site. About 84,900 gross square feet (gsf) of new retail, 55,900 gsf of new office space, and a new 64,000-gsf community center would be constructed in the eastern and southern areas of the site. Under the Historic District Central Core Alternative some, but not all of the traffic and infrastructure improvements planned for the Proposed Project would be constructed. The Muni light rail line would not be rerouted through the site due to site constraints; it would remain in19th Avenue as at present, and the San Francisco State University station would remain in the 19th Avenue median. There would be 6 more open space acres than with the Proposed Project; the existing Commons and meadow areas would remain, and the private recreational facilities included in the Proposed Project would be constructed in this alternative. Wind turbines and solar photovoltaic cells would not be installed to offset a portion of the development's energy demand. A separate stormwater collection and treatment system would not be installed; stormwater would continue to be collected and treated in the City's combined sewer/stormwater system.

This alternative would result in the addition of about 2,346 new units to the City's housing stock, about 3,300 fewer than in the Proposed Project. This alternative would include about 205,000 sq. ft. of retail, commercial, and community uses, about 100,000 sq. ft. less than in the Proposed Project.

Retention of the historic district under this alternative would retain essential features and characteristics of the Parkmerced historical resource, and therefore there would be no project-level or cumulative historic architectural resources impacts under this alternative. With fewer residential units and less retail/commercial space, this alternative would result in significant traffic impacts at fewer intersections, although impacts at many of the study intersections would remain significant and unavoidable. The alternative would reduce significant impacts on the transit facilities in the northeast screenline to less-than-significant levels. Traffic generated by this alternative would cause impacts on transit travel times, as with the Proposed Project, but on three transit lines rather than six. Impacts on birds and bats from

installation and operation of wind turbines identified as significant and unavoidable for the Proposed Project would not occur with this alternative, because no wind turbines are included in the alternative.

The Commission rejects the Retention of the Historic District Central Core Alternative because it would add fewer residential units to the City's housing stock and therefore contribute less to the City and regional housing needs allocation; it would add fewer residential units in a urban infill location; it would provide less residential density and therefore would be less consistent with the City's goal to create a sustainable and self-sufficient "better" neighborhood that supports neighborhood serving retail, community facilities and transfit infrastructure and service; although it would reduce, it would not eliminate significant transportation impacts; it would require that the majority of new housing be situated on a portion of the project site that is farthest from the Muni M Ocean View light rail line and therefore would be less likely to result in a reduction of automobile dependency; it would not reduce wet-weather flows in the City's combined wastewater collection and treatment system; it would provide fewer employment opportunities both during construction and in new retail and office space; it would not provide the reconfiguration of the street system in accordance with the Better Streets Plan; would not provide a more fine-grained system of streets and pathways and therefore correct the deficiencies of the existing automobile-oriented streets and site plan; would not reconfigure the open space at the Project Site to provide more usable open spaces such as a park; and would not re-route the M Ocean View light rail line into the Project Site, because doing so would negatively impact the historic resource, and therefore would be less consistent with the City's Transit First policy. For these reasons, the Commission finds that, on balance, the Proposed Project is preferable to the Historic District Central Core Alternative, and this alternative is rejected as infeasible.

4. Partial Historic District Alternative

Under the Partial Historic District Alternative, development would be similar to the Proposed Project except that a portion of the northwest corner of the Project Site would remain unchanged. Under this alternative, all 11 towers and two blocks of garden apartments would remain, comprising a total of containing 1,849 residential units. Under this alternative, the remainder of the buildings on the site would be demolished and redesigned to accommodate 6,689 new units (5,317 net new units) and a total of 8,538 units on site. The alternative would result in about 360 fewer residential units than the Proposed Project. Like the Proposed Project, a new neighborhood core containing 224,300 gsf of new neighborhood-serving retail and 80,000 gsf of new office space would be constructed within walking distance of the residences at Parkmerced. A new 37,800-gsf leasing office, a new 64,000-gsf community center, and a new 25,000-gsf school and day care facility, as well as about 70 acres of new open space uses, including athletic fields, walking and biking paths, and an approximately 2-acre organic farm, would also be built on the Project Site.

The development around the periphery of the Project Site would require amendments to the Planning Code and General Plan and approval of a Special Use District, similar to the Proposed Project but covering a smaller area.

Under the Partial Historic District Alternative, traffic and transit improvements would be similar to those planned under the Proposed Project. These improvements include rerouting the Metro M Ocean View light rail line from its current alignment along 19th Avenue, and providing modifications along 19th Avenue to accommodate the new route.

Similar to the Proposed Project, implementation of a sustainability plan would provide for a variety of new infrastructure improvements intended to reduce the alternative's per-unit use of electricity, natural gas, water, and the City's wastewater conveyance and treatment systems. A combination of renewable energy sources, including wind turbines and photovoltaic cells, would be used to meet a portion of this alternative's energy demand. In addition, stormwater runoff from buildings and streets would be captured and filtered through a series of bioswales, ponds, and other natural filtration systems. As with the Proposed Project, the filtered stormwater would then either percolate into the groundwater that feeds the Westside groundwater basin and Lake Merced or be released directly into Lake Merced.

The Commission rejects the Partial Historic District Alternative because retention of only a portion of the historic district resource would not be sufficient to convey its historic and architectural significance and would not justify its eligibility for inclusion in the CRHR. Thus, although this alternative would somewhat reduce impacts to the Parkmerced historic district historic resource, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. Although a portion of the Parkmerced visual/scenic resource would be retained as a representative sample of the visual character that once existed on the Project Site, the portion retained would not be sufficient to convey the distinctive visual qualities of the site, and the alternative would not reduce significant visual quality impacts. Additionally, impacts on transportation, noise, air quality, wind, and biological resources would be similar to those of the Proposed Project and would not be substantially reduced with implementation of this alternative. Additionally, this alternative would not include the adoption of a land use program for Parkmerced that, among other things, maximizes walking, bicycling and use of public transportation, and minimizes the impacts and use of private automobiles by implementing a land use program with increased residential density and a commercial neighborhood core located within comfortable walking distance of transit service and residences. This alternative would also not provide sufficient housing to help alleviate the effects of suburban sprawl and protect the green belt. For these reasons, the Commission finds that, on balance, the Proposed Project is preferable to the Partial Historic District Alternative, and this alternative is rejected as infeasible.

5. Full Project Buildout With Transit Options Alternative

Under the Full Project Buildout with Transit Options Alternative, the 152-acre site would be replanned and redesigned exactly as it would for the Proposed Project, except for the configuration of the Muni light rail line. The number and location of new and retained residential units would be the same as under the Proposed Project, as would the retail, office, commercial, school and community space facilities, and open space configuration.

Under this alternative, the M Ocean View line would leave 19th Avenue at Holloway Avenue, turn south at Crespi Drive, and continue south through the neighborhood core, as it would with the Proposed Project.

However, unlike the Proposed Project, it would not re-enter 19th Avenue south of Felix Avenue. Instead, it would terminate at a new layover station constructed at the intersection of font Boulevard and Chumasero Drive. The J Church line would be extended from its current terminus at Balboa Park, continue west along the existing M Ocean View alignment, and terminate at a newly-constructed Muni stop on 19th Avenue just south of Holloway Avenue.

Other traffic and infrastructure improvements would be similar to the Proposed Project, except that the northbound left-turn lane at 19th Avenue/Crespi Drive would not be added. Like the Proposed Project, implementation of a sustainability plan would provide for a variety of new infrastructure improvements intended to reduce the per-unit use of electricity, natural gas, water, and the City's wastewater conveyance and treatment systems. A combination of renewable energy sources, including wind turbines and photovoltaic cells, would be used to meet a portion of this alternative's energy demand. In addition, stormwater runoff from buildings and streets would be captured and filtered through a series of bioswales, ponds, and other natural filtration systems. As with the Proposed Project, the filtered stormwater would then either percolate into the groundwater that feeds the Westside groundwater basin and Lake Merced or be released directly into Lake Merced.

A design variant studied under the Full Project Buildout with Transit Options Alternative involves dedicating the fourth southbound through lane on 19th Avenue to transit and high-occupancy vehicle use only (a HOT lane), rather than mixed-flow. There would be no change to this alternative's land use configuration or utilities under the variant.

The Full Buildout With Transit Options would not substantially reduce significant environmental impacts compared to the Proposed Project. A new significant impact would result at the intersection of 19th Avenue and Junipero Serra Boulevard during the weekend midday peak hour and a new cumulative impact would be added at this location during the weekday PM peak hour. (The new significant cumulative impact would not occur with the variant.) Thus, the total number of intersections impacted would be greater than the Proposed Project. This alternative would reduce significant impacts on travel time to less-than-significant levels on two transit lines that would be significantly impacted by the Proposed Project, but would continue to cause significant unavoidable impacts on travel times on the other four transit lines affected by the Proposed Project.

All other significant impacts identified under the Proposed Project for aesthetics, historic architectural resources, noise, air quality, wind, and biological resources would remain under this alternative.

Implementation of this alternative to change the routing of two Muni light rail lines is within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency and outside the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission. In addition, the alternative does not substantially reduce the significant impacts of the Proposed Project. For these reasons, the Commission finds that, on balance, the Proposed Project is preferable to the Full Project Buildout With Transit Options Alternative, and this alternative is rejected as infeasible.

6. No Muni Realignment Alternative

As described in Section I above, the Project proposes to reroute the existing Muni Metro M Ocean View line from its current alignment along 19th Avenue, which would require the approval of Caltrans and the CPUC. In the event that such approval is not granted, the approval granted by this Commission would permit the Project to proceed after identifying an alternate transportation improvement of equivalent value to the proposed rerouting of the existing Muni Metro M Ocean View line. In the event that Caltrans and CPUC approval is not granted, the San Francisco Planning Commission approves adoption of the No Muni Realignment Alternative. In the event the Caltrans and CPUC approvals are granted, the Commission presently rejects this Alternative because the Project as proposed is preferable to this Alternative because overall, the alternative would not provide as direct a connection the M Ocean View light rail line for Parkmerced residents and visitors as would the Proposed Project, and would de-emphasize the overall transit-oriented feel of the Project Site. In addition, the alternative continues the overcrowded conditions at the SFSU Muni station. Therefore, the Proposed Project is preferable to the No Muni Realignment Alternative.

E. Alternatives Considered and Rejected in the EIR

1. Infill Development within the Historic District

An infill development within the historic district would retain the majority of the existing buildings and landscape features at Parkmerced, and include new construction of a series of 3- to 14-story infill buildings on the sites of the existing carports between garden apartment buildings, and on sites adjacent to the existing towers. In total, the new infill buildings would consist of 20 three-story buildings; 2 four-story buildings; 1 eight-story building; 2 eleven-story buildings; and 6 fourteen-story towers. Under this scenario, all of the existing 3,221 residential units would remain, and about 1,400 new units would be constructed (a total of 4,621 residential units on site), or about 4,280 fewer units than are included in the Proposed Project. There would be no transit or infrastructure improvements under this scenario, nor would there be any combination of renewable energy sources, such as wind turbines and photovoltaic cells, to offset any portion of energy demand. As under existing conditions, stormwater runoff from buildings and streets would flow into the combined sewer and stormwater lines that lead into the Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant.

This potential EIR alternative was considered but not selected for detailed analysis in the EIR because it would not achieve most of the Project Sponsor's objectives including those related to maximizing the opportunity to create high-density housing near a commercial core, transportation and infrastructure improvements, and sustainability. Additionally, although this potential EIR alternative would reduce impacts on the Parkmerced historic district resource by retaining most of its existing physical features, it would not retain this resource's essential integrity as it would require demolition of the carports within the garden apartment courtyards and construction of new residential structures within the courtyards. As such, this potential alternative would result in a significant and unavoidable adverse impact on the Parkmerced historic district resource.

The Commission concurs with these findings in the EIR, and rejects this alternative as infeasible because it would not reduce significant impacts on the historic resource at Parkmerced, which would remain significant and unavoidable under this alternative, and would provide substantially fewer residential units. The alternative is also infeasible because it would not provide a neighborhood core of residential and commercial uses with immediate access to transit and therefore would be less likely to encourage use of travel modes other than single-occupant automobile. It would also not reduce the overcrowded conditions at the existing SFSU Muni station in the 19th Avenue median. Therefore the Proposed Project is preferable.

2. West Side Partial Historic District

Preservation of a partial historic district on the west side of Parkmerced would retain about half of the garden courtyard apartment block surrounding Juan Bautista Circle, as well as the blocks surrounding the Meadow and along a portion of Arballo Drive. In addition, all eleven of the tower buildings, the Administration Building, and some of the major landscape features, including the landscaping along Font Boulevard, would be retained. In total, 2,365 existing units would be retained. In the remaining portion of the 152-acre site, about 4,100 new residential units would be constructed (a total of 6,465 units on site), about 2,435 fewer than the Proposed Project. This scenario would include about 120,000 gsf of retail space, 47,500 gsf of office space, a new 64,000-gsf community center, and a 37,800-gsf leasing office, for a total of about 205,300 gsf, about 105,000 gsf less than the Proposed Project. The new 25,000-gsf school and new open space uses including athletic playing fields would be the same as or similar to the Proposed Project.

