RESOLUTION NO. 13-2012  
Adopted October 12, 2012  

RESOLUTION (1) DIRECTING THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO TRANSFER, PURSUANT TO SECTION 34181(A) OF THE CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE, AN AIRSPACE PARCEL LOCATED ABOVE THE SAN FRANCISCO MUSEUM OF MODERN ART AT 151 THIRD STREET FOR THE APPRAISED VALUE AS MUSEUM SPACE OF $1.00 TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AS AN ASSET USED FOR A GOVERNMENTAL PURPOSE, (2) AUTHORIZING A TRANSFER AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY AND THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR THE SALE OF THAT ASSET, AND (3) ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT ("CEQA").

WHEREAS, The Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco ("Redevelopment Agency") dissolved on February 1, 2012, pursuant to the California Assembly Bill known as AB 26 and the California Supreme Court's decision and order in the case entitled California Redevelopment Association et al. v. Ana Matosantos. Upon dissolution, all of the Redevelopment Agency’s non-housing assets, including all real property, transferred to the Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency (“Successor Agency”); and,

WHEREAS, The Successor Agency owns all of that certain real property identified as an airspace parcel above a sloping plane between elevations 109.5 and 165.5 within a portion of Lot 078, Assessor’s Block 3722, located at 151 Third Street (the “Property” or “Airspace Parcel”). The Airspace Parcel is located within the boundaries of the former Yerba Buena Center Approved Redevelopment Project Area D-1 and was subject to the Redevelopment Plan for the Yerba Buena Center Approved Redevelopment Project Area D-1, which was duly adopted in accordance with Community Redevelopment Law, and which expired by its own terms on January 1, 2011 (the “Redevelopment Plan”); and,

WHEREAS, The Redevelopment Agency originally acquired the Airspace Parcel and the land and airspace beneath it (collectively “Parcel 3722-B”) with urban renewal funds provided through a federal Contract for Loan and Capital Grant dated December 2, 1966 (Contract No. Calif. R-59) and approved by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Renewal (the “HUD Contract”). Under the HUD Contract, the Former Redevelopment Agency was required to use the federal funds to carry out redevelopment activities in accordance with the Redevelopment Plan and the federal standards for urban renewal under Title I of the Housing Act of 1949. In 1974, urban renewal funding was phased out and replaced with the Community Development Block Grant (“CDBG”) program; and,

WHEREAS, In 1983, the Redevelopment Agency and the City executed, with the concurrence of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Renewal (“HUD”), the Yerba Buena Center Redevelopment Project Closeout Agreement (“YBC Closeout Agreement”) whereby the Redevelopment Agency agreed to retain Parcel 3722-B (and other parcels identified as “Project Property” in Exhibit A to the YBC Closeout Agreement) for disposition, subject to applicable federal law and subject further to restrictions on the use of any proceeds received from the sale or lease of
the Project Property (See Section 1(b) & (c) of the YBC Closeout Agreement). The YBC Closeout Agreement also describes the permissible uses of the proceeds (See Exhibit B, “Description of Proposed Project Completion and Economic Development Activities”). In approving the YBC Closeout Agreement, HUD emphasized that “all future proceeds from the sale or lease of Project land must be treated as program income under the CDBG [Community Development Block Grant] program.” (See letter date stamped August 15, 1983 from Henry Dishroom, HUD Area Manager, to Dianne Feinstein, Mayor); and,

WHEREAS, The Redevelopment Agency held Parcel 3722-B for the governmental purposes described in the YBC Closeout Agreement and the CDBG program (See 24 C.F.R. §§ 570.201 (completion of urban renewal projects under Title I of the Housing Act of 1949) and 24 C.F.R. § 570.800 (pre-1996 federal urban renewal regulations continue to apply to completion of urban renewal projects)) (“CDBG Program Requirements”); and,

WHEREAS, In 1991, the Redevelopment Agency and the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, a California nonprofit corporation (the “Museum”) entered into that certain Disposition and Development Agreement dated as of January 15, 1991 and recorded in the Official Records of the City and County of San Francisco (“Official Records”) on January 16, 1991 as Document No. E848701 at Reel F293, Image 408 (“Original DDA”), as amended by that certain First Amendment to Disposition and Development Agreement dated as of March 10, 1992 and recorded in the Official Records on March 25, 1992 as Document No. F090282 at Reel F591, Image 318 (“First Amendment”), and as further amended by that certain Second Amendment to Disposition and Development Agreement dated as of December 17, 1996 and recorded in the Official Records on May 23, 1997 as Document No. G165545 at Reel G889, Image 467 (“Second Amendment,” and together with the Original DDA and the First Amendment, the “DDA”); and,

WHEREAS, Pursuant to the DDA and the YBC Closeout Agreement, the Agency transferred to the Museum portions of Parcel 3722-B, namely that certain real property referred to therein as the “EB-2 Museum Site,” located below the Airspace Parcel for development of a first-class museum known as the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art (the “SFMOMA”) – an economic development use consistent with the CDBG Program Requirements. At that time, the Agency retained ownership of the Airspace Parcel, which remains subject to the governmental purposes described in the YBC Closeout Agreement and the CDBG Program Requirements. The Museum subsequently constructed the SFMOMA on the EB-2 Museum Site; and,

WHEREAS, On June 27, 2012, California's Governor approved follow-up legislation to AB 26: Assembly Bill No. 1484 (Chapter 26, Statutes of 2011-12, Regular Session) (“AB 1484”). AB 1484 imposes on successor agencies additional requirements, including a requirement that suspends certain dispositions of former redevelopment agency property until certain state-imposed requirements are met. Cal. Health & Safety Code § 34191.3. Excluded from such suspension are certain transfers of property used for governmental purposes to other governmental entities if the oversight board for a successor agency directs the successor agency to transfer the property. Cal. Health & Safety Code § 34181 (a); and,
WHEREAS, The Successor Agency now seeks to transfer the Airspace Parcel to the City in
furtherance of the governmental purpose of completion of urban renewal projects
under the YBC Closeout Agreement and the CDBG Program Requirements; and,

WHEREAS, The City will transfer the Airspace Parcel to the Museum, which is embarking on
a major expansion of the SFMOMA to better display to the public its growing
collections of modern and contemporary art. This expansion involves the
construction of a new high-rise building that will extend into the Airspace Parcel
and onto three adjacent parcels (the “Museum Expansion Project”). The Museum
needs to acquire the Successor Agency’s Airspace Parcel to complete the
Museum Expansion Project. The Museum Expansion Project serves a critical
economic development purpose by improving the City's cultural landscape and
enhancing City revenues, and constitute a valuable public addition to the City's
civic well-being; and,

WHEREAS, The Museum Expansion Project also fulfills another governmental purpose: the
disposition of the Airspace Parcel facilitates the construction and use of a new
City fire station, a governmental purpose described in AB 1484, which is part of
the Museum Expansion Project. One of the adjacent parcels needed for the
Museum Expansion Project is 676 Howard Street, a City-owned parcel that is
improved with an obsolete City fire station. The City has agreed to sell the
Howard Street property to the Museum, and allow the Museum to demolish the
obsolete fire station, to facilitate construction of the Museum Expansion Project.
In exchange, the Museum has agreed to build and convey to the City a new $10.0
million fire station at 935 Folsom Street, a parcel of land owned by a Museum
affiliate (the “Replacement Fire Station”). This “land swap” was formalized in
the Conditional Land Disposition and Acquisition Agreement dated October 15,
2010 between the City, the Museum, and the Museum affiliate (the “Land Swap
Agreement”). The Replacement Fire Station is expected to improve response
times and streamline operations and will obviate the need for the City to
seismically upgrade the obsolete fire station at 676 Howard Street, at considerable
governmental expense. Under the Land Swap Agreement, conveyance to the City
of the Replacement Fire Station is contingent upon Museum obtaining a building
permit for the Museum Expansion Project, which Museum would not do unless
and until it has the right to acquire the Air Space Parcel; and,