Under this scenario, transit and transportation improvements would be similar to those in the Proposed Project, including rerouting of the Metro M Ocean View line from its current alignment along 19th Avenue into the Project Site.

Unlike the Proposed Project, there would be no renewable energy sources, such as wind turbines and photovoltaic cells, to offset any portion of energy demand. As under existing conditions, stormwater runoff from buildings and streets would flow into the combined sewer and stormwater lines that lead to the Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant.

This potential EIR alternative was considered but not selected for detailed analysis in the EIR because it would not achieve the Project Sponsor's objectives, particularly those related to maximizing the opportunity to create high-density housing near a commercial center, sustainability, and financial feasibility. In addition, this potential EIR alternative would not avoid a significant adverse impact on the significance of the Parkmerced's historic district resource. Although a portion of the existing Parkmerced historic district resource would be retained as a representative sample of the historic and architectural significance of the original Parkmerced historic district resource, the retained portion would not be sufficient to convey its historic and architectural significance to justify its eligibility for inclusion in the CRHR, and thus this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

The Commission concurs with the findings in the EIR, and rejects this alternative as infeasible because it would not avoid significant impacts on the historic resource, and would provide substantially fewer residential units than the Proposed Project.

VII. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Pursuant to CEQA section 21081 and CEQA Guideline 15093, the Commission hereby finds, after consideration of the Final EIR and the evidence in the record, that each of the specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological and other benefits of the Project as set forth below independently and collectively outweighs the significant and unavoidable impacts and is an overriding consideration warranting approval of the Project. Any one of the reasons for approval cited below is sufficient to justify approval of the Project. Thus, even if a court were to conclude that not every reason is supported by substantial evidence, the Commission will stand by its determination that each individual reason is sufficient. The substantial evidence supporting the various benefits can be found in the preceding findings, which are incorporated by reference into this Section, and in the documents found in the Record of Proceedings, as defined in Section I.

On the basis of the above findings and the substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding, the Commission specially finds that there are significant benefits of the Project in spite of the unavoidable significant impacts, and therefore makes this Statement of Overriding Considerations. The Commission further finds that, as part of the process of obtaining Project approval, all significant effects on the environment from implementation of the Project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible. 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.

The Project will have the following benefits:

- Addition of approximately 5,679 residential units to the City's housing stock, including affordable housing, and helping the City to meet is regional housing needs allocation;
- Addition of approximately 5,679 residential units to the City's housing stock within an urban infill location at close proximity to transit, which will assist in alleviating the effects of suburban sprawl and development of the greenbelt.
- Development of a innovative land use program that provides an innovative model of environmentally sustainable design practices, to, among other things maximize walking, bicycling and use of public transportation, and minimize the impacts and use of private automobiles by implementing a land use program with increased residential density and a commercial neighborhood core located within comfortable walking distance of transit service and residences.

- One-for-one replacement of 1,538 rent-controlled dwelling units currently existing on the Project Site with, under the terms of the Proposed Development Agreement, new rent-controlled units, each of approximately equal or greater size and with the same or greater number of bedrooms and bathrooms as the Existing Unit being replaced. Although none of the Existing Units have washer or dryers, each Replacement Unit will have a washer and a dryer and a dish washer installed by Developer prior to occupancy;
- Under the terms of the proposed Development Agreement, the City is providing certain benefits to the project that, along with Developer's waiver of all rights under the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act and any similar or successor law, are designed to ensure that (i) each Replacement Unit will be subject to rent control and other provisions and provisions protecting tenants under the San Francisco Rent Ordinance and (ii) each Inclusionary Unit will be subject to the City's Inclusionary Unit requirements as set forth in Planning Code section 315;
- Under the terms of the proposed Development Agreement, relocation by Developer of Existing Tenants from their Existing Units to the Replacement Units, with an initial rent and equal to the rent charged to the Existing Tenant for their Existing Unit at the time of relocation to the Replacement Unit, with the right to remain in the Replacement Unit for an unlimited term subject to the eviction rules, procedures and protections set forth in the San Francisco Rent Ordinance, and no pass throughs added to rent of the Replacement Unit for the capital costs of the Project;
- Construction of two new transit stations, relocation of an existing transit station, and a new alignment for the MUNI Metro M-Oceanview, integrated into the SFMTA transit system, that will leave 19th Avenue at Holloway Avenue and proceed through the neighborhood core in Parkmerced as further described in the Transportation Plan, and the provision of a low emissions shuttle bus from Parkmerced to the Daly City BART station and to the Stonestown retail center;
- Reconfiguration of the street grid within the Project Site to conform with San Francisco's Better Streets design guidelines, including the realignment of existing streets and the creation of new publicly-owned streets and publicly-accessible streets that accommodate bicycles, pedestrians and motor vehicles;
- Improvement and reconfiguration of streets and intersections on the periphery of the Project Site to improve access and safety for all modes of transportation;
- Creation and implementation of a Transportation Demand Management ("TDM") program, including but not limited to transit pass subsidies for residents and employees in the Project Site, to facilitate and encourage the use of transportation modes other than the private automobile, to minimize the amount of automobile traffic originating from Parkmerced and to improve traffic flow on adjacent roadways such as 19th Avenue and Brotherhood Way, as further described in the Transportation Plan;
- Reconfiguration of the existing open space at Parkmerced to provide more usable open spaces and related public benefits such as a new park, athletic fields, an organic farm, walking and bicycling paths, and community gardens;
- Construction of a series of bioswales, ponds, and other natural filtration systems to capture and filter stormwater runoff from buildings and streets in accordance with the Infrastructure Plan and

the Sustainability Plan. The filtered stormwater will either percolate into the groundwater that feeds the Upper Westside groundwater basin and Lake Merced or be released directly into Lake Merced. This feature of the Proposed Project will reduce the amount of stormwater flows directed to the Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant and reduce combined sewage overflows to the ocean.

- Zoning of a parcel for the construction of an elementary school.
- Provision of renewable energy sources on site—installation of photovoltaic cells on up to 50 percent of roof areas of new buildings and up to 51 vertical axis wind turbines; and
- Provision of employment opportunities during construction and in newly-constructed retail and commercial space in the neighborhood core during this period of high unemployment in the City and the region.

In the event that any Non-City agency required to approve the realignment of the Muni M Oceanview line as proposed by the Project denies such approval, Pursuant to CEQA section 21081 and CEQA Guideline 15093, the Commission hereby finds, after consideration of the Final EIR and the evidence in the record, that each of the specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological and other benefits of No Muni Realignment Alternative as set forth below independently and collectively outweighs the significant and unavoidable impacts and is an overriding consideration warranting approval of the No Muni Realignment Alternative. Any one of the reasons for approval cited below is sufficient to justify approval of the No Muni Realignment Alternative. Thus, even if a court were to conclude that not every reason is supported by substantial evidence, the Commission will stand by its determination that each individual reason is sufficient. The substantial evidence supporting the various benefits can be found in the preceding findings, which are incorporated by reference into this Section, and in the documents found in the Record of Proceedings, as defined in Section I.

On the basis of the above findings and the substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding, the Commission specially finds that there are significant benefits of the Project in spite of the unavoidable significant impacts, and therefore makes this Statement of Overriding Considerations. The Commission further finds that, as part of the process of obtaining project approval, all significant effects on the environment from implementation of the No Muni Realignment Alternative have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible. 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.

The No Muni Realignment Alternative will have the following benefits:

- Addition of approximately 5,679 residential units to the City's housing stock, including affordable housing, and helping the City to meet is regional housing needs allocation;
- Addition of approximately 5,679 residential units to the City's housing stock within an urban infill location at close proximity to transit, which will assist in alleviating the affects of suburban sprawl and development of the greenbelt.

- Development of a innovative land use program that provides an innovative model of environmentally sustainable design practices, to, among other things maximize walking, bicycling and use of public transportation, and minimize the impacts and use of private automobiles by implementing a land use program with increased residential density and a commercial neighborhood core located within comfortable walking distance of transit service and residences.
- One-for-one replacement of 1,538 rent-controlled dwelling units currently existing on the Project Site with, under the terms of the Proposed Development Agreement, new rent-controlled units, each of approximately equal or greater size and with the same or greater number of bedrooms and bathrooms as the Existing Unit being replaced. Although none of the Existing Units have washer or dryers, each Replacement Unit will have a washer and a dryer and a dish washer installed by Developer prior to occupancy;
- Under the terms of the proposed Development Agreement, the City is providing certain benefits to the project that, along with Developer's waiver of all rights under the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act and any similar or successor law, are designed to ensure that (i) each Replacement Unit will be subject to rent control and other provisions and provisions protecting tenants under the San Francisco Rent Ordinance and (ii) each Inclusionary Unit will be subject to the City's Inclusionary Unit requirements as set forth in Planning Code section 315;
- Under the terms of the proposed Development Agreement, relocation by Developer of Existing Tenants from their Existing Units to the Replacement Units, with an initial rent and equal to the rent charged to the Existing Tenant for their Existing Unit at the time of relocation to the Replacement Unit, with the right to remain in the Replacement Unit for an unlimited term subject to the eviction rules, procedures and protections set forth in the San Francisco Rent Ordinance, and no pass throughs added to rent of the Replacement Unit for the capital costs of the Project;
- The provision of a low emissions shuttle bus from Parkmerced to the Daly City BART station and to the Stonestown retail center;
- Reconfiguration of the street grid within the Project Site to conform with San Francisco's Better Streets design guidelines, including the realignment of existing streets and the creation of new publicly-owned streets and publicly-accessible streets that accommodate bicycles, pedestrians and motor vehicles;
- Improvement and reconfiguration of streets and intersections on the periphery of the Project Site to improve access and safety for all modes of transportation;
- Creation and implementation of a Transportation Demand Management ("TDM") program, including but not limited to transit pass subsidies for residents and employees in the Project Site, to facilitate and encourage the use of transportation modes other than the private automobile, to minimize the amount of automobile traffic originating from Parkmerced and to improve traffic flow on adjacent roadways such as 19th Avenue and Brotherhood Way, as further described in the Transportation Plan;

- Reconfiguration of the existing open space at Parkmerced to provide more usable open spaces and related public benefits such as a new park, athletic fields, an organic farm, walking and bicycling paths, and community gardens;
- Construction of a series of bioswales, ponds, and other natural filtration systems to capture and filter stormwater runoff from buildings and streets in accordance with the Infrastructure Plan and the Sustainability Plan. The filtered stormwater will either percolate into the groundwater that feeds the Upper Westside groundwater basin and Lake Merced or be released directly into Lake Merced. This feature of the Proposed Project will reduce the amount of stormwater flows directed to the Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant and reduce combined sewage overflows to the ocean.
- Zoning of a parcel for the construction of an elementary school.
- Provision of renewable energy sources on site—installation of photovoltaic cells on up to 50 percent of roof areas of new buildings and up to 51 vertical axis wind turbines; and
- Provision of employment opportunities during construction and in newly-constructed retail and commercial space in the neighborhood core during this period of high unemployment in the City and the region.

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT				
Cultural Resources and Archeological Paleontological Resources Mitigation Measures				
Mitigation Measure M-CR-1: Documentation and Interpretation Documentation The Project Sponsor shall retain a professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Architectural History to prepare written and photographic documentation of the Parkmerced complex within the Project Site. The documentation for the property shall be prepared based on the National Park Service's (NPS) Historic American Building Survey (HABS) / Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) Historical Report Guidelines, and will include a selection of measured drawings based upon NPS Historic American Landscape Survey (HALS) Guidelines. This type of documentation is based on a combination of both HABS/HAER standards (Levels I, II and III) and NPS's policy for photographic documentation as outlined in the National Register of Historic Places and National Historic Landmarks Survey Photo Policy Expansion. The measured drawings for this documentation shall follow HALS Level I standards. To determine the number of the measured drawings, the professional shall consult with the San Francisco Planning Department's Preservation Coordinator. The written historical data for this documentation shall follow HABS / HAER Level I standards. The written data shall be accompanied by a sketch plan of the property. Efforts should also be made to locate original construction drawings or plans of the property during the period of significance. If located, these drawings should be photographed, reproduced, and included in the dataset. If construction drawings or plans cannot be located, as-built drawings shall be produced. Either HABS/HAER standard large format or digital photography shall be used. If digital photography is used, the ink and paper combinations for printing photographs must be in compliance with NR-NHL Photo Policy Expansion and have a permanency rating of approximately 115 years. Digital photographs will be taken as uncompressed, TIF file format. The size of each image will be 1600x1200 pixels at 330 ppi (pixels per inch) or larger, color format, and printed in black and white. The file name for each electronic image shall correspond with the index of photographs and photograph label. Photograph views for the dataset shall include (a) contextual views; (b) views of each side of each building and interior views, where possible; (c) oblique views of buildings; and (d) detail views of character-defining features, including features on the interiors of some buildings. All views shall be referenced on a photographic key. This	Project sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant	Prior to construction submittal of HABS/HAER/HALS guidelines documentation for approval by Planning Department. Prior to construction, transmit documentation to the SF Library, and NWIC.	Consultant to submit report to Planning Department	

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
photographic key shall be on a map of the property and shall show the photograph number with an arrow to indicate the direction of the view. Historic photographs shall also be collected, reproduced, and included in the dataset. The Project Sponsor shall transmit such documentation to the History Room of the San Francisco Public Library, and to the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Information Resource System. All documentation will be revised and approved by the San Francisco Planning Department's Preservation Coordinator prior to granting any demolition permit. <u>Interpretation</u> The Project Sponsor shall provide a permanent display of interpretive materials concerning the history and architectural features of the original Parkmerced complex within public spaces of the Project Site. Interpretation of the site's history shall be conducted and written by an architectural historian or historian, who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards, and shall be conducted in coordination with an exhibit designer. The interpretative materials should be placed in a prominent public setting and be permanent. The media, and other characteristics of such interpretive display shall be approved by the San Francisco Planning Department's Preservation Coordinator prior to any demolition or removal activities. <u>Archives</u> The Project Sponsor shall donate original Leonard Schultz and Thomas Church architectural drawings of Parkmerced to the University of California, Berkeley Environmental Design Archives, Confirmation from UC Berkeley shall be received and the San Francisco Planning Department's Preservation Coordinator shall be notified.	Project sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant. Project sponsor	Prior to any demolition or removal activities, approval of interpretative materials to occur. Considered complete once verification of donation of occurs.	Consultant to submit materials to Planning Department for approval. Consultant to submit confirmation of donation to Planning Department.	
M-CR-3a: Archaeological Testing, Monitoring, Data Recovery and Reporting for first Project Phase Based on a reasonable presumption that archaeological resources may be present within the project site, the following measures shall be undertaken to avoid any potentially significant adverse effect from the proposed project on buried or submerged historical resources. The project sponsor shall retain the services of an archaeological consultant from the Planning Department ("Department") pool of qualified archaeological consultants as provided by the Department archaeologist. The archaeological consultant shall undertake an archaeological testing program as specified herein. In addition, the consultant shall be available to conduct an archaeological monitoring and/or data recovery program if required pursuant to this measure. The archaeological	Project sponsor to retain appropriately qualified consultant	Prior to and during construction	Consultant to prepare Archaeological Monitoring Program (AMP) in consultation with the ERO. Consultant to prepare Archaeological Data Recovery Program with consultation in the ERO.	The project archaeologist to consult with the ERO as indicated. Considered complete after review and approval of the Final Archaeological Resources Report by the ERO.

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
consultant's work shall be conducted in accordance with this measure and the requirements of the ARDTP (Archeo-Tec, Archeological Research Design and Treatment Plan, Parkmerced Project, March 2010) at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer (ERO). In instances of inconsistency between the requirements of the project ARDTP and the requirements of this mitigation measure, the requirements of this archaeological mitigation measure shall prevail. All plans and reports prepared by the consultant as specified herein 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. Archaeological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction of the project for up to a maximum of four weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of construction can be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce to a less-than-significant level potential effects on a significant archaeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 (a)(c). <u>Archaeological Testing Program</u> The archaeological consultant shall prepare and submit to the ERO for review and approval an archaeological testing plan (ATP). The archaeological testing program shall be conducted in accordance with the approved ATP. The ATP shall identify the property types of the expected archaeological resource(s) that potentially could be adversely affected by the proposed project, the testing method to be used, and the locations recommended for testing. The purpose of the archaeological testing program will be to determine to the extent possible the presence or absence of archaeological resources and to identify and to evaluate whether any archaeological resource encountered on the site constitutes an historical resource under CEQA. At the completion of the archaeological testing program, the archaeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings to the ERO. If based on the archaeological testing program the archaeological consultant finds that significant archaeological resources may be present, the ERO in consultation with the archaeological consultant shall determine if additional measures are warranted. Additional measures that may be undertaken include additional archaeological testing, archaeological monitoring, and/or an archaeological data recovery program. If the ERO determines that a significant archaeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the proposed project, at the discretion of the project sponsor either: A) The proposed project shall be re-designed so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archaeological resource; or B) A data recovery program shall be implemented, unless the ERO determines that the archaeological resource is of greater interpretive than research significance	Project sponsor to retain appropriately qualified consultant	Prior to and during construction	If applicable, upon discovery of human remains and/or associated or unassociated funerary objects, the consultant shall notify the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco, and in the event of the Coroner's determination that the human remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) who shall make reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of human remains and/or associated or unassociated funerary objects. Consultant to prepare draft and final Archeological Resources Report reports. The ERO to review and approve the Final Archeological Resources Report	

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible. <u>Archaeological Monitoring Program (AMP)</u> If the ERO in consultation with the archaeological consultant determines that an archaeological monitoring program shall be implemented the archaeological monitoring program shall minimally include the following provisions: • The archaeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the AMP reasonably prior to any project-related soils-disturbing activities commencing. The ERO in consultation with the archaeological consultant shall determine what project activities shall be archaeologically monitored. In most cases, any soils-disturbing activities, such as demolition, foundation removal, excavation, grading, utilities installation, foundation work, driving of piles (foundation, shoring, etc.), site remediation, etc., shall require archaeological monitoring because of the risk these activities pose to potential archaeological resources and to their depositional context; • The archaeological consultant shall advise all project contractors to be on the alert for evidence of the presence of the expected resource(s), of how to identify the evidence of the expected resource(s), and of the appropriate protocol in the event of apparent discovery of an archaeological resource; • The archaeological monitor(s) shall be present on the project site according to a schedule agreed upon by the archaeological consultant and the ERO until the ERO has, in consultation with the project archaeological consultant, determined that project construction activities could have no effects on significant archaeological deposits; • The archaeological monitor shall record and be authorized to collect soil samples and artifactual/ecofactual material as warranted for analysis; • If an intact archaeological deposit is encountered, all soils-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit shall cease. The archaeological monitor shall be empowered to temporarily redirect demolition/excavation/pile driving/construction activities and equipment until the deposit is evaluated. If in the case of pile-driving activity (foundation, shoring, etc.), the archaeological monitor has cause to believe that the pile-driving activity may affect an archaeological resource, the pile-driving activity shall be terminated until an appropriate evaluation of the resource has been made in consultation with the ERO. The archaeological consultant shall immediately notify the ERO of the encountered archaeological deposit. The archaeological consultant shall make a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the	Project sponsor to retain appropriately qualified consultant	Prior to and during construction		

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
encountered archaeological deposit, and present the findings of this assessment to the ERO. Whether or not significant archaeological resources are encountered, the archaeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings of the monitoring program to the ERO. <u>Archaeological Data Recovery Program</u> The archaeological data recovery program shall be conducted in accord with an archaeological data recovery plan (ADRP). The archaeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the ADRP prior to preparation of a draft ADRP. The archaeological consultant shall submit a draft ADRP to the ERO. The ADRP shall identify how the proposed data recovery program will preserve the significant information the archaeological resource is expected to contain. That is, the ADRP will identify what scientific/historical research questions are applicable to the expected resource, what data classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions. Data recovery, in general, should be limited to the portions of the historical property that could be adversely affected by the proposed project. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be applied to portions of the archaeological resources if non-destructive methods are practical. The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements: • Field Methods and Procedures. Descriptions of proposed field strategies, procedures, and operations. • Cataloguing and Laboratory Analysis. Description of selected cataloguing system and artifact analysis procedures. • Discard and De-accession Policy. Description of and rationale for field and post-field discard and de-accession policies. • Interpretive Program. Consideration of an on-site/off-site public interpretive program during the course of the archaeological data recovery program. • Security Measures. Recommended security measures to protect the archaeological resource from vandalism, looting, and non-intentionally damaging activities. • Final Report. Description of proposed report format and distribution of results. • Curation. Description of the procedures and recommendations for the	Project sponsor to retain appropriately qualified consultant	Prior to and during construction		

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
curation of any recovered data having potential research value, identification of appropriate curation facilities, and a summary of the accession policies of the curation facilities. Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils-disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and Federal laws. This shall include immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the Coroner's determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (Pub. Res. Code Sec. 5097.98). The archaeological consultant, project sponsor, and MLD shall make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of, with appropriate dignity, human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects (CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15064.5(d)). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects. Final Archaeological Resources Report The archaeological consultant shall submit a Draft Final Archaeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archaeological resource and describes the archaeological and historical research methods employed in the archaeological testing/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. Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one (1) copy and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Major Environmental Analysis division of the Planning Department shall receive two copies (bound and unbound) and one unlocked, searchable PDF copy on a CD or DVD of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest in or the high interpretive value of the resource, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.				
Mitigation Measure M-CR-3b: Archaeological Treatment Plan for Subsequent Project Phases Based on a reasonable presumption that archaeological resources may be present within	Project sponsor to retain appropriate consultant	The project archaeologist to consult with ERO prior to preparation of TP. The	Project archaeologist to provide draft and final reports. ERO to review	

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
the Project Site, the following measures shall be undertaken to avoid any potentially significant adverse effect from subsequent project phases the Proposed Project on buried archaeological resources. The Project Sponsor shall retain the services of a qualified archaeological consultant having expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archaeology. The archaeological consultant shall prepare an archaeological treatment plan (TP). The archaeological consultant's work shall be conducted in accordance with this measure at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer (ERO). All plans and reports prepared by the consultant as specified herein 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. Archaeological Treatment Plan. The archaeological consultant shall meet and consult with the ERO on the scope of the TP prior to preparation of the TP. The TP shall be submitted to the ERO for review and approval prior to the Project ground-breaking activities for subsequent project phases. Archaeological field investigations for subsequent project phases shall be conducted in accordance with the approved TP. The TP shall identify project-specific vertical / horizontal areas of archaeological sensitivity and appropriate archaeological identification and evaluation strategies, and archaeological mitigatory protocols applicable to specific project activities / improvements (for example, excavation building foundation installation, grading, etc.) with the potential to affect archaeological properties. Mitigation strategies requiring archaeological testing plans (ATP) and archaeological monitoring plans (AMP) shall conform to the requirements for preparation and implementation including preparation of archaeological investigation and data recovery results reporting of an ATP and AMP in Mitigation Measure M-CR-3a.		TP for each phase to be completed prior to ground-breaking for that phase. ATP and AMPs, where necessary, shall be prepared pursuant to schedule in M-CR-3a.	and approve	
M-CR-5: Paleontological Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Program The Project Sponsor shall retain the services of a qualified paelontological consultant having expertise in California paleontology to design and implement a Paleontological Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Program (PRMMP). The PRMMP shall include a description of when and where construction monitoring would be required; emergency discovery procedures; sampling and data recovery procedures; procedure for the preparation, identification, analysis, and curation of fossil specimens and data recovered; preconstruction coordination procedures; and procedures for reporting the results of the monitoring program. The PRMMP shall be consistent with the Society for Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP) Standard Guidelines for the mitigation of construction–related adverse impacts to paleontological resources and the requirements of the designated repository for any fossils collected. During construction, earth-moving activities shall be monitored by a qualified paleontological consultant having expertise in California paleontology in the	Project sponsor to retain appropriately qualified consultant to prepare PRMMP, carry out monitoring, and reporting	Prior to and during construction. The project paleontological consultant to consult with the ERO as indicated; completed when ERO accepts final report	ERO to approve final PRMMP. Consultant shall provide brief monthly reports to ERO during monitoring or as identified in the PRMMP, and notify the ERO immediately if work should stop for data recovery during monitoring.	