WHEREAS, The Successor Agency is transferring the Airspace Parcel to the City at its
appraised value as museum space (March 1, 2012 appraisal by Clifford Advisory,
LLC, values the Airspace Parcel at $1.00, assuming the Property is encumbered
with a deed restriction that limited its use to museum space) (the “Transfer
Agreement”). Although Section 34181(a) of the California Health & Safety Code
states that assets disposition may be accomplished by distribution of income to the
taxing entities in proportionate to their property tax share, proceeds from the
disposition of the Airspace Parcel are not available for distribution to the taxing
entities identified in AB 26 and AB 1484 because the federal restrictions on the
use of the proceeds described in the YBC Closeout Agreement and the CDBG
Program Requirements supersede the state law; and,

WHEREAS, The Successor Agency is transferring the Airspace Parcel to the City with the
understanding that the City will then transfer the Airspace Parcel to the Museum
under the same use restrictions contained in the Transfer Agreement, and subject
to the Museum’s covenant to restrict use of the Airspace Parcel to museum,
cultural, educational, and ancillary uses in accordance with the use restrictions and covenants set forth in the grant deed from the City to the Museum; and,

WHEREAS, The City has completed its environmental review for the Museum Expansion Project and the transactions contemplated under the Land Swap Agreement pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.), the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, title 14, Sections 15000 et seq.), and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code (collectively, the "Environmental Review"). On November 10, 2011, the City Planning Commission certified, by Motion No. 18485, the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Museum Expansion Project (Final EIR), and by Motion No. 18486, adopted CEQA Findings including a Statement of Overriding Consideration, and adopted a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the Museum Expansion Project. On January 10, 2012, the City Board of Supervisors affirmed, by Motion No. M12-007, certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Museum Expansion Project. The San Francisco Planning Department is the custodian of record for the Museum Expansion Project's environmental review, located in the File for Case Nos. 2009.0291E and 2010.0275E, at 1650 Mission Street, Fourth Floor, San Francisco, California. "The Final EIR, entitled "SFMOMA Expansion/Fire Station Relocation and Housing Project," can be found on the San Francisco Planning Department's webpage at http://www.sfp.com/index.aspx?page=1828;" and,

WHEREAS, The City, through the Mayor's Office of Housing, as a Responsible Entity under the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA"), 42 U.S.C. Section 4321 et seq., has determined that the transference and sale of the Airspace Parcel to the City is categorically excluded from further environmental review under NEPA; and,

WHEREAS, Successor Agency staff, having consulted with the City Attorney's Office, recommends that the Oversight Board approve the transfer of assets for a governmental purpose pursuant to Section 34181(a) of the California Health & Safety Code and authorize a Transfer Agreement with the City; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That this Oversight Board adopts as its own the CEQA Findings, including the Statement of Overriding Consideration and MMRP found in Planning Commission Motion No. 18486, attached hereto as Exhibit A; and be it further,

RESOLVED, That this Oversight Board finds that no changes have occurred with respect to the Museum Expansion Project or the circumstances surrounding the Museum Expansion, and no new information has been put forward that would result in new significant environmental impacts or cause a substantial increase in previously identified significant environmental impacts that have not been adequately analyzed in the Final EIR for the Museum Expansion Project or that would require additional review under CEQA prior to the transfer of the Airspace Parcel; and be it further,

RESOLVED, That this Oversight Board directs the Successor Agency to transfer the Airspace Parcel to the City for the above-described governmental purposes under Section 34181(a) of the California Health & Safety Code and authorizes the Executive Director to execute a Transfer Agreement with the City in substantially the form of the agreement on file with the Secretary of the Oversight Board; provided the
Executive Director may make any modifications to the agreement that the Executive Director determines are in the Successor Agency’s best interest, do not materially decrease the Successor Agency’s benefit with respect to the transfer, do not materially increase the Successor Agency’s obligations or liabilities in connection with the agreement, and are consistent with Section 34181(a) of the California Health and Safety Code, such determination to be conclusively evidenced by execution and delivery by the Executive Director of any such modification; and be it further,

RESOLVED, That this Oversight Board authorizes the Successor Agency to take such actions as may be necessary or appropriate, in consultation with the City Attorney, to effectuate the purpose and intent of this resolution.

Exhibit A: Planning Commission Motion No. 18486 CEQA Findings

I hereby certify that the forgoing resolution was adopted by the Oversight Board at its meeting of October 12, 2012.

Natasha Jones
Board Secretary
Planning Commission Motion 18486
CEQA Findings
HEARING DATE: NOVEMBER 10, 2011

Date: November 3, 2011
Case No.: 2009.0291EMRZ; 2010.0275EMRZ
Project Address: 151 THIRD STREET; 670-676 HOWARD STREET;
935 FOLSOM STREET
Zoning: 151 Third Street:
   C-3-O (Downtown, Office)
   500-I Height and Bulk District
670 Howard Street:
   C-3-S (Downtown, Support)
   320-I Height and Bulk District
676 Howard Street:
   P (Public)
   320-I Height and Bulk District
935 Folsom Street:
   MUR (Mixed Use-Residential)
   45-X/85-X Height and Bulk District
   SOMA Youth and Family Special Use District
Block/Lot: 676 Howard Street: 3722/028; 935 Folsom Street: 3753/140
Project Sponsor: Greg Johnson
   San Francisco Museum of Modern Art
   151 Third Street
   San Francisco, CA 94103
Staff Contact: Kevin Guy – (415) 558-6163
   kevin.guy@sfgov.org
Recommendation: Adopt Findings

ADOPTING FINDINGS UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT,
INCLUDING FINDINGS REJECTING ALTERNATIVES AS INFEASIBLE, ADOPTING A
STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS, AND ADOPTING MITIGATION,
MONITORING, AND REPORTING PROGRAMS, RELATING TO THE EXPANSION OF
THE EXISTING SAN FRANCISCO MUSEUM OF MODERN ART LOCATED AT 151 THIRD
STREET (ASSESSOR BLOCK 3722, LOT 78) AND RELOCATION OF THE EXISTING FIRE STATION NO. 1 FROM ITS EXISTING 676 HOWARD STREET LOCATION (ASSESSOR'S BLOCK 3722, LOT 27) TO 935 FOLSOM STREET (ASSESSOR'S BLOCK 3753, LOT 140), AS WELL AS THE CONSTRUCTION OF A FUTURE RESIDENTIAL BUILDING CONTAINING UP TO 13 RESIDENTIAL UNITS ON THE SOUTHERLY PORTION OF THE 935 FOLSOM STREET SITE. THE 151 THIRD STREET SITE IS LOCATED IN A C-3-O (DOWNTOWN OFFICE) USE DISTRICT AND A 500-I HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICT. THE 670 HOWARD STREET SITE IS LOCATED IN A C-3-S (DOWNTOWN SUPPORT) USE DISTRICT AND A 320-I HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICT. THE 676 HOWARD STREET SITE IS LOCATED IN A P (PUBLIC) DISTRICT AND A 320-I HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICT. THE 935 FOLSOM STREET SITE IS LOCATED IN A MUR (MIXED-USE RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICT AND A 85-X/45-X HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICT.