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
areas where these activities have the potential to disturb previously undisturbed native sediment or sedimentary rocks. Monitoring need not be conducted in areas where the ground has been previously disturbed, in areas of artificial fill, in areas underlain by nonsedimentary rocks, or in areas where exposed sediment would be buried, but otherwise undisturbed. The consultant's work shall be conducted in accordance with this measure and at the direction of the City's Environmental Review officer (ERO). Plans and reports prepared by the consultant shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment, and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Paleontological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction of the Proposed Project for up to a maximum of four weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of construction can be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce potential effects on a significant paleontological resource as previously defined to a less-than-significant level.			The ERO to review and approve the final documentation as established in the PRMMP	
Transportation and Circulation				
M-TR-1: Parkmerced Construction Traffic Management Program. The Project Sponsor shall develop and implement a Construction Traffic Management Program to minimize impacts of the Project and its contribution to cumulative impacts related to construction activities and construction traffic. The program shall provide necessary information to various contractors and agencies as to how to maximize the opportunities for complementing construction management measures and to minimize the possibility of conflicting impacts on the roadway system, while safely accommodating the traveling public in the area. The program shall supplement and expand, rather than modify or supersede any manual, regulations, or provisions set forth by SFMTA, DPW or other City departments and agencies. Preparation of the Construction Management Program shall be the responsibility of the Project Sponsor, and shall be reviewed and approved by SFMTA and DPW prior to initiation of construction. The program shall: • Identify construction traffic management practices in San Francisco, as well as other jurisdictions that could provide useful guidance for a project of this size and characteristic. • Describe procedures required by different departments and/or agencies in the City for implementation of a construction management plan, such as reviewing agencies, approval process, and estimated timelines. • Identify construction traffic management strategies and other elements for the	Project sponsor and sponsor's construction contractor(s)	Prior to construction in each development phase.	Planning Department, SFMTA, and DPW	

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
Project, and present a cohesive program of operational and demand management strategies designed to maintain acceptable traffic operations during periods of construction activities in the Project area. These could include construction strategies, demand management strategies, alternate route strategies, and public information strategies. • Coordinate with other projects in construction in the immediate vicinity, so that they can take an integrated approach to construction-related traffic impacts. • Present guidelines for selection of construction traffic management strategies.				
M-TR-2A: Do not construct the proposed northbound left-turn lane from 19th Avenue onto Crespi Drive. The northbound left-turn lane from 19th Avenue to Crespi Drive would require southbound traffic on 19th Avenue to stop to allow northbound left-turning traffic.	Project sponsor and sponsor's construction contractor(s)	No left hand turn lane would be constructed.	Sponsor to provide revised plans to Planning Department as part of Development Agreement; Planning Department to review and acknowledge change in proposed street configurations.	
M-TR-2C: Construct a dedicated northbound right-turn lane from Lake Merced Boulevard to eastbound Winston Drive. This improvement would provide a dedicated lane for the relatively large number of vehicles expected to execute the northbound right-turn movement. Implementation of the roadway improvement would require roadway widening to the east, which necessitates relocation of the sidewalk, a utility box, a signal mast, and several other elements. Funding, implementation, and construction of this measure shall be the responsibility of the Project Sponsor. The feasibility of this measure is uncertain due to the adjacent unsignalized intersection, approximately 75 feet south of Winston Drive, which would conflict with the northbound right-turn lane. [SFMTA to determine if this is feasible, and if SFMTA determines that it is not, this mitigation measure shall not be implemented.]	Project sponsor and sponsor's construction contractor(s) in consultation with SFMTA	The following effective PM peak hour auto trip generation rates for each major land use proposed (accounting for the mix of uses and the level of transit service proposed) and the total number of PM peak hour trips generated by the Proposed Project that would trigger the need for this mitigation measure are shown below: Effective PM Peak Hour Trip Generation Rates (vehicle trips per unit of	SFMTA	

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
		development): Residential: 0.35 trips / dwelling unit Retail: 3.24 trips / 1,000 square feet Commercial: 3.76 trips / 1,000 square feet Recreational: 0.84 trips / 1,000 square feet Schools: 1.60 trips / 1,000 square feet A feasibility study must be completed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 930 trips based on the trip generation rates as described above. If the mitigation measure is deemed feasible, the mitigation measure must be constructed prior to the		

EXHIBIT 1: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Schedule**	**Monitoring/Report Responsibility**	**Status/Date Completed**
		issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 930, based on the trip generation rates as described above.		
M-TR-2D: Provide a third northbound through lane and a second southbound left-turn lane at the Lake Merced Boulevard/Font Boulevard intersection. This mitigation measure would require restriping the northbound right-turn lane at the Lake Merced Boulevard/State Drive intersection as a through lane and removing the on-street parking on the north side of the intersection to recreate the dedicated right-turn lane (assuming that it is required for acceptable operations at this intersection). Additionally, providing a second southbound left-turn lane at this intersection would require removal of on-street parking on the south side of Font Boulevard to create a second receiving lane, as well as the removal of some spaces on the west side of Lake Merced Boulevard and shifting the through travel lanes to the west to make room for the second southbound left-turn lane. Implementation would require significant roadway restriping and signal optimization and coordination at multiple intersections, as well as the removal of approximately 25 parking spaces. Funding, implementation, and construction of this measure shall be the responsibility of the Project Sponsor. [SFMTA to determine if this is feasible, and if SFMTA determines that it is not, this mitigation measure shall not be implemented.]	Project sponsor and sponsor's construction contractor(s) in consultation with SFMTA	A feasibility study must be completed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 930, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C. If the mitigation measure is deemed feasible, the mitigation measure must be constructed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 930, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C.	SFMTA	
M-TR-2E: Reconfigure the westbound right-turn and southbound left-turn as the primary movements of the intersection of Lake Merced Boulevard/Brotherhood Way. This would	Project sponsor and sponsor's	A feasibility study must be completed prior to the	SFMTA	

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
convert the northbound approach of Lake Merced Boulevard into the "minor" approach to the intersection. Although the configuration may be able to fit within the existing right-of-way at the intersection, further study is needed to determine the feasibility of this measure. A conceptual intersection configuration is presented in the Project's Transportation Study. Funding, implementation, and construction of this measure shall be the responsibility of the Project Sponsor.	construction contractor(s) in consultation with SFMTA	issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 1,128, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C. If the mitigation measure is deemed feasible, the mitigation measure must be constructed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 1,128, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C.		
M-TR-9: Eliminate the weaving segment between the loop on-ramp from Brotherhood Way and the loop off-ramp to Brotherhood Way by reconfiguring the interchange. Specifically, evaluate the feasibility of closing the loop on-ramp from eastbound Brotherhood Way to northbound SR 1 and instead constructing an eastbound left-turn lane from Brotherhood Way on the east side of the structure. The direct on-ramp from westbound Brotherhood Way to northbound SR 1 should be configured with one access point to serve traffic from westbound Brotherhood Way and those making a left-turn from eastbound Brotherhood Way. The eastbound left turn-lane can and shall be constructed to approximately 150 feet in length. Ultimately, this measure may require a design exception from Caltrans. Funding, implementation, and construction of this measure shall be the responsibility of the Project Sponsor.	Project sponsor and sponsor's construction contractor(s) in consultation with SFMTA and Caltrans	A feasibility study must be completed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 755, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C. If the mitigation measure is deemed feasible, the	SFMTA	

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
		mitigation measure must be constructed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 755, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C.		
M-TR-12: Contribute fair share toward developing and implementing revised transit service plan that increases capacity on the M Ocean View. Fund a fair-share contribution towards evaluating and implementing a revised operating plan to increase frequencies on the M Ocean View from 10 minute headways (as proposed by the project) to 7.5 minute headways north of Parkmerced. This would increase capacity such that the northeast screenline would operate within SFMTA's capacity utilization threshold in each peak hour. Under this plan, similar to the proposed service plan, every other train would continue east through the Ingleside neighborhood. The Proposed Project's fair-share contribution toward implementing a comprehensive revised operating plan should be proportional to the magnitude of the Proposed Project's impact in relation to additional capacity identified in a revised operating plan.	Project sponsor and SFMTA	A feasibility study must be completed prior to the completion and operation of the proposed Muni realignment and associated service plan updates. The study shall determine whether additional capacity can be provided on the M Ocean View, and if so, what the Proposed Project's fair share contribution to the service plan updates shall be. If the mitigation measure is deemed feasible, a fair share contribution must be made prior to the re-alignment of the M Ocean View through the Parkmerced site.	SFMTA	
M-TR-21A: Purchase an additional light rail vehicle for the M Ocean View. Purchase and insert another light-rail vehicle into the system in order to maintain headways. This will allow Muni to maintain proposed headways on the M Ocean View with a slightly longer route. The procurement of new light rail vehicles shall be completed by	Project sponsor and SFMTA	Either M-TR-21A or M-TR-21B (but not both) shall be implemented upon rerouting the M	SFMTA	

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
SFMTA, and shall be completed prior to operating the rerouted system. However, new transit vehicles required to serve the Proposed Project shall not be the financial responsibility of SFMTA.		Ocean View through the Parkmerced site. If both measures are deemed feasible and effective at reducing impacts to less than significant levels, M-TR-21B shall be implemented and M-TR-21A shall not be required.		
M-TR-21B: Install Transit Signal Priority (TSP) treatments to improve transit travel times on the M Ocean View such that M-TR-21A (an additional vehicle) is not required. A study shall be conducted to determine whether TSP treatments could improve transit travel times along the M Ocean View corridor. If feasible, implement Transit Signal Priority (TSP) measures along the M Ocean View corridor between the Project Site and the West Portal Station. To reduce the Proposed Project's impact to the M Ocean View line, the TSP measures would need to improve the travel time by approximately 50 seconds in the AM peak period and 30 seconds in the PM peak period. Achieving these reductions would reduce the Project's impact to travel time to less than half the headway of the current M Ocean View. SFMTA and Caltrans shall design the measure prior to operating the rerouted system; however, funding, implementation, and construction of this measure shall be the responsibility of the Project Sponsor. [SFMTA and Caltrans to determine if this is feasible, and if SFMTA or Caltrans determines that it is not, this mitigation measure shall not be implemented.]	Project sponsor and sponsor's construction contractor(s) in consultation with SFMTA and Caltrans	Either M-TR-21A or M-TR-21B (but not both) shall be implemented upon rerouting the M Ocean View through the Parkmerced site. If both measures are deemed feasible and effective at reducing impacts to less than significant levels, M-TR-21B shall be implemented and M-TR-21A shall not be required.	SFMTA and Caltrans	
M-TR-22A: Construct intersection mitigations to reduce congestion caused by vehicular delay. To address Project impacts to the 18 46th Avenue, the Project Sponsor in cooperation with SFMTA shall implement the improvements described in mitigation measures M-TR-2C (construct a dedicated northbound right-turn lane at the Lake Merced Boulevard/Winston Drive intersection), M-TR-2D (reconfigure the northbound approach to consist of a third through lane and provide a second southbound left-turn lane at the Lake Merced Boulevard/Font Boulevard intersection), and M-TR-2E (Reconfigure the westbound right-turn and southbound left-turn as the primary movements of the Lake Merced Boulevard/Brotherhood Way intersection). This involves lane modifications at several intersections along Lake Merced Boulevard to increase vehicular capacity, thus reducing approach delay at those intersections. [SFMTA to determine if this is feasible, and if SFMTA determines that it is not, this mitigation measure shall not be implemented.]	Project sponsor and sponsor's construction contractor(s) in consultation with SFMTA	See below with regard to M-TR-22C	SFMTA	

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
M-TR-22B: Maintain the proposed headways of the 18 46th Avenue. The Project Sponsor in cooperation with SFMTA shall conduct a study to evaluate the effectiveness and feasibility of the following improvements which could reduce Project impacts on transit operations along the Lake Merced Boulevard corridor, generally between Brotherhood Way and Winston Drive. The study shall create a monitoring program to determine the implementation extent and schedule (as identified below) to maintain the proposed headways of transit lines impacted by the Project. • A transit-only queue-jump lane should be considered on Lake Merced Boulevard at Font Boulevard. This treatment could be constructed within the existing curb-to-curb right of way for the northbound direction. • Southbound queue-jumps are viable at State Drive and Font Boulevard with removal of on-street parking. However, these treatments may conflict with mitigation measure M-TR-2C collectively summarized in M-TR-22A), which have been designed to reduce the Project's traffic impacts. These improvements would collectively benefit not only the 18 46th Avenue prior to the TEP improvements, but also SamTrans Route 122, and the proposed "shopper shuttle." Funding, implementation, and construction of this measure shall be the responsibility of the Project Sponsor. The Project Sponsor shall fully fund the costs of implementing the transit priority improvements (either the improvements identified above, or alternative improvements of equal or greater effectiveness and comparable cost) as determined by the study and the monitoring program. Other options to be evaluated in the study could include comprehensive replacement of stop-controlled intersections with interconnected traffic signals equipped with transit priority elements. [SFMTA to determine if this is feasible, and if SFMTA determines that it is not, this mitigation measure shall not be implemented.]	Project sponsor and sponsor's construction contractor(s) in consultation with SFMTA	See below with regard to M-TR-22C	SFMTA	
M-TR-22C: Purchase additional transit vehicles as necessary to mitigate the Project impacts to headways on the 18 46th Avenue. Should mitigation measures M-TR-22A or M-TR-22B not be feasible or effective, the Project Sponsor shall work with SFMTA to purchase additional transit vehicles and contribute to operating costs and facility improvements as necessary to mitigate the Project impacts to headways for the transit line. The Project Sponsor shall be responsible for the procurement and financing of the new transit vehicles.	Project sponsor and sponsor's construction contractor(s) in consultation with SFMTA	A feasibility study of M-TR-22A and M-TR-22B must be completed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 465, based on the trip generation rates described	SFMTA	

EXHIBIT 1: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Schedule**	**Monitoring/Report Responsibility**	**Status/Date Completed**
		in M-TR-2C. To the extent they are deemed either physically feasible or effective at reducing the severity of Impact TR-22, mitigation measures M-TR-22A and M-TR-22B must be constructed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 465, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C. The schedule for implementing M-TR-22C shall be determined by the feasibility study for M-TR-22A and M-TR-22B.		
M-TR-25B: Maintain the proposed headways of the 29 Sunset**.** The Project Sponsor in cooperation with SFMTA shall conduct a study to evaluate the effectiveness and feasibility of installing transit priority elements along Lake Merced Boulevard, between Winston Drive and Sunset Boulevard. This may include, but is not limited to, queue-jump lanes and transit-only lanes. Funding, implementation, and construction of this measure shall be the responsibility of the Project Sponsor. The Project Sponsor shall fully fund the costs of implementing the transit priority improvements (either the improvements identified above, or alternative improvements of equal or greater effectiveness and comparable cost) as determined by the study and the monitoring program	SFMTA, with funding from Project Sponsor	See discussion of M-TR-25C	SFMTA	

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
[SFMTA to determine if this is feasible, and if SFMTA determines that it is not, this mitigation measure shall not be implemented.]				
M-TR-25C: Purchase additional transit vehicles as necessary to mitigate the Project impacts to headways on the 29 Sunset. Should mitigation measures M-TR-25A or M-TR-25B not be feasible or effective, the Project Sponsor shall work with SFMTA to purchase additional transit vehicles and contribute to operating costs and facility improvements as necessary to mitigate the Project impacts to headways for the transit line. The procurement of new transit vehicles shall be completed by SFMTA. However, new transit vehicles required to serve the Proposed Project shall not be the financial responsibility of SFMTA.	SFMTA, with funding from Project Sponsor	. A feasibility study of M-TR-25A and M-TR-25B must be completed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 1,551, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C. To the extent they are deemed either physically feasible or effective at reducing the severity of Impact TR-25, mitigation measures M-TR-25A and M-TR-25B must be constructed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 1,551, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C. The schedule and/or need for implementing M-TR-25C shall be determined by the feasibility study for	SFMTA	

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
		M-TR-25A and M-TR-25B.		
M-TR-26: Maintain proposed headways on SamTrans Route 122**.** To address Project impacts to SamTrans Route 122, implement mitigation measures M-TR-22A (lane modifications at several intersections along Lake Merced Boulevard) and M-TR-22B (implementation of transit priority and queue-jump treatments on Lake Merced Boulevard). Since SamTrans Route 122 shares a route with the 18 46th Avenue, improvements designed to reduce travel time impacts to the 18 46th Avenue would also benefit SamTrans Route 122. As described in the discussion of mitigation measures M-TR-22A and M-TR-22B, feasibility of these measures is uncertain.	Project sponsor and sponsor's construction contractor(s) in consultation with SFMTA	A feasibility study must be completed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 1,880, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2BC. If the mitigation measure is deemed feasible, the mitigation measure must be constructed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 1,880, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C.	SFMTA	
M-TR-36A: Retime signal at 19th Avenue/Holloway Avenue to allocate more green time to the east-west movements. 19th Avenue is a coordinated corridor with closely spaced intersections. Traffic progression relies on the interconnectivity between each signal. Retiming this particular intersection would require evaluation of the corridor. SFMTA would be responsible for evaluating and implementing a new signal timing plan. [SFMTA and Caltrans to determine if this is feasible, and if SFMTA or Caltrans determines that it is not, this mitigation measure shall not be implemented.]	SFMTA to carry out feasibility study. If feasible, SFMTA to monitor traffic conditions at this intersection to determine when modifications are needed.	A feasibility study must be completed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 1,725, based on the trip	SFMTA	

EXHIBIT 1: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Schedule**	**Monitoring/Report Responsibility**	**Status/Date Completed**
	SFMTA to retime signal if determined feasible and necessary.	generation rates described in M-TR-2C. If the mitigation measure is deemed feasible, the mitigation measure must be constructed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 1,725, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C.		
M-TR-36B: Construct a dedicated westbound right-turn lane and convert the shared westbound through/right-turn lane to a dedicated westbound through lane at the Brotherhood Way/Chumasero Drive intersection. Construction of this mitigation measure would require roadway widening into the Project Site. However, if the existing pedestrian overcrossing across Brotherhood Way at this intersection remains, widening the roadway to implement this measure may not be feasible due to conflicts with structural support columns for the overcrossing. Funding, implementation, and construction of this measure shall be the responsibility of the Project Sponsor. [SFMTA to determine if this is feasible, and if SFMTA determines that it is not, this mitigation measure shall not be implemented.]	SFMTA to carry out feasibility study. Project sponsor and sponsor's construction contractor(s) to carry out design and implementation in consultation with SFMTA	Upon construction of proposed improvements to the Brotherhood Way/Chumasero Drive intersection, as specified in the Development Agreement.	Sponsor to provide revised plans to Planning Department as part of Development Agreement; Planning Department to review and acknowledge change in proposed intersection configurations.	
M-TR-36C: Install a traffic signal at Lake Merced Boulevard/John Muir Drive. The Project Sponsor should contribute a fair-share toward funding this mitigation measure. Funding, implementation, and construction of this measure shall be the responsibility of the Project Sponsor. [SFMTA to determine if this is feasible, and if SFMTA determines that it is not, this mitigation measure shall not be implemented.]	SFMTA to carry out feasibility study. If determined feasible, project sponsor to provide fair-share funding and SFMTA to	A feasibility study must be completed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at	SFMTA	

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
	design and construct.	Parkmerced exceed 2,326, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C. If the mitigation measure is deemed feasible, the mitigation measure must be constructed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 2,326, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C.		
M-TR-36D: Convert the dedicated southbound through lane into a dedicated left-turn lane at John Daly Boulevard/Lake Merced Boulevard. This would result in the southbound approach consisting of a shared through-right-turn lane and triple left-turn lanes. To achieve adequate lane utilization, John Daly Boulevard would have to be configured to have three eastbound through travel lanes east of the intersection. This would require the removal of some pedestrian elements and converting the existing right-turn lane into the Westlake Shopping Center into a shared through/right-turn lane. Funding, implementation, and construction of this measure shall be the responsibility of the Project Sponsor. [Project Sponsor to coordinate with City of Daly City to determine if this is feasible, and if Daly City determines that it is not, this mitigation measure shall not be implemented.	Project Sponsor to coordinate with the City of Daly City	A feasibility study must be completed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 2,946, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C. If the mitigation measure is deemed feasible, the mitigation measure must be constructed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after	Project Sponsor to report to SFMTA and ERO on results of coordination with City of Daly City	

EXHIBIT 1: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Schedule**	**Monitoring/Report Responsibility**	**Status/Date Completed**
		completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 2,946, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C.		
M-TR-36E: Install an auxiliary lane from Brotherhood Way through the Lake Merced Boulevard/Gonzalez Drive intersection to provide three northbound through lanes**.** Funding, implementation, and construction of this measure shall be the responsibility of the Project Sponsor. [SFMTA to determine if this is feasible, and if SFMTA determines that it is not, this mitigation measure shall not be implemented.]	SFMTA to conduct feasibility study. Project sponsor and sponsor's construction contractor(s) to design and construct in consultation with SFMTA	A feasibility study must be completed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 2,946, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C. If the mitigation measure is deemed feasible, the mitigation measure must be constructed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 2,946, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C.	SFMTA	
M-TR-36F: Install an auxiliary lane from Brotherhood Way through the Lake Merced Boulevard/Gonzalez Drive intersection to provide three northbound through lanes**.**	SFMTA to conduct feasibility study.	A feasibility study must be completed prior to the	SFMTA	

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
Funding, implementation, and construction of this measure shall be the responsibility of the Project Sponsor. [SFMTA to determine if this is feasible, and if SFMTA determines that it is not, this mitigation measure shall not be implemented.]	Project sponsor and sponsor's construction contractor(s) to design and construct in consultation with SFMTA	issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 2,946, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C. If the mitigation measure is deemed feasible, the mitigation measure must be constructed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 2,946, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C.		
M-TR-44: Provide additional capacity on the south and north screenlines by adding additional buses to the 28 19th Avenue and 28L 19th Avenue Limited lines. Providing additional service on the bus line would require further feasibility and capacity studies with coordination from SFMTA. The Project sponsor would be responsible to fund a "fair share" contribution towards the implementation of this mitigation measure.	SFMTA to conduct feasibility and capacity study. Project sponsor to make fair-share contribution. If feasible, SFMTA to purchase and operate vehicles.	A feasibility study must be completed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 2,667, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C. If the mitigation measure	SFMTA	

EXHIBIT 1: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Schedule**	**Monitoring/Report Responsibility**	**Status/Date Completed**
		is deemed feasible, the mitigation measure must be constructed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 2,667 based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C.		
Noise				
M-NO-1a: Reduce Noise Levels During Construction The following practices shall be incorporated into the construction contract agreement documents to be implemented by the construction contractor: • Provide enclosures and mufflers for stationary equipment, shroud or shield impact tools, and install barriers around particularly noisy activities at the construction sites so that the line of sight between the construction activities and nearby sensitive receptor locations is blocked to the maximum feasible extent; • Use construction equipment with lower noise emission ratings whenever possible, particularly for air compressors; • Provide sound-control devices on equipment no less effective than those provided by the manufacturer; • Locate stationary equipment, material stockpiles, and vehicle staging areas as far as practicable from sensitive receptor locations; • Prohibit unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines; • Require applicable construction-related vehicles and equipment to use designated truck routes to access the project sites; • Implement noise attenuation measures to the extent feasible, which may include, but are not limited to, noise barriers or noise blankets. The	Project Sponsor and construction contractor(s)	During Construction of each phase	Planning Department	

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
placement of such attenuation measures shall be reviewed and approved by the Director of Public Works prior to issuance of development permits for construction activities. Designate a Noise Disturbance Coordinator who shall be responsible for responding to complaints about noise during construction. The telephone number of the Noise Disturbance Coordinator shall be conspicuously posted at the construction site and shall be provided to the City. Copies of the construction schedule shall also be posted at nearby noise-sensitive areas				
M-NO-1b: Pile Driving Noise-Reducing Techniques and Muffling Devices The Project Sponsor shall require its construction contractor to use noise-reducing pile driving techniques if nearby buildings are subject to pile driving noise and vibration. These techniques shall include pre-drilling pile holes (if feasible, based on soils; see Mitigation Measure M-NO-2, pp. V.F.20-V.F.21) to the maximum feasible depth, installing intake and exhaust mufflers on pile driving equipment, vibrating piles into place when feasible, and installing shrouds around the pile driving hammer where feasible. Construction contractors shall be required to use construction equipment with state-of-the-art noise shielding and muffling devices. In addition, at least 48 hours prior to pile driving activities, the Project Sponsor shall notify building owners and occupants within 500 feet of the project site of the dates, hours, and expected duration of such activities.	Project Sponsor	During Construction of each phase if pile driving is required. At least 48 hours prior to pile driving activities, the Project Sponsor shall notify building owners and occupants within 500 feet of the project site of the dates, hours, and expected duration of such activities.	Planning Department	
M-NO-2: Pre-Construction Assessment to Minimize Vibration Levels Associated with Impact Activities The Project Sponsor shall hire a qualified geotechnical engineer to conduct a pre-construction assessment of existing subsurface conditions and the structural integrity of nearby buildings subject to pile driving noise and vibration prior to receiving a building permit. If recommended by the geotechnical engineer, for structures or facilities within 50 feet of pile driving activities, the Project Sponsor shall require ground-borne vibration monitoring of nearby structures. Such methods and technologies shall be based on the specific conditions at the construction site such as, but not limited to, the following: • Pre-construction surveying of potentially affected structures; • Underpinning of foundations of potentially affected structures, as necessary; The construction plan shall include a monitoring program to detect ground settlement or lateral movement of structures in the vicinity of impact activities. Monitoring results shall be submitted to the Department of Building Inspection. In the event of unacceptable ground movement, as determined by the Department of Building	Project Sponsor and qualified geotechnical engineers	Prior to commencement of construction of each phase.	Geotechnical engineer to provide reports to Department of Building Inspection for review and approval	

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
Inspection, all impact work shall cease and corrective measures shall be implemented. The impact program and ground stabilization measures shall be reevaluated and approved by the Department of Building Inspection.				