PREAMBLE

On April 9, 2009, Joel Roos, acting on behalf of the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art (SFOMA, "Project Sponsor"), submitted an Environmental Evaluation Application with the Planning Department ("Department"), Case No. 2009.0291E, in connection with a project to demolish the existing 7,620-square-foot, 4-story-over-basement building at 670 Howard Street (Assessor's Block 3722, Lot 027), demolish the existing 4,400-square-foot, two-story Fire Station No. 1 at 676 Howard Street, and vacate a 115-by-30-foot land-locked portion of Hunt Street located between 151 Third and 670 and 676 Howard Street, in order to accommodate an expansion of SFOMA, measuring approximately 230,000 square feet and reaching a height of approximately 200 feet, located at the rear of the existing SFOMA building located at 151 Third Street. On March 24, 2011, Joel Roos, acting on behalf of the Project Sponsor, submitted an Environmental Evaluation Application with the Department, Case No. 2010.0275E, in connection with a project to demolish an existing building at 935 Folsom Street (Assessor’s Block 3753, Lot 140), subdivide the property, and construct a fire station, measuring approximately 15,000 square feet and reaching a height of approximately 34 feet on the northern portion of the site, and construct a future residential containing up to 13 dwelling units, reaching a height of approximately 43 feet, on the southern portion of the site (collectively, "Project").

The Department issued a Notice of Preparation of Environmental Review on October 25, 2010 to owners of properties within 300 feet, adjacent tenants, and other potentially interested parties.

On July 12, 2010, the Project Sponsor submitted a request for a General Plan Referral, Case No. 2009.0291R, in association with a Conditional Land Disposition and Acquisition Agreement between SFOMA and the City and County of San Francisco to convey the property located at 676 Howard Street (Fire Station No. 1) and the Hunt Street right-of-way within Block 3722 to SFOMA, in exchange for conveyance by SFOMA to the City and County of San Francisco of the property located at 935 Folsom Street and a new fire station to be constructed by or on behalf of SFOMA. On July 13, 2010, the Department issued a determination finding that the actions described in the Conditional Land Disposition and Acquisition Agreement are consistent with the objectives and policies of the General Plan and the Priority Policies of Planning Code Section ("Section") 101.1.
On February 22, 2011, the Project Sponsor submitted a request for review of a proposed development on the Project Site exceeding 40 feet in height, pursuant to Section 295, analyzing the potential shadow impacts of the proposed expansion of SFMOMA to properties under the jurisdiction of the Department of Recreation and Parks (Case No. 2009.0291K). Department staff prepared a shadow fan depicting the potential shadow cast by the development and concluded that the Project would have no impact to properties subject to Section 295.

On March 23, 2011, the Project Sponsor applied for a Planning Code Section ("Section") 309 Determination of Compliance and Request for Exceptions, Application No. 2009.0291X, for the expansion of SFMOMA.

On August 26, 2011, the Project Sponsor applied for a General Plan Referral (Application Nos. 2009.0291R and 2010.0275R), for the vacation of Hunt Street, subdivision of 935 Folsom Street, and construction of a new fire station on the northerly portion of 935 Folsom Street.

On October 4, 2011, the Board of Supervisors initiated a rezoning to amend Sectional Map ZN01 of the Zoning Maps of the San Francisco Planning Code to change the use classification of 676 Howard Street from Public (P) to Downtown—Support District (C-3-S) and a portion of 935 Folsom Street from Mixed Use—Residential (MUR) to Public (P) (Board of Supervisors File No. 111080, Case Nos. 2009.0291Z and 2010.0275Z).

On October 20, 2011, the Planning Commission ("Commission") initiated a General Plan Amendment to amend Map 2 of the Community Facilities Element of the San Francisco General Plan to delete the reference to 676 Howard Street as a fire facility and add a reference to 935 Folsom Street as a fire facility (Resolution R-18463, Case Nos. 2009.0291M and 2010.0275M).

On July 11, 2011, the Department published a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for public review (Case Nos. 2009.0291E and 2010.0275E). The Draft EIR was available for public comment until August 25, 2011. On August 11, 2011, the Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to solicit comments regarding the Draft EIR. On October 27, 2011, the Department published a Comments and Responses document, responding to comments made regarding the Draft EIR prepared for the Project.

On October 25, 2011, the Board of Supervisors approved a motion urging the Commission to review and consider the above-referenced General Plan Amendment to Map 2 of the Community Facilities Element of the General Plan (Board of Supervisors File No. 111121, Case Nos. 2009.0291M and 2010.0275M).

On November 10, 2011, the Commission reviewed and considered the Final EIR and found that the contents of said report and the procedures through which the Final EIR was prepared, publicized, and reviewed complied with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.) ("CEQA"), 14 California Code of Regulations Sections 15000 et seq. ("the CEQA Guidelines"), and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code ("Chapter 31").
The Commission found the Final EIR was adequate, accurate and objective, reflected the independent analysis and judgment of the Department and the Commission, and that the summary of comments and responses contained no significant revisions to the Draft EIR, and approved the Final EIR for the Project in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31.

The Planning Department, Linda Avery, is the custodian of records, located in the File for Case No. Case Nos. 2009.0291E and 2010.0275E, at 1650 Mission Street, Fourth Floor, San Francisco, California.

Department staff prepared Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting programs ("MMRP's") for the SFMOMA Expansion Project and the Fire Station Relocation and Housing Project, and these materials were made available to the public and this Commission for this Commission's review, consideration and action.

On November 10, 2011, the Commission adopted Resolution No. 18488, recommending that the Board of Supervisors approve the General Plan Amendment to amend Map 2 of the Community Facilities Element of the San Francisco General Plan to delete the reference to 676 Howard Street as a fire facility and add a reference to 935 Folsom Street as a fire facility.

On November 10, 2011, the Commission adopted Resolution No. 18489, recommending that the Board of Supervisors approve the rezoning to amend Sectional Map ZN01 of the Zoning Maps of the San Francisco Planning Code to change the use classification of 676 Howard Street from Public (P) to Downtown—Support District (C-3-S) and a portion of 935 Folsom Street from Mixed Use—Residential (MUR) to Public (P).

On November 10, 2011, the Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting on Case Nos. 2009.0291R and 2010.0275R. The Commission has heard and considered the testimony presented to it at the public hearing and has further considered written materials and oral testimony presented on behalf of the applicant, the Planning Department staff, and other interested parties.

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

MOVED, that the Commission hereby adopts findings under the California Environmental Quality Act, including rejecting alternatives as infeasible, adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and adopting Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Programs attached as Exhibits A and B, based on the following findings:

FINDINGS

Having reviewed the materials identified in the preamble above, and having heard all testimony and arguments, this Commission finds, concludes, and determines as follows:
In determining to approve the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art (SFMOMA) Expansion / Fire Station Relocation and Housing Projects ("Projects") described in Section I, Project Description below, the San Francisco Planning Commission ("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 Projects proposed for adoption, the environmental review process for the Project, the approval actions to be taken, and the location of records;

Section II identifies potentially significant impacts that are avoided or reduced to less-than-significant levels and makes findings regarding Mitigation Measures;

Section III identifies significant, unavoidable historic resource and air quality impacts of the Project that cannot be avoided or reduced to less-than-significant levels through Mitigation Measures;

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

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

The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Programs ("MMRPs") for the mitigation measures that have been proposed for adoption are attached with these findings as Exhibit A (SFMOMA Expansion) and Exhibit B (Fire Station Relocation and Housing). The MMRPs are required by CEQA Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091. The MMRPs provide a tables setting forth each mitigation measure listed in the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Project ("Final EIR") that is required to reduce or avoid a significant adverse impact. The MMRPs also specifies the agency responsible for implementation of each measure and establishes monitoring actions and a monitoring schedule. The full text of the mitigation measures is set forth in the MMRPs.