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
M-NO-5: Light Rail Noise and Vibration Reduction Plan The proposed realignment of the Muni M Ocean View light rail and its operations shall be designed with input from a qualified acoustical consultant so that light rail operation noise levels are attenuated at and in the vicinity of the final alignment so that the San Francisco Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Community Noise standards are not exceeded. The Light Rail Noise and Vibration Reduction Plan shall be prepared by a qualified acoustical consultant and submitted to the City for review and approval prior to construction of the proposed realignment. The plan shall identify noise attenuation measures that would ensure compliance with the City's community noise guidelines, including, but not limited to, requiring light rail operators to reduce vehicle speeds when approaching and departing and operating within the Project Site. The following noise and vibration attenuation measures shall be included as part of the plan: • **Rail Bed Design:** The light rail trackwork shall be designed to prevent the production of excessive vibration levels at the nearest sensitive structures. The design should include the installation of high-resilience direct fixation fasteners for embedded track, ballast mat for ballast and tie track, or other measures as determined by a qualified light rail vibration consultant. • **Rail Grinding and Replacement:** As rails wear, both noise levels from light rail by-passes and vibration levels can increase. By grinding down or replacing worn rail, noise and vibration levels will remain at the initial operating levels. Rail grinding or replacement is normally performed every 3 to 5 years. • **Wheel Truing and Replacement:** Wheel truing is a method of grinding down flat spots (commonly called "wheel flats") on the light rail's wheels. Flat spots occur primarily because of hard braking. When flat spots occur they can cause increases in both the noise and vibration levels produced by the light rail vehicles. • **Vehicle Maintenance:** Vehicle maintenance includes performing scheduled and general maintenance on items such as air conditioning units, bearings, wheel skirts, and other mechanical units on the light rail vehicles. Keeping the mechanical system on the light rail vehicles in top condition will also help to control noise and vibration levels. • **Operator Training:** Operators will be trained to maintain light rail travel speeds at those speeds given in the operation plan and to avoid "hard braking" whenever possible. As stated, hard braking can cause	Project Sponsor with qualified professional consultant. Project sponsor and sponsor's construction contractor(s) in consultation with SFMTA	Light Rail Noise and Vibration Reduction Plan shall be prepared by a qualified acoustical consultant and submitted to SFMTA for review and approval prior to construction of the proposed realignment. During final engineering design, vibration propagation testing shall be conducted at the final light rail alignment near Gonzalez Drive and Diaz Avenue.	SFMTA. SFMTA to monitor rail grinding and replacement every other 3 to 5 years. SFMTA shall perform ongoing vehicle maintenance. SFMTA shall perform ongoing operator training.	

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
wheel flats and may also damage track. Furthermore, by training operators to identify potential wheel flats and other mechanical problems with the trains, proper maintenance can be performed in a timely manner. During final engineering design, vibration propagation testing shall be conducted at the final light rail alignment near Gonzalez Drive and Diaz Avenue to confirm the predicted impact and finalize the mitigation measures. Where vibration impacts are confirmed, they shall be reduced to meet the FTA criteria.				
M-NO-6: Residential Use Plan Review by Qualified Acoustical Consultant To ensure that interior noise levels induced by the light rail station, and by automobile, bus, and light rail traffic at noise sensitive uses do not result in excessive awakenings, or exceed an interior noise level standard of 45 dBA (L_{dn}), a qualified acoustical consultant shall review plans for all new residential uses, the new Pre K-5 school, and new day care facility, and provide recommendations to provide acoustical insulation or other equivalent measures to ensure that interior noise levels would not exceed acceptable limits and a cumulative noise level of 45 dBA (L_{dn}). These studies shall be presented to the Department of Building Inspection at the time that permits for individual buildings are submitted for review.	Project Sponsor to retain qualified acoustical consultant	Prior to issuance of each individual building permit.	Consultant to submit reports to Department of Building Inspection Building designers to follow the recommendations of the acoustical consultant. DBI to review plans to ensure recommendations are included in plans	
M-NO-7: Stationary Operational Noise Sources. All utility and industrial stationary noise sources (e.g., district energy system, wind turbines, etc.) shall be located away from noise sensitive receptors, be enclosed within structures with adequate setback and screening, be installed adjacent to noise reducing shields, or constructed with some other adequate noise attenuating features, to achieve compliance with the noise level limits of the San Francisco Noise Ordinance and to achieve acceptable levels at the property lines of nearby residences or other sensitive uses, as determined by the San Francisco Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Community Noise standards. Once the stationary noise sources have been installed, the Project Sponsor shall retain a qualified acoustics specialist to monitor noise levels to ensure compliance with local noise standards. Initial noise monitoring shall occur within three months after the installation of the stationary noise source, and a report of the results shall be made available to on-site tenants. Subsequent noise monitoring shall be conducted by the Project Sponsor, within three months of on-site tenants reporting persistent intrusive noise. If project stationary noise sources exceed the applicable noise standards, a qualified acoustical consultant shall by retained by the Sponsor to install additional noise attenuation measures or acoustic insulation in order to meet the applicable noise standards.	Project Sponsor to retain qualified acoustical consultant	Within three months of installation of stationary noise sources. Subsequent noise monitoring within three months of on-site tenants reporting persistent intrusive noise.	Planning Department	

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
M-NO-8: Residential Building Plan Review by Qualified Acoustical Consultant To ensure that noise produced during garbage collection is reduced to the maximum practicable extent, a qualified acoustical consultant shall review plans for all new residential buildings and associated garbage collection facilities, and provide recommendations to provide enclosures, acoustical shielding, or other equivalent measures. These studies shall be presented to the Department of Building Inspection at the time that permits for individual buildings are submitted for review.	Project Sponsor to retain qualified acoustical consultant	Prior to issuance of a building permit for each individual building.	Department of Building Inspection	
Air Quality				
M-AQ-3: Construction Exhaust Emissions. The applicant shall implement feasible combustion emission reduction strategies, during construction activities, including the following measures: • The project applicant shall keep all off-road equipment well-tuned and regularly serviced to minimize exhaust emissions, and shall establish a regular and frequent check-up and service/maintenance program for equipment. • Off-road diesel equipment operators shall be required to shut down their engines rather than idle for more than five minutes, unless such idling is necessary for proper operation of the equipment. • Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points. The applicant shall require construction contracts to specify implementation of the following combustion emission reduction strategies, during construction activities: • The project should use equipment with engines compliant with USEPA Tier 3 engine standards or better for all off-road equipment, or utilize Retrofit Emission Control Devices which consist of diesel oxidation catalysts, diesel particulate filters or similar retrofit equipment control technology verified by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) (http://www.arb.ca.gov/diesel/verdev/verdev.htm), where feasible. • The project shall use equipment with engines compliant with USEPA Tier 4 engine standards or better for 50 percent of the fleet by 2015, increasing to 100 percent by 2020. The project shall use 2007 or newer model year haul trucks, where feasible.	Project Sponsor and Sponsor's construction contractor(s).	Submit planned emission reduction strategies and copies of applicable construction specification related to off-road equipment for each construction phase prior to issuance of the site permit for that phase. Construction contractor shall submit quarterly reports regarding implementation of emission reduction strategies and use of Tier3 or Tier 4 or equivalent equipment during construction.	Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection	
M-AQ-15: Mechanical Ventilation Systems for New Residential Uses. New residential uses within 200 feet from the edge of the Project Site boundary along Junipero Serra Boulevard, including ramps on Brotherhood Way, 19th Avenue, or Brotherhood Way shall	Project Sponsor and Sponsor's construction	Prior to issuance of a building permit for each individual building.	Planning Department and	

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
incorporate mechanical ventilation systems. If the project anticipates operable windows or other sources of infiltration of ambient air, the residences shall be provided with a central HVAC (heating, ventilation and air conditioning) system that includes high efficiency filters for particulates (MERV-13 or higher). The system should operate to maintain positive pressure within the building interior to prevent entrainment of outdoor air indoors. Alternatively, if the development limits infiltration though non-operable windows and other techniques, the residences shall be provided with a ventilation and filtration system that meets the following specifications: (1) ASHRAE MERV-13 supply air filters; (2) >= 1 air exchanges per hour of fresh outside filtered air; (3) >= 4 air exchanges / hour recirculation; and (4) <= 0.25 air exchanges per hour in unfiltered infiltration.	contractor(s).		Department of Building Inspection	
Wind and Shadow				
M-WS-1a: Wind Impact Analysis for Proposed Buildings Over 100 feet in Height. A wind impact analysis shall be required for any proposed building over 100 feet in height. Wind tunnel testing shall be required for each building unless, upon review by a qualified wind consultant, it is determined that the exposure, massing, and/or orientation of the building are such that adverse wind impacts would not occur. The analysis shall assess wind conditions for the building in conjunction with the anticipated pattern of development on surrounding blocks. All feasible means (such as relocating or reorienting certain buildings, sculpting buildings to include podiums and roof terraces, or installing landscaping) to eliminate hazardous winds, if predicted, shall be implemented. A significant wind impact would be a substantial increase in the number of hours that the 26 mph wind hazard criterion is exceeded or a substantial increase in the area subjected to winds greater than 26 mph.	Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant	Prior to building permit issuance for any proposed building over 100 feet in height.	Planning Department	
M-WS-1b: Wind Tunnel Testing for Proposed Buildings Over 50 feet in Height. Wind tunnel testing shall be required for any proposed building over 50 feet in height that is within 200 feet of any of the existing 13-story buildings on the Project Site. The analysis shall assess wind conditions for the building in conjunction with the anticipated pattern of development one surrounding blocks. All feasible means (such as relocating or reorienting certain buildings, sculpting buildings to include podiums and roof terraces, or installing landscaping) to eliminate hazardous winds, if predicted, shall be implemented. A significant wind impact would be a substantial increase in the number of hours that the 26 mph wind hazard criterion is exceeded or a substantial increase in the area subjected to winds greater than 26 mph.	Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant	Prior to building permit issuance for any proposed building over 50 feet in height that is within 200 feet of any of the existing 13-story buildings on the Project Site.	Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection	
Biological Resources				
M-BI-1a: Pre-construction Survey for Gumplant. A pre-construction survey shall be conducted to locate and fence the boundaries of any gumplant populations with a	Project Sponsor to retain qualified	Prior to construction for each phase, a	Planning Department	

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
25-foot buffer zone. To determine if any previously unknown special-status plant or animal species would be affected, a preconstruction survey shall be conducted within the construction area in the spring (May and June) by a qualified biologist authorized by CDFG to conduct such activities.	professional consultant	preconstruction survey shall be conducted within the construction area in the spring (May and June) by a qualified biologist authorized by CDFG.		
M-BI-1b: Avoidance of Gumplant During Construction. The configuration of the construction area shall be modified to avoid any special-status species encountered during the pre-construction survey. No construction activities shall occur within the buffer area. The Project Sponsor shall ensure that the construction area is fenced to the minimum size necessary to avoid impacts from the outfall to the willow basin.	Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant	Prior to construction for each phase	Planning Department	
M-BI-1c: Restoration and Expansion of Gumplant Population. If it is not possible to avoid the gumplant population during construction, the Project Sponsor shall implement a restoration and mitigation plan in consultation with the San Francisco Planning Department (City) and CDFG. Impacts to the San Francisco gumplant will be mitigated by restoring the affected area and expanding the size of the population by increasing the area and number of individual gumplant plants. The size and density of the affected gumplant population shall be measured prior to construction. This mitigation plan shall describe methods for planting, monitoring, and maintaining the affected area. Performance standards to determine success of the mitigation shall be attained that show that the cover and density of the population affected has been replaced. An annual report shall be submitted to the City and CDFG that documents maintenance and monitoring methods and results. Such monitoring and maintenance shall continue for at least 5 years beyond the implementation of the mitigation plan.	Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant	If gumplant population cannot be avoided, prior to construction for each phase, mitigation plan shall be submitted. An annual report shall be submitted to the City and CDFG that documents maintenance and monitoring methods and results. Monitoring and maintenance shall continue for at least 5 years beyond the implementation of the mitigation plan.	Planning Department and CDFG	
M-BI-2a: <u>Preconstruction Survey for Common Yellowthroat Nesting Activities and Buffer Area.</u> If outfall repair or construction activities occur along the Lake Merced shoreline during the breeding season of the common yellowthroat (March-August), a qualified ornithologist authorized by CDFG to conduct such activities shall conduct a preconstruction survey of the work area to determine if any birds are nesting in or in the vicinity of the outfall. The preconstruction survey shall be conducted within 15 days prior to the start of work from March through May (since there is higher	Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant	If outfall repair or construction activities occur during the breeding season (March-August), a qualified ornithologist authorized by CDFG shall conduct a preconstruction	CDFG and Planning Department	

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
potential for birds to initiate nesting during this period), and within 30 days prior to the start of work from June through August. If active nests are found in the work area, a buffer of 50 feet shall be established between the work area and the nest(s). No work will be allowed within the buffer until the young have successfully fledged. The size of the nest buffer can be reduced as a result of consultation with the CDFG. Such a reduction shall be dependent on a relatively low frequency and intensity of disturbance and the tolerance of the nesting birds to human disturbance.		survey. The preconstruction survey shall be conducted within 15 days prior to the start of work from March through May, and within 30 days prior to the start of work from June through August.		
M-BI-2b: Monitoring for Western Pond Turtles During Construction. Stormwater outfall construction activities at the Lake Merced outfall site(s) shall be monitored by a biologist to ensure that no western pond turtles are present and subjected to harm. If turtles are present, the biologist shall capture and relocate them or ensure that they are moved to an area outside of the construction zone and away from harm. Identification, capture and relocation of turtles shall be done by a qualified biologist authorized by CDFG to conduct such activities.	Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant	During construction for each phase	CDFG and Planning Department	
M-BI-2c: SWPPP Design Details for Site Drainage and Water Quality Control in Outfall Construction Area. The SWPPP is required and shall include design details and construction specifications for all site drainage control and other water quality control strategies. It shall also detail the implementation schedule, methods and locations of erosion and water quality control features. The California Stormwater Quality Association Construction Handbook provides guidance for selecting and implementing Best Management Practices (BMPs) that would eliminate or reduce the discharge of pollutants from construction sites to waters of the state. Three levels of BMPs are considered for each potential pollutant: source control, management control, and treatment control. BMPS which could be implemented as part of the SWPPP include: hydroseeding, straw mulch, temporary stream bank stabilization, silt fences, sediment traps, temporary stream crossings, stockpile management, and spill prevention and control.	Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant	Prior to and during construction for each phase	SFPUC	
M-BI-3a: Restrict Vegetation Removal Activities in Wetland and Riparian Areas During Outfall Construction. Vegetation removal activities in wetland and riparian habitats in the willow basin and along the shoreline of Lake Merced shall be restricted to as small an area as possible. Construction areas shall be no longer than 40 feet and shall be shorter where possible. In addition, construction shall avoid large willow and wax myrtle trees.	Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant	Prior to and during construction for each phase	Planning Department	
M-BI-3b: Vegetation Restoration in Outfall Construction Area. The vegetation of any affected riparian or wetland area shall be restored to the same or to a more	Project Sponsor to retain qualified	A mitigation plan shall be developed prior to the	Planning Department	

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
biologically valuable condition. This shall entail planting of vegetation, if it is not expected to return on its own, and removal of non-native species. A mitigation plan that describes site preparation, planting, performance standards, maintenance (including weed control), and monitoring methods shall be developed for impacts to marsh and riparian vegetation. The performance standards shall include a mitigation ratio of 1:1, standards for cover, plant composition of the restored area, and erosion, at the end of 5 years. Remedial activities shall be outlined in the plan to address any of the restoration areas that are not attaining performance standards at the end of 5 years. The mitigation area shall be monitored and maintained for at least 5 years. Monitoring and maintenance activities shall be summarized in an annual report to be prepared for each of the 5 years the area is monitored. This mitigation plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City prior to the approval of the final map for the project.	professional consultant	approval of the final map for Project. The mitigation area shall be monitored and maintained for at least 5 years. Monitoring and maintenance activities shall be summarized in an annual report to be prepared for each of the 5 years the area is monitored.		
M-BI-4: <u>Breeding Bird Pre-construction Surveys and Buffer Areas.</u> Vegetation removal activities for the Proposed Project and stormwater treatment option areas and building demolitions shall be conducted during the non-breeding season (i.e., September through February) to avoid impact to nesting birds or preconstruction surveys shall be conducted for work scheduled during the breeding season (March through August). Preconstruction surveys shall be conducted by a qualified ornithologist, authorized by CDFG to conduct such activities, to determine if any birds are nesting in or in the vicinity of vegetation or buildings to be removed. The preconstruction survey shall be conducted within 15 days prior to the start of work from March through May (since there is higher potential for birds to initiate nesting during this period), and within 30 days prior to the start of work from June through August. If active songbird nests are found in the work area, a buffer of 50 feet between the nest and work area shall be established. If active raptor nests are found in the work area, a buffer of 200 feet shall be established between the nest and the work area. No work will be allowed with the buffer(s) until the young have successfully fledged. In some instances, the size of the nest buffer can be reduced and its size shall therefore be determined by the biologist in consultation with the CDFG, and shall be based to a large extent on the nesting species, its sensitivity to disturbance, and the type and frequency of disturbance.	Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant	Vegetation removal activities shall be conducted during the non-breeding season (i.e., September through February), OR preconstruction surveys shall be conducted for work scheduled during the breeding season (March through August). The preconstruction survey shall be conducted within 15 days prior to the start of work from March through May, and within 30 days prior to the start of work from June through August. If active raptor nests are found in the work area, no work will be allowed with the buffer(s) until the young have successfully	CDFG and Planning Department	

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
		fledged.		
M-BI-7a: <u>Pre-maintenance Surveys for Active Bird Nests and Buffer Areas.</u> If maintenance of the stormwater treatment system occurs during the nesting season (March-August), a qualified ornithologist, authorized by CDFG to conduct such activities, shall conduct a survey of the work area to determine if any birds are nesting in the work area or in the vicinity. The survey shall be conducted within 15 days prior to the start of maintenance work from March through May (since there is higher potential for birds to initiate nesting during this period), and within 30 days prior to the start of work from June through August. If active songbird nests are found in the work area, a buffer of 50 feet between the nest and the work area shall be established. If active raptor nests are found in the work area, a buffer of 200 feet shall be established between the nest and the work area. No work will be allowed within the buffer until the young have successfully fledged. In some instances, the size of the buffer can be reduced and its size shall therefore be determined by the biologist in consultation with the CDFG, and shall be based to a large extent on the nesting species, its sensitivity to disturbance, and the type and frequency of disturbance.	Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant	If maintenance of the stormwater treatment system occurs during the nesting season (March-August), a qualified ornithologist shall conduct a survey of the work area. The survey shall be conducted within 15 days prior to the start of maintenance work from March through May, and within 30 days prior to the start of work from June through August.	CDFG and Planning Department	
M-BI-7b: <u>Monitoring During Maintenance Activities.</u> The on-site stormwater features shall be monitored by a qualified biologist, authorized by CDFG to conduct such activities, during maintenance activities to ensure that no western pond turtles or other special-status amphibians or reptiles are present and subject to harm. If turtles or other special-status reptiles and amphibians are present, the biologist shall capture and relocate them, or ensure that they are moved to an area outside of the construction zone and away from harm.	Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant	Ongoing monitoring after completion of each phase	CDFG and Planning Department (Reporting Only)	
M-BI-8a: <u>Pre-permitting Surveys for Birds and Bats.</u> To obtain baseline information on existing bird use of the proposed wind turbine alignment along Lake Merced Boulevard, the Project Sponsor shall retain a qualified wildlife biologist, authorized by CDFG to conduct such activities, to conduct bi-weekly bird use counts (BUCs) of the area for two years using methods described in Anderson and CEC/CDFG. Three point count stations spaced approximately 500 feet apart in the existing median between Lake Merced Boulevard and Vidal Drive would likely be sufficient to detect all birds using and/or flying through the area, although the final study design shall be subject to review and approval by the CDFG. Methods other than BUCs may be used if improved methods for documenting bird use at proposed wind turbine sites are developed in the interim period between the certification of this EIR and the initiation of the wind turbine program. Obtaining baseline information on existing bat use of the wind turbine alignment is complicated by the fact that bats are much more difficult to detect than birds and	Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant	Prior to permit issuance for wind turbines, bi-weekly bird use counts (BUCs) shall be conducted for two years. Prior to permit issuance for wind turbines, a qualified bat expert shall conduct a one-day habitat assessment of the proposed wind turbine alignment.	CDFG and Planning Department (Reporting Only)	

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
available monitoring methods (i.e., acoustic monitoring of echolocation calls) may not be feasible in a dense urban environment. As such, the Project Sponsor shall retain a qualified bat expert to conduct a one-day habitat assessment of the proposed wind turbine alignment. Based on the results of the assessment, the bat expert shall provide recommendations on the appropriate level of monitoring required to establish baseline patterns of seasonal bat activity along the proposed wind turbine alignment. If the bat expert believes that focused bat surveys are not necessary or that the proposed wind turbines do not pose a significant risk to local bat populations, he/she shall explain his/her opinions following standard scientific report format. Similarly, the Project Sponsor shall retain a biologist experienced with nocturnal bird survey methods (e.g., radar, acoustic monitoring, visual surveys using night vision equipment) to conduct an assessment of the proposed wind turbine alignment and assess the feasibility of conducting nocturnal surveys for migrating birds. Given substantial uncertainty and variation over the optimal protocols for detecting nocturnal migrating birds and the viability of such protocols to predict collision risk, it is important to identify species of primary concern and develop site-specific questions that any nocturnal studies should address prior to implementing a nocturnal monitoring program. The biologist retained to conduct the nocturnal bird survey feasibility assessment shall provide such information in their report. Data gathered during the pre-permitting surveys shall be used to develop baseline estimates of bird and bat fatality rates (expressed as fatalities/megawatt/year) from the proposed wind turbines. Given the lack of scientific studies on wind turbine-wildlife interactions in urban areas and vertical-axis wind turbine (VAWT) impacts on wildlife, it will be difficult if not impossible to apply known fatality rates from other studies to the project site (although such information may become available by the time the wind turbine program is implemented). As such, baseline fatality estimates shall be developed with input from scientists experienced with statistical analysis of wind turbine-wildlife interactions.		Prior to permit issuance for wind turbines, a biologist experienced with nocturnal bird survey methods (e.g., radar, acoustic monitoring, visual surveys using night vision equipment) shall conduct an assessment of the proposed wind turbine alignment.		
M-BI-8b: <u>Operations Monitoring Program.</u> The Project Sponsor shall implement a scientifically defensible operations monitoring program to estimate bird and bat fatality rates from the new wind turbines. Operations monitoring typically consists of counts of bird and bat carcasses in the vicinity of turbines and ongoing bird use data collection (i.e., continued BUCs) using the most current methods prescribed by the California Energy Commission and CDFG. Given the lack of published information on impacts to birds and bats from urban wind turbines and the site's proximity to a major wildlife habitat feature (i.e., Lake Merced), and the Pacific flyway a minimum of two years of post-construction monitoring shall be conducted. The operations monitoring program shall be developed with input from the CDFG, USFWS, and scientists experienced in	Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant	A post-construction monitoring program shall be established for a minimum of two years after installation of wind turbines.	CDFG and USFWS and Planning Department (Reporting Only)	

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
the analysis of wind turbine-wildlife interactions.				
M-BI-8c: Implementation of Management Strategies (Wind Turbines). If results of operations monitoring indicate that bird and/or bat fatality rates exceed those predicted during the pre-permitting phase, the City shall require implementation of some or all of the following management strategies or compensation measures: 1. Seasonal shutdown (e.g., spring or fall migratory period, depending on results of surveys) of a particular turbine or turbines that may be found to be contributing a disproportionate amount to bird and/or bat fatalities. 2. Contribution of funds towards the management, restoration, enhancement, and/or protection of the local habitats used by species affected by wind turbines (e.g., lands managed by San Francisco Recreation and Park Natural Areas Program or the National Park Service Golden Gate National Recreation Area). Contribution of funds towards research programs aimed at wind turbine-wildlife interactions, nocturnal bird study methods, and/or collision risk.	Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant	Upon conclusion of monitoring program, implementation of management strategies or compensation measures.	Planning Department	
M-BI-8d: Design Elements to Minimize Bird and/or Bat Strikes. The following measures shall be incorporated into wind turbine design to minimize the likelihood of bird strikes: 1. FAA-mandated obstruction lighting at the turbine tops shall consist of red or white strobe-type lights rather than steady-burning lights, as several studies have demonstrated reduced mortality of night-migrating birds at facilities using strobe-type lights. 2. No guy wires shall be used to support the wind turbines, as they are a known hazard to birds. 3. To prevent bird collisions with overhead power lines, turbines shall be powered via underground electrical connections. 4. Bare soil or manicured grass around turbine bases may provide habitat for small mammals, resulting in increased prey availability for raptors and putting them at increased risk of collision. To discourage small mammals from burrowing under or near turbine bases, gravel or artificial turf shall be placed at least 5 feet around each turbine foundation. Additional design elements proven to minimize bird and/or bat strikes shall be implemented as information on such measures becomes available in the scientific literature and/or agency guidance documents.	Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant	Prior to wind turbine permit issuance, design measures shall be incorporated.	Planning Department	
M-BI-8e: Incidental Take Permit. As mentioned above, the proposed wind turbines	Project Sponsor to	Prior to wind turbine	CDFG	