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"), which together comprise the Final EIR, are for ease of reference and are not intended to provide an exhaustive list of the evidence relied upon for these findings.
I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

SFMOMA proposes to increase its gallery space by up to approximately 130,000 square feet, including galleries to house the Doris and Donald Fisher Collection, and increase support space to allow the museum to consolidate its back-of-house functions that currently are housed partly in the museum and partly at a nearby off-site location on Mission Street (the Minna Annex). In order to accomplish this expansion, SFMOMA proposes to utilize the property at 676 Howard Street, which is currently developed with Fire Station No. 1, an active San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD) fire station. Accordingly, in consultation with the SFFD, SFMOMA acquired the site at 935 Folsom Street to accommodate the proposed relocation of Fire Station No. 1.

A. The Fire Station Relocation and Housing Project

The Fire Station Relocation and Housing Project site is located at 935 Folsom Street at the corner of Falmouth Street between Fifth and Sixth Streets on Assessor’s Block 3753, Lot 140. The 14,400-square-foot site is a through lot with frontages on both Folsom and Shipley Streets and is currently developed with a 1-story (with mezzanine), 25-foot tall, 18,210-gross-square-foot industrial building. The building was constructed in 1923 and is currently vacant, but was previously used as a commercial laundry facility and later as an apparel sewing factory. The site is generally flat and is approximately 4 feet above SF Datum.

The first phase of project construction would be the demolition of the existing commercial building at 935 Folsom Street and the construction of a new fire station on the site. This would allow the fire company currently housed in Fire Station No. 1 at 676 Howard Street to relocate so that the 676 Howard Street property may be made available to the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art (SFMOMA) for the SFMOMA Expansion Project, and to ensure minimal interruption in fire protection services. As the fire station would not require the entire 14,400-square-foot property, the lot at 935 Folsom Street would be subdivided into two parcels and would include two uses: the new fire station fronting Folsom Street and a multi-family residential building with up to 13 units fronting Shipley Street. The replacement fire station would be built on the northerly 9,025-square-foot parcel referred to as Lot A and the multi-family residential project would be built on Lot B, the 5,444 square foot southerly portion of the lot, and a portion of both Lots A and B would provide at-grade parking for firefighters (15 spaces for cars parked in tandem; the personal vehicles of fire fighters would remain parked for each fire-fighter’s 24-hour shift). The eight spaces of surface parking on Lot B would be provided pursuant to a parking easement.

The new fire station would be 2 stories plus a mezzanine level. It would be an approximately 34-foot-tall structure with a gross area up to 15,000 square feet and a footprint of approximately 6,750 square feet. The fire station’s staffing level and equipment would not differ from the current condition at Fire Station No. 1. (The existing fire station is staffed by 13 firefighters and houses three vehicles.) The fire station would have three bay doors (as opposed to two bay doors at the existing fire station) fronting on Folsom Street and a surface area for firefighter parking located at the rear of the station. The three apparatus bays would dominate the Folsom Street façade, and the large red doors would be accentuated by three light metal screens suspended
above them, which would provide visual privacy and sun shading for the captains’ sleeping rooms. The exterior walls would be clad with a lightweight cement board rain screen and a prismatic glass bay would project from the building mass above the public entry. Traffic signal preemption would be installed at the intersections of Folsom/Fifth Street and Folsom/Sixth Street to enable emergency vehicles to safely exit the station with reduced use of sirens and horns.

No detailed design has yet been prepared for the residential building fronting Shipley Street. However, conceptual plans indicate that the building would be a 4-story, approximately 43-foot-tall structure with a subterranean parking garage. The garage would comprise approximately 5,550 square feet and would be accessed from Falmouth Street. The above-grade structure would have a gross area of approximately 17,000 square feet, and would include up to 13 residential units. The residential units would consist of approximately two studios (ranging from approximately 420 to 600 square feet in size); five one-bedroom units (ranging from approximately 680 to 830 square feet in size); and six two-bedroom units (ranging from approximately 1,000 to 1,050 square feet in size). Approximately 1,040 square feet of open space to serve the residential uses would be provided on the site. Excavation to a depth of 10 feet below grade would be required for construction of the building’s basement-level garage, which would contain approximately 10 vehicle spaces with a portion of the subterranean parking area located beneath the 20-foot at-grade parking easement provided for the fire fighters’ vehicles.

B. The SFMOMA Expansion Project

The SFMOMA Expansion site is bordered by Third Street to the west; Minna Street to the north; the 147-151 Minna Street Parking Garage, Natoma Street, and office uses to the east; and the W Hotel and Howard Street to the south. The total footprint of the irregularly-shaped expansion site (including the existing 151 Third Street museum footprint) is 74,355 square feet. The site is generally flat and is approximately 18 feet above San Francisco Datum (SF Datum). The SFMOMA Expansion site includes the following four properties:

- **151 Third Street, Assessor’s Block 3722, Lot 78.** This 59,195-square-foot lot is currently developed with the SFMOMA building, a 5-story, 145-foot tall, 225,000 gross-square-foot art museum designed by Mario Botta and completed in 1995. The building contains galleries, a retail area, a café, a theater, an education center, public areas such as the lobby and event space, support spaces, art storage, loading and receiving areas, and basement parking. An approximately 17,250-square-foot sculpture garden and a coffee bar are located on the roof of an adjacent parking garage at 147-151 Minna Street and are accessed from the fifth floor of the 151 Third Street building. Portions of the easterly wing of 151 Third Street would be demolished to make land available for the Project.

- **670 Howard Street** (also known as the Heald Building site and 15 Hunt Street), Block 3722 Lot 27. This irregularly-shaped 7,260-square-foot lot is currently developed with a 4-story building and basement. The building, constructed of heavy timber with a masonry façade, was built in 1906 (after the earthquake), is owned by an affiliate of SFMOMA, and is currently used for museum support functions. 670 Howard would be demolished.
• **676 Howard Street, Block 3722 Lot 28.** This 4,400-square-foot lot is currently developed with Fire Station No. 1, an active San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD) fire station. The 2-story, 14,410-square-foot double-bay facility with a basement was constructed in 1958. Fire Station No. 1 would be relocated to 935 Folsom Street and the existing fire station at 676 Howard Street would be demolished.

• **Hunt Street.** Hunt Street is an approximately 3,500-square-foot landlocked City-owned right-of-way that is located between 151 Third Street and 676 and 670 Howard Street. The dimensions of Hunt Street within the site are approximately 115 feet by 30 feet. A portion of Hunt Street extending west to Third Street was previously vacated by the City on August 6, 1979, and conveyed to the developer of the W Hotel, such that the right-of-way does not connect to any other public street (Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 755-79). Hunt Street would be vacated and the underlying land conveyed by the City to SFMOMA.

SFMOMA has expanded its collection and programming since the 151 Third Street building opened in 1995. In response, the museum seeks additional space for galleries and public spaces, enhanced and expanded curatorial, conservation, and library programs, and consolidation of its support functions. Approximately 60 percent of the museum’s support functions are currently housed off-site across Minna Street in 20,000 square feet of leased office space on Mission Street (also known as the Minna Annex) and at Fort Mason (where space is used by the museum for rental art and storage functions). In February 2010, SFMOMA and the Doris and Donald Fisher Foundation entered into an agreement to present the Fisher Collection, containing approximately 1,100 pieces of contemporary art, at SFMOMA. This agreement, along with other advances in the SFMOMA collection, has increased the demand for expansion of SFMOMA’s galleries, as well as its public and support spaces.

The Project would extend along a north/south axis from Minna Street to Howard Street (a length of 347 feet), and would rise to a maximum height of approximately 200 feet (plus rooftop mechanical, elevator, and stair penthouses up to 20 feet high). It would connect to and be integrated with the existing 151 Third Street museum building. The expanded portion of the museum would thus function as a backdrop to the existing 145-foot-tall museum. The SFMOMA Expansion would also extend the existing 151 Third Street basement area under Hunt Street, the Heal Building site, and the Fire Station No. 1 site. Excavation to approximately 19 to 20 feet below surface grade would be required for the construction of the expansion project’s mat foundation and basement areas (basements currently exist at 670 Howard Street and 676 Howard Street, but would require additional excavation to meet the level of the museum basement).

SFMOMA proposes approximately 230,000 square feet of new construction. The design for the SFMOMA Expansion is intended to meet the additional space needs of the museum while responding to the irregular shape of the site and the existing Mario Botta-designed structure. The Project architects are Snøhetta and EHDD.

The SFMOMA Expansion would increase SFMOMA’s gallery space by up to approximately 130,000 square feet (comprising 13,500 square feet of renovated space in the existing museum and 116,500 square feet of new development), including galleries to house the Fisher Collection,
and would increase support space to allow the museum to consolidate its back-of-house functions that currently are housed partly in the museum and partly at a nearby off-site location on Mission Street (the Minna Annex).

C. Environmental Review

On July 11, 2011, the Planning Department prepared and published a Draft EIR, which describes the Project and the environmental setting, identifies potential impacts, present mitigation measures for impacts found to be significant or potentially significant, and evaluates Project alternatives. The Draft EIR was available for a 45-day public comment period, ending on August 25, 2011. The Commission held a duly advertised public hearing on the Draft EIR on August 11, 2011, at which opportunity for public comment, both oral and written, was given, and public comment was received.

The Planning Department prepared responses to comments on environmental issues received at the public hearing and in writing during the public review period for the Draft EIR, prepared revisions to the text of the Draft EIR, and published the Comments and Responses document on October 26, 2011. Together the Draft EIR and the Comments and Responses document comprise the Final EIR for the Project. During a public hearing, the Planning Commission certified the Final EIR on November 10, 2011.

The Final EIR fully analyzed the Project proposed for approval herein. No new impacts have been identified that have not been analyzed in the Final EIR.

D. Approval Actions

1. Planning Commission Actions

The Planning Commission is taking the following actions and approvals to implement the Projects:

- Certification of the Final EIR, adoption of CEQA findings and adoption of the MMRPs;
- General Plan consistency determination for the proposed Project;
- Recommend approval to the Board of Supervisors of the rezoning of 676 Howard Street from P (Public) to C-3-S (Downtown Support) and the rezoning of the fire station portion of 935 Folsom Street from MUR (Mixed Use Residential) to P (Public);
- Recommend approval to the Board of Supervisors of an amendment to Map 2 of the Community Facilities Element of the San Francisco General Plan; and
- Planning Code Section 309 Downtown Project Approval (SFMOMA Expansion Project);

2. Planning Commission or Zoning Administrator Action

Either the Planning Commission or the Zoning Administrator will approve a Planning Code Section 307(h)/329 Eastern Neighborhoods Project Approval for Housing Project (Fire Station Relocation and Housing Project).
3. **Board of Supervisors Actions**

The Board of Supervisors is taking the following actions and approvals to implement the Project:

- 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;
- Vacation of Hunt Street and conveyance to SFMOMA (SFMOMA Expansion Project);
- Rezoning of 676 Howard Street from P (Public) to C-3-S (Downtown Support) [SFMOMA Expansion Project] and rezoning of the fire station portion of 935 Folsom Street from MUR (Mixed Use Residential) to P (Public) [Fire Station Relocation and Housing Project] [with recommendation of the Planning Commission]; and
- Approval of an amendment to Map 2 of the Community Facilities Element of the San Francisco General Plan (with recommendation of the Planning Commission).

4. **Department of Public Works Actions**

The Department of Public Works is taking the following actions and approvals to implement the Project:

- Lot merger (SFMOMA Expansion); and
- Lot subdivision (Fire Station Relocation and Housing Project).

5. **Department of Building Inspection Actions**

The Department of Building Inspection will approve demolition and building permits.

6. **Public Utilities Commission Actions**

The Public Utilities Commission will approve Stormwater Control Plans, per the Stormwater Management Ordinance.

7. **Arts Commission Action**

The Arts Commission will approve the design of a new public building (Fire Station Relocation and Housing Project).

8. **San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Commission Action**

The San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Commission will approve an amendment of the 151 Third Street Disposition and Development Agreement (DDA) (SFMOMA Expansion Project).

E. **Location 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.

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

II. POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS THAT ARE AVOIDED OR REDUCED TO A LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT LEVEL AND FINDINGS REGARDING MITIGATION MEASURES

The following Sections II and III set forth the Commission’s findings about the Final EIR’s determinations regarding significant environmental impacts and the mitigation measures proposed to address them. These findings provide the written analysis and conclusions of the Commission regarding the environmental impacts of the Project and the mitigation measures included as part of the Final EIR and adopted by the Commission and other City decisionmakers as part of the Project. To avoid duplication and redundancy, and because the Commission agrees with, and hereby adopts, the conclusions in the Final EIR, these findings will not repeat the 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 Commission has considered the opinions of City staff and experts, other agencies and members of the public. The Commission finds that the determination of significance thresholds is a judgment decision within the discretion of the City and County of San Francisco; the significance thresholds used in the EIR are supported by substantial evidence in the record, including the expert opinion of the EIR preparers and City staff; and the significance thresholds used in the EIR provide reasonable and appropriate means of assessing the significance of the adverse environmental effects of the Project.

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

The potentially significant impacts of the SFMOMA Expansion Project that will be mitigated through implementation of mitigation measures include impacts related to:
• construction noise;
• construction air quality;
• hazards from handling, hauling and disposal of lead-contaminated soil and PCBs; and
• archeological resources.

The potentially significant impacts of the Fire Station Relocation and Housing Project that will be mitigated through implementation of mitigation measures include impacts related to:

• noise from construction, stationary sources and traffic;
• hazards from handling, hauling and disposal of lead-contaminated soil and PCBs; and
• damage to, or destruction of, archeological resources.

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

With the required mitigation measures, all potential project impacts, with the exception of impacts of the Fire Station Relocation and Housing Project related to historic resources and construction air quality as described in Section III below, would be avoided or reduced to a less-than-significant level.

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

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

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

A. Significant and Unavoidable Impacts to Historic Resources.

By demolishing the industrial building at 935 Folsom Street, the proposed Fire Station Relocation and Housing Project will result in significant and unavoidable impacts to a historic resource. That is because the building at 935 Folsom Street is considered individually eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources based on its association with the redevelopment of the SoMa neighborhood following the 1906 earthquake and fire (California Register Criterion 1), as well as for its representation of industrial architecture designed by a notable local architect (California Register Criterion 3).

- Mitigation Measure CP-4. Architectural survey in accordance with HABS level II documentation standards.

Completing a historical resources survey to HABS level II documentation standards would reduce this impact, but not to a less-than-significant level. Thus, this impact remains significant and unavoidable.

B. Significant and Unavoidable Impacts to Air Quality.

Construction of the proposed Fire Station Relocation and Housing Project will result in significant and unavoidable impacts to air quality due to exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations and the making of a considerable contribution to cumulatively significant levels of small particulate matter (PM2.5) and toxic air contaminants.

- Mitigation Measure AQ-6. To reduce the health risk associated with construction of the Fire Station Relocation and Housing Project, all off-road construction equipment shall be equipped with Tier 3 (Tier 2 if greater than 750 hp) diesel engines or better.

For certain types of specialty equipment, it may not be feasible for construction contractors to modify their current, older equipment to accommodate the particulate filters required by the mitigation measure, or for them to provide newer models with these filters preinstalled. Therefore full implementation of this mitigation measure may be infeasible. Thus, this impact remains significant and unavoidable.

These impacts could only be eliminated by selection of the No Project Alternative. However, selection of the No Project Alternative was determined to be infeasible, as discussed below in Section IV. Furthermore, although the Adaptive Reuse Alternative would incrementally reduce impacts to historic resources associated with demolition of the 935 Folsom Street building, this
impact would continue to be significant. Also, unavoidable air quality impacts associated with construction of the Adaptive Reuse Alternative would remain approximately the same as under the Project. Finally, as with the No Project Alternative, the Adaptive Reuse Alternative was determined to be infeasible, as discussed below in Section IV.

Accordingly, pursuant to Section 21067 of CEQA and Sections 15040, 15081, and 15082 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the Commission finds that the proposed Project would result in impacts that cannot be avoided if the Project is implemented: demolition of the 935 Folsom building, an historic resource, and construction related air quality impacts. These impacts would remain significant and unavoidable if the Project were implemented.

IV. CONSIDERATION OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

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

The EIR analyzed and concluded that the Project would result in either no or less-than-significant impacts to Land Use, Aesthetics, Transportation and Circulation, Noise, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Wind and Shadow and Public Services. In addition, the Initial Study (Appendix A to the EIR) concluded that impacts in the following areas would be less-than-significant (some with the mitigation measures identified in the Initial Study) and thus these areas were not evaluated in the EIR: Population and Housing, Paleontological Resources, Recreation; Utilities and Service Systems, Biological Resources, Geology and Soils, Hydrology and Water Quality, Hazards/Hazardous Materials; Minerals/Energy Resources, and Agriculture and Forestry Resources. As set forth in Section III above, the Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to Historic Resources and Air Quality, both due to the Fire Station Relocation and Housing Project.

Four alternatives were evaluated in the Final EIR: the No Project Alternative; the Preservation Alternative for the SFMOMA Expansion site; the Partial Fire Station Demolition Alternative for the SFMOMA Expansion site; and the Adaptive Reuse Alternative for the Fire Station Relocation and Housing site.

The Commission certifies that it has independently reviewed and considered the information on the alternatives provided in the Final EIR and in the record. The Final EIR reflects the Commission’s and the City’s independent judgment as to the alternatives.

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

A. Project Objectives

The Project is intended to provide a substantial increase in gallery space in order to exhibit SFMOMA’s growing collections (which currently totals approximately 26,000 pieces), the ongoing program of special exhibitions, and the Doris and Donald Fisher Collection (pursuant to an agreement between SFMOMA and the Fisher family). In addition, the SFMOMA Expansion would allow SFMOMA to consolidate and enhance its administrative, support, and visitor spaces contiguous to the existing museum building at 151 Third Street. Currently, the museum contains approximately 55,400 square feet of gallery space, 67,000 square feet of public visitor space, and 130,000 square feet of support space, plus additional administrative and support space off-site in leased space at 667 Mission Street and at Fort Mason.

In order to accomplish this expansion, SFMOMA proposes to utilize the property at 676 Howard Street, which is currently developed with Fire Station No. 1, an active San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD) fire station. Accordingly, in consultation with the SFFD, SFMOMA acquired the site at 935 Folsom Street to accommodate the potential relocation of Fire Station No. 1 and would construct a new fire station facility, as well as housing, at 935 Folsom Street.

1. SFMOMA Objectives Relative to the SFMOMA Expansion

a) Provide up to 130,000 square feet of additional indoor gallery space to enable the museum to better exhibit its permanent collection, provide galleries to display the Doris and Donald Fisher Collection, increase space for special exhibitions, and attract donations to the museum of additional works of modern art and modern art collections.

b) Provide the additional gallery space immediately contiguous to the museum’s existing galleries to enhance the visitor experience, enable efficient museum operations, and provide easy access for museum staff to the galleries.

c) Provide new galleries in column-free spaces in a range of sizes to maximize the flexibility of the galleries and provide appropriately-sized galleries to display the larger sculptures and paintings in the SFMOMA permanent collection and the Fisher Collection, including a publicly-accessible ground floor lobby or gallery space to exhibit “Sequence,” a Richard Serra sculpture, which measures approximately 65 by 41 feet and rises to height of approximately 13 feet.

d) Provide galleries no higher than the seventh floor of the expanded museum, to optimize the visitor experience.

e) Consolidate on-site and enlarge the museum’s administrative and support functions, to provide up to 220,000 square feet of administrative and support space on-site, including space for art conservation, curatorial staff, art storage, library, and marketing and administrative operations.
2. **SFMOMA Objectives Relative to the Fire Station Relocation and Housing Project**

a) Provide the SFFD with a replacement station for Fire Station No. 1, meeting the Department’s criteria set forth below, at no cost to the Fire Department and in a cost-effective manner for SFMOMA.

b) Defray a portion of the costs incurred in acquiring the 935 Folsom Street site by maximizing the development potential (within existing zoning constraints) of the Shipley Street frontage of the 935 Folsom Street site that is not needed for the relocated fire station.

3. **SFFD Objectives Relative to the Fire Station Relocation and Housing Project**

a) Locate a new fire station to conveniently serve Fire Station No. 1’s service area.

b) Locate the new fire station mid-block on an east-west thoroughfare between Mission and Harrison Streets to enhance ease of egress and ingress of emergency vehicles and to allow traffic signal preemption in order to minimize the need to sound sirens and air horns on vehicles exiting the station.

c) Replace the seismically vulnerable existing Fire Station No. 1 with a structurally sound fire station meeting life safety standards applicable to an “essential facility.”

d) Enlarge Fire Station No. 1 from two vehicles bays to three vehicle bays and locate all essential firefighting and emergency services equipment on the ground floor adjacent to the vehicle bays.

e) Provide adequate sleeping, living, cooking, fitness, locker, and bathroom facilities for both male and female firefighters.

f) Provide off-street parking for approximately 12 to 15 firefighters at one time.

**B. Alternatives Rejected and the Reasons for Rejection**

The Commission rejects the Alternatives set forth in the Final EIR and listed below because the Commission finds that there is substantial evidence, including evidence of economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations described in this Section in addition to those described in Section V below under CEQA Guidelines 15091(a)(3), that make infeasible such Alternatives. In making these determinations, the Commission is aware that CEQA defines “feasibility” to mean “capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors.” The Commission is also aware that under CEQA case law the concept of “feasibility” encompasses (i) the question of whether a particular alternative promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. and (ii) the question of whether an alternative is “desirable” from a policy standpoint to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors.
The Commission adopts the EIR’s analysis and conclusions regarding alternatives eliminated from further consideration, both during the scoping process and in response to comments.

1. **No Project Alternative**

Under the No Project Alternative, the SFMOMA Expansion site would not be redeveloped with new museum uses and would generally remain in its existing condition. The exiting SFMOMA, located at 151 Third Street, would continue to function as a museum, and internal building space could be reconfigured to allow for an evolving series of exhibits. However, the museum would not be expanded on the site to accommodate the museum’s growing permanent collection and special exhibitions. In addition, the Doris and Donald Fisher collection would not be able to be exhibited on a permanent basis at SFMOMA. Off-site administrative and support space for the museum (currently located at 667 Mission Street and Fort Mason) would not be relocated to the SFMOMA Expansion site and the 4-story building located at 670 Howard Street, currently owned by an SFMOMA affiliate, would continue to be used for museum support activities. Because the museum would not be expanded, Fire Station No. 1 would not be relocated from 676 Howard Street to 935 Folsom Street. Thus, in the near-term, Fire Station No. 1 would continue to operate at 676 Howard Street. However, the existing structure is seismically unsound and sustained damage when, in 1997, a large concrete wall segment being lifted by a crane during construction of the W Hotel fell through the roof of the building. The Department of Public Works estimates that bringing the station to modern seismic standards for an essential facility would cost approximately $9.5 million. Therefore, under the No Project Alternative, the SFFD may explore the options of retrofitting the existing building and the fire station use.

In addition, under the No Project Alternative, the commercial/industrial building located at 935 Folsom Street would also remain in its existing condition. Because the building is in poor shape due to deferred maintenance, its potential for reuse in the near-term is limited. Therefore, this alternative assumes that the building would remain vacant, and that additional deterioration of the structure could potentially occur.

The No Project Alternative is hereby found by the Commission to be infeasible and is rejected because it does not implement many of the objectives and goals of the General Plan to the same degree as the proposed Project, including but not limited to:

**Arts Element**

Objective I-1: Recognize the arts as necessary to the quality of life for all segments of San Francisco.

Policy I-1.3: Increase public awareness of the arts in San Francisco by greater promotion of existing arts programs and services in the community and schools.

Objective I-2: Increase the contribution of the arts to the economy of San Francisco.

Policy I-2.1: Encourage and promote opportunities for the arts and artists to contribute to the economic development of San Francisco.
Policy I-2.2: Continue to support and increase the promotion of the arts and arts activities throughout the City for the benefit of visitors, tourists and residents.

Objective III-2: Strengthen the contribution of arts organizations to the creative life and vitality of San Francisco.

Policy III-2.2: Assist in the improvement of arts organizations’ facilities and access in order to enhance the quality and quantity of arts offerings.

Policy VI-1.11: Identify, recognize, and support existing arts clusters and, wherever possible, encourage the development of clusters of arts facilities and arts related businesses throughout the city.

Commerce and Industry Element

Objective 1: Manage economic growth and change to ensure enhancement of the total city living and working environment.

Policy 1.1: Encourage development which provides substantial net benefits and minimizes undesirable consequences. Discourage development which has substantial undesirable consequences that cannot be mitigated.

Objective 2: Maintain and enhance a sound and diverse economic base and fiscal structure for the city.

Policy 2.3: Maintain a favorable social and cultural climate in the city in order to enhance its attractiveness as a firm location.

Objective 3: Provide expanded employment opportunities for city residents, particularly the unemployed and economically disadvantaged.

Downtown Area Plan

Objective 1: Manage economic growth and change to ensure enhancement of the total city living and working environment.

Policy 1.1: Encourage development which produces substantial net benefits and minimizes undesirable consequences. Discourage development which has substantial undesirable consequences which cannot be mitigated.

Objective 4: Enhance San Francisco’s role as a tourist and visitor center.

Objective 13: Create an urban form for downtown that enhances San Francisco’s stature as one of the world’s most visually attractive cities.
Additionally, the No Project Alternative is hereby found by the Commission to be infeasible and is rejected because it does implement many of the objectives and goals of the General Plan as well as the Fire Station Relocation and Housing Project, including but not limited to:

*Community Facilities Element*

Objective 5: Development of a system of firehouses which will meet the operating requirements of the fire department in providing fire protection services and which will be in harmony with related public service facilities and with all other features and facilities of land development and transportation provided for in other sections of the General Plan.

*Community Safety Element*

Objective 2: Reduce structural and non-structural hazards to life safety, minimize property damage and resulting social, cultural and economic dislocations resulting from future disasters.

Policy 2.5: Assess the risks presented by other types of potentially hazardous structures and reduce the risks to the extent possible.

Policy 2.7: Abate structural and non-structural hazards in City-owned structures.

Objective 3: Ensure the protection of life and property from disasters through effective emergency response. Provide public education and training about earthquakes and other natural disasters and how individuals, businesses and communities can reduce the impacts of disasters.

Policy 3.6: Maintain and expand the city’s fire prevention and fire fighting capability with adequate personnel and training. Assure the provision of adequate water for fighting fires.

*Community Safety Element 2007 Draft Update*

Objective 1: Reduce structural and non-structural hazards to life safety and minimize property damage resulting from future disasters.

Policy 1.13: Abate structural and non-structural hazards in City-owned structures.

Objective 2: Be prepared for the onset of disaster by providing public education and training about earthquakes and other natural and man-made disasters, by readying the city’s infrastructure and by ensuring the necessary coordination is in place for ready response.

Policy 2.7: Maintain and expand the city’s fire prevention and fire fighting capability with adequate personnel and training. Assure the provision of adequate water for fighting fires.

Policy 2.21: Develop partnerships with private businesses, public service organizations and local nonprofits to meet disaster-time needs.
East SoMa Area Plan

The No Project Alternative would not advance key goals of the East SoMa Area Plan; this Plan focuses on the creation of a mix of land uses in the neighborhood while increasing the neighborhoods supply of family housing and providing the neighborhood with essential community services. These goals include but are not limited to:

Objective 1.1: Encourage production of housing and other mixed-use development in East SoMa while maintaining its existing special mixed-use character.

Objective 1.2: Maximize housing development potential in keeping with neighborhood character.

Policy 1.2.1: Encourage development of new housing throughout East SoMa.

Objective 2.4: Lower the cost of the production of housing.

Policy 2.4.4: Facilitate housing production by simplifying the approval process wherever possible.

Objective 3.1: Promote an urban form that reinforces East SoMa’s distinctive place in the city’s larger form and strengthens its physical fabric and character.

Objective 3.2: Promote an urban form and architectural character that supports walking and sustains a diverse, active and safe public realm.

Objective 7.1: Provide essential community services and facilities.

Housing Element

Objective 1: Identify and make available for development adequate sites to meet the city’s housing needs, especially permanently affordable housing.

Policy 1.10: Support new housing projects, especially affordable housing, where households can easily rely on public transportation, walking and bicycling for the majority of daily trips.

Objective 4: Foster a housing stock that meets the needs of all residents across lifecycles.

Policy 4.1: Develop new housing, and encourage the remodeling of existing housing, for families with children.

Policy 4.6: Encourage an equitable distribution of growth according to infrastructure and site capacity.

Objective 11: Support and respect the diverse and distinct character of San Francisco’s neighborhoods.
Policy 11.1: Promote the construction and rehabilitation of well-designed housing that emphasizes beauty, flexibility, and innovative design, and respects existing neighborhood character.

Objective 13: Prioritize sustainable development in planning for and constructing new housing.

Policy 13.1: Support “smart” regional growth that locates new housing close to jobs and transit.

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

Finally, the No Project Alternative is infeasible because it fails to achieve any of SFMOMA’s objectives with regard to the SFMOMA Expansion Project, including but not limited to:

- Provide up to 130,000 square feet of additional indoor gallery space to enable the museum to better exhibit its permanent collection, provide galleries to display the Doris and Donald Fisher Collection, increase space for special exhibitions, and attract donations to the museum of additional works of modern art and modern art collections.

- Provide the additional gallery space immediately contiguous to the museum’s existing galleries to enhance the visitor experience, enable efficient museum operations, and provide easy access for museum staff to the galleries.

- Provide new galleries in column-free spaces in a range of sizes to maximize the flexibility of the galleries and provide appropriately-sized galleries to display the larger sculptures and paintings in the SFMOMA permanent collection and the Fisher Collection, including a publicly-accessible ground floor lobby or gallery space to exhibit “Sequence,” a Richard Serra sculpture, which measures approximately 65 by 41 feet and rises to height of approximately 13 feet.

- Consolidate on-site and enlarge the museum’s administrative and support functions, to provide up to 220,000 square feet of administrative and support space on-site, including space for art conservation, curatorial staff, art storage, library, and marketing and administrative operations.

The No Project Alternative is infeasible because it fails to achieve SFMOMA’s objectives and meet any of SFFD’s criteria with regard to the Fire Station Relocation and Housing Project, including but not limited to:

- Provide the SFFD with a replacement station for Fire Station No. 1, meeting the Department’s criteria set forth below, at no cost to the Fire Department and in a cost-effective manner for SFMOMA.
Locate a new fire station to conveniently serve Fire Station No. 1’s service area.

Locate the new fire station mid-block on an east-west thoroughfare between Mission and Harrison Streets to enhance ease of egress and ingress of emergency vehicles and to allow traffic signal preemption in order to minimize the need to sound sirens and air horns on vehicles exiting the station.

Replace the seismically vulnerable existing Fire Station No. 1 with a structurally sound fire station meeting life safety standards applicable to an “essential facility.”

Enlarge Fire Station No. 1 from two vehicles bays to three vehicle bays and locate all essential firefighting and emergency services equipment on the ground floor adjacent to the vehicle bays.

Provide adequate sleeping, living, cooking, fitness, locker, and bathroom facilities for both male and female firefighters.

Provide off-street parking for approximately 12 to 15 firefighters at one time.

2. Preservation Alternative (SFMOMA Expansion Site)

The primary objective of the Preservation Alternative is to retain the building located at 676 Howard Street (currently occupied by Fire Station No. 1) in order to reduce less-than-significant Project effects that would result from the demolition of that structure (which is a contributor to a potential non-contiguous San Francisco 1952 Firehouse Bond Thematic Historic District), while allowing SFMOMA to expand. The Preservation Alternative would thus remove 676 Howard Street from the SFMOMA Expansion site and retain Fire Station No. 1 in its existing location and configuration. Fire Station No. 1 would continue to have vehicle access via Howard and Hunt Streets. Under the alternative, 676 Howard Street would remain operational as Fire Station No. 1 and would function independently of SFMOMA operations (thus avoiding construction of a new fire station at 935 Folsom Street). However, as discussed under the “No Project Alternative,” above, the existing fire station is seismically unsound and the Department of Public Works estimates that bringing the building to modern seismic standards for an essential facility would cost approximately $9.5 million.

As with the proposed project, the building located at 670 Howard Street (the Heald Building, which is not considered a historic resource under CEQA) would be demolished, and the museum addition would partially extend over Hunt Street to connect the 151 Third Street structure to the new narrower (than proposed as part of the project) wing fronting onto Howard Street.

Under the Preservation Alternative, the width of the museum’s frontage on Howard Street would be reduced from 97 feet to 57 feet; however, the height of the Howard Street frontage would increase from approximately 200 feet (10 stories) to approximately 218 feet (11 stories). The museum would expand to the same degree as the proposed project, with up to approximately 230,000 square feet of additional gallery and support space. Off-site administrative and support space for the museum (currently located at 667 Mission Street and
Fort Mason) would be relocated to the expanded museum. No promenade, and associated open space, would be developed that would connect Natoma and Howard Streets, as under the proposed project.

The Preservation Alternative would reduce identified less-than-significant effects associated with demolition of the building located at 676 Howard Street which would occur as a result of the proposed project. However, the remaining impacts resulting from the Preservation Alternative and including impacts to Land Use, Transportation and Circulation, Noise, Air Quality, and Greenhouse Gas Emissions, would remain relatively the same as under the proposed Project. In addition, impacts to Wind and Shadow and Public Services would increase somewhat as compared to the proposed Project.

Because the Preservation Alternative would result in the construction of an 11-story building (instead of a 10-story building, as proposed as part of the Project), and would create a larger gap between the proposed Howard Street tower and W Hotel than would occur as part of the Project, wind conditions would worsen slightly compared to the Project (including cumulative wind conditions). In particular, the alternative would likely create stronger winds relative to existing conditions on the south side of Howard Street, where winds currently exceed the hazard criterion. In addition, rooftop wind speeds would also increase relative to the proposed project. The 11-story addition would slightly increase shadow coverage on Howard Street compared to the Project during the Summer solstice, and Spring and Fall equinoxes.

Further, under the Preservation Alternative, because Fire Station No. 1 would remain at its existing location, it would remain subject to the existing constraints of its location and design. Operations would continue to be hindered by vehicle and pedestrian congestion that occurs around the existing station. In addition, operations would continue to be constrained by the existence of only two vehicle bays in the fire station (requiring one of the station’s three fire trucks to be “parked in” or parked on Howard Street) and the lack of modern design features, such as a design that is in accordance with current seismic standards for an essential facility, a dedicated communications room, a design that is accessible to the disabled, enhanced locker and shower facilities for both male and female firefighters, and on-site parking. Therefore, under the Preservation Alternative, Fire Station No. 1 would not function as well as it would under the proposed Project, and would be less effective at responding to cumulative demand for emergency services.

With a similar less-than-significant impact to historic resources as the Project with regard to 676 Howard Street, the Preservation Alternative would provide less publicly accessible gallery space, reduced open space and would preclude the SFFD from acquiring a new fire station meeting essential facility seismic standards at no cost to the SFFD. The Preservation Alternative is also rejected because it is less consistent than the proposed Project with many of the objectives and goals of the General Plan, including but not limited to:

Urban Design Element

Objective 3: Moderation of major new development to complement the city pattern, the resources to be conserved, and the neighborhood environment.
Policy 3.1: Promote harmony in the visual relationships and transitions between new and older buildings.

Policy 3.4: Promote building forms that will respect and improve the integrity of open spaces and other public areas.

Objective 4: Improvement of the neighborhood environment to increase personal safety, comfort, pride