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
may result in mortality of bank swallows, which is state-listed as threatened under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) or other species of concern. Given the current uncertainty over the extent and magnitude of potential take of bank swallows or other species of concern, the Project Sponsor shall apply to the CDFG for an incidental take permit pursuant to Section 2081 of CESA and implement all CDFG conditions of that permit, which may include the some or all of the mitigation measures described above. The permit application will comply with the applicable requirements of Section 738.2 of CESA, as it may be amended.	retain qualified professional consultant	permit issuance from the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection, a take permit application from CDFG shall be issued..	and Planning Department (reporting only)	
M-BI-9: <u>Bird-Safe Design Practices.</u> The Project Sponsor shall ensure that the new residential towers should follow bird-safe design practices as much as possible to minimize the potential for increased bird-window collisions. Building facades should create "visual noise" via cladding or other design features that make it easier for birds to identify buildings as such and not mistake windows for open sky or trees. Windows should not be comprised of clear or reflective glass, which is coated with a reflective film to control solar heat gain. Instead, windows should incorporate different glass types such as UV-A or fritted glass. Windows should also incorporate UV-absorbing and UV-reflecting stripe and grid patterns in locations with the highest potential for bird-window collisions (e.g., lower levels near trees).	Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant	Prior to building permit issuance for each phase, bird-safe design practices shall be included.	Planning Department	
M-BI-10: <u>Study of Willow Basin to Control Water Level and Duration of Inundation.</u> A hydrological study shall be conducted on the willow basin to determine whether the additional input of storm runoff will affect the duration and depth of ponding. If the level of water will rise to within 3 feet of the base of any wax myrtle and remain at that level for more than 4 days, then the outlet of the willow basin shall be modified to prevent such rise of water level and duration. If the water level already exhibits these characteristics, then no change shall be made to ensure that the existing depth and duration of ponding in the willow basin remains as is.	Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant	Submit a hydrological study prior to permit issuance for each phase. If the level of water will rise to within 3 feet of the base of any wax myrtle and remain at that level for more than 4 days, then the outlet of the willow basin shall be modified to prevent such rise of water level and duration. If the water level already exhibits these characteristics, then no change shall be made in the willow basin .	Planning Department	
Hydrology and Water Quality				
M-HY-1: <u>Best Management Practices for SWPPP</u>. A pollution prevention plan shall	Project Sponsor and	Submit copy of NOI and	SFPUC	

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
be developed for all construction activities on the Project Site. The applicant shall apply for coverage under the NPDES General Construction Activity Permit from the State Water Quality Control Board by filing a Notice of Intent (NOI), and, as part of the permit and monitoring process, prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP shall include design details and construction specifications for all site drainage control and other water quality control strategies, including Best Management Practices (BMPs) and other measures for stormwater pollution reduction. These include, but are not limited to, the following: • Soil stabilization controls, such as hydroseeding and/or placement of straw mulch; • Watering for dust control; • Perimeter silt fences; • Sediment traps/basins; • Minimizing the length of open trenches and stockpile volumes; • Slip prevention and control, such as minimizing grading during the rainy season; and Controlled entry and egress from the excavation area to minimize off-site tracking of sediment, and vehicle and equipment wash-down facilities.	construction contractor(s)	SWPPP prior to permit issuance for each phase. Provide copies of any monitoring documents required in the SWPPP to Planning Department as well as to the requiring agency.		
Hazards and Hazardous Materials				
M-HZ-2A: Hazardous Materials - Testing for and Handling of Contaminated Soil The Proposed Project would be carried out in four major Phases over a 20-year construction period. Within the geographic boundaries to be redeveloped within each Phase, the Project Sponsor shall, if appropriate, identify large, planned areas of redevelopment. For the purpose of this mitigation measure, each such area is referred to as a "Sub-Phase." The steps below shall be taken for each Sub-Phase. If the Project Sponsor does not identify such areas within a Phase, then each step shall be taken for the geographic boundaries of the entire Phase at once. <u>Step 1: Soil Testing</u> Soil testing would be done incrementally over the 20-year construction period, including pre-testing of each Sub-Phase, prior to excavation and/or soil disturbance. Prior to obtaining building permits for a particular Sub-Phase, the Project Sponsor shall hire a consultant to collect soil samples (borings) from selected locations in the work area in which soil would be disturbed and/or excavated. (This initial soil sampling and reporting shall be done prior to excavation, but additional soil testing from on-site soil stockpiles	Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant for Steps 1, 2 and 4. Construction contractor to carry out and report on activities required in Step 3.	Soil report and SMP shall be approved by the San Francisco Department of Public Health prior to permit issuance for each phase, with a copy to the Planning Department. Construction contractor to provide annual reports to Department of Public Health (or quarterly reports if required by SMP), with copies to the Planning Department, of activities carried out	Department of Public Health	

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
may also be required, if there are indications [e.g., odors, visible staining] of contamination in the excavated soil.) The soil samples shall be tested for these Compounds of Concern: total lead, petroleum hydrocarbons, volatile organic compounds (VOCs), and four heavy metals: chromium, nickel, copper, and zinc. The consultant shall analyze the soil borings as discrete, not composite samples. The consultant shall prepare a report on the soil testing for the Compounds of Concern that includes the laboratory results of the soil testing and a map that shows the locations from which the consultant collected the soil samples. The Project Sponsor shall submit the report on the soil testing for the Compounds of Concern for the Sub-Phase and a fee of $501 in the form of a check payable to the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH), to the Hazardous Waste Program, Department of Public Health, 1390 Market Street, Suite 210, San Francisco, California 94102. The fee of $501 shall cover three hours of soil testing report review and administrative handling. If additional review is necessary, DPH shall bill the Project Sponsor for each additional hour of review over the first three hours, at a rate of $167 per hour. These fees shall be charged pursuant to Section 31.47(c) of the San Francisco Administrative Code. DHP shall review the soil testing program to determine whether soils on the Project Site are contaminated with any of the Compounds of Concern at or above potentially hazardous levels. <u>Step 2: Preparation of Site Mitigation Plans</u> Incrementally over the 20-year construction period, for each Sub-Phase, prior to beginning demolition, excavation, and construction work for that area, the Project Sponsor shall prepare a Site Mitigation Plan (SMP). The SMP for the Sub-Phase shall include a discussion of the level of contamination of soils by Compounds of Concern, if any, based on the soils testing in Step 1. The SMP shall set forth mitigation measures for managing contaminated soils on the site, if any, including but not limited to: 1) the alternatives for managing contaminated soils on the site (e.g., encapsulation, partial or complete removal, treatment, recycling for reuse, or a combination); 2) the preferred alternative for managing contaminated soils on the site and a brief justification; and 3) the specific practices to be used to handle, haul, and dispose of contaminated soils on the site. The SMP for each Sub-Phase shall be submitted to the Department of Public Health (DPH) for review and approval. A copy of the SMP shall be submitted to the Planning Department to become part of the case file. Additionally, the DPH may require confirmatory samples for the project site. <u>Step 3: Handling, Hauling, and Disposal Contaminated Soils</u> (a) Specific work practices: The construction contractor shall be alert for the presence of contaminated soils during excavation and other construction activities on the site (detected		pursuant to Step 3 for each construction phase Consultant to submit closure report to DPH for approval pursuant to Step 4 for each phase; a copy of the approved report shall be provided to the Planning Department		

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
through soil odor, color, and texture and results of on-site soil testing), and shall be prepared to handle, profile (i.e., characterize), and dispose of such soils appropriately (i.e., as dictated by local, State, and federal regulations, including OSHA work practices) when such soils are encountered on the site. (b) Dust suppression: Soils exposed during excavation for site preparation and project construction activities shall be kept moist throughout the time they are exposed, both during and after work hours. (c) Surface water runoff control: Where soils are stockpiled, visqueen shall be used to create an impermeable liner, both beneath and on top of the soils, with a berm to contain any potential surface water runoff from the soil stockpiles during inclement weather. (d) Soils replacement: If necessary, clean fill or other suitable material(s) shall be used to bring portions of the Project Site, where lead-contaminated soils have been excavated and removed, up to construction grade. (e) Hauling and disposal: If soils are contaminated such that they must be hauled off-site for treatment and/or disposal, contaminated soils shall be hauled off the Project Site by waste hauling trucks appropriately certified with the State of California and adequately covered to prevent dispersion of the soils during transit, and shall be disposed of at the permitted hazardous waste disposal facility registered with the State of California. <u>Step 4: Preparation of Closure/Certification Report for Each Sub-Phase</u> After excavation and foundation construction activities are completed for a particular Sub-Phase, the Project Sponsor shall prepare and submit a closure/certification report to DPH for review and approval for that area. The closure/certification report shall include the mitigation measures (if any were necessary) in the SMP for handling and removing contaminated soils, if any, from the Project Site, and if applicable, whether the construction contractor modified any of these mitigation measures, and how and why the construction contractor modified those mitigation measures.				
M-HZ-2B: Hazards (Decontamination of Vehicles) If, for any Sub-Phase, the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) determines that the soils in that area are contaminated with contaminants at or above potentially hazardous levels, all trucks and excavation and soil handling equipment working in that area shall be decontaminated following use and prior to removal from the site. Gross contamination shall be first removed through brushing, wiping, or dry brooming. The vehicle or equipment shall then be washed clean (including tires). Prior to removal from the work site, all vehicles and equipment shall be inspected to ensure that contamination has been removed.	Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant	During construction for each phase, if determined by the San Francisco DPH.	Department of Public Health	
IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT				

EXHIBIT 1:
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT
(Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)

MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
Improvement Measure I-TR-7: Provide a southbound right turn deceleration lane at the new access from 19th Avenue at Cambon Drive to avoid interference with HOT lane operations. As an improvement measure, to avoid conflict with the through traffic, a right-turn deceleration lane should be constructed on the west side of the fourth southbound lane, allowing vehicular access from 19th Avenue to Cambon Drive, minimizing disruption to flow in the HOT lane. This would require the removal of on-street parking in the vicinity of the ingress.	Project Sponsor with coordination of SFMTA and Caltrans	Simultaneous with implementation of HOT lane.	Planning Department	
Improvement Measure I-TR-29: Install colored bike lanes to direct cyclists through the Brotherhood Way/Junipero Serra Boulevard interchange and raise auto awareness of bicycles. This improvement measure may not achieve the same level of comfort for a cyclist that exists under current conditions, but it would improve conditions with implementation of the auxiliary lanes. Implementation of this improvement measure would require approval by Caltrans, which operates the facility.	Project Sponsor with coordination of SFMTA and Caltrans	Simultaneous with construction of other project-proposed improvements at Junipero Serra Boulevard / Brotherhood Way interchange		
Improvement Measure I-WS-A: Design Feature Consideration for Proposed Buildings. Building massing can affect wind flow. Podiums or terraced roofs create horizontal "shelves" that can deflect downward wind flow away from streets and sidewalks. These types of design features should be considered for the proposed buildings at the intersection of Chumasero Drive and Brotherhood Way and the intersection of Junipero Serra Boulevard and Brotherhood Way. Like podiums and terraced roofs, canopies can deflect downward wind flow from streets and sidewalks.	Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant	Prior to building permit issuance for proposed buildings at the intersection of Chumaero Drive and Brotherhood Way and at the intersection of Junipero Serra Boulevard and Brotherhood Way.	Department of Building Inspection	
Improvement Measure I-WS-B: Incorporation if Landscaping to Reduce Wind Speeds. Landscaping can be effective at reducing wind speeds. Porous materials (latticework, screens, vegetation, etc.) offer more effective wind shelter than solid surfaces. Landscaping should be installed in appropriate locations throughout the Project Site to reduce wind speeds. Wind-sheltering elements should be located west of the area being protected and should be of sufficient height.	Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant	Prior to building permit issuance for each phase	Planning Department	
Improvement Measure I-GE.a: Use of Soldier-Pile-and-Lagging Shoring System. The Project Sponsor has agreed to follow the conclusions and recommendations of the 2008 Geologic, Geotechnical and Seismic Findings report to use a soldier-pile-and-lagging shoring system to shore up soils during excavation for building foundations and basements.	Project Sponsor	Prior to building permit issuance for each phase	Department of Building Inspection	
Improvement Measure I-GE.b: Soil Corrosivity Tests. The Project Sponsor has agreed to follow the conclusions and recommendations of the 2008 Geologic,	Project Sponsor	Prior to building permit issuance for each phase	Department of Building Inspection	

EXHIBIT 1: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT (Includes Text for Adopted Mitigation and Improvement Measures)				
MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Schedule**	**Monitoring/Report Responsibility**	**Status/Date Completed**
Geotechnical and Seismic Findings report to test the soils for corrosivity and take appropriate measures to protect new construction in contact with the soil from corrosion.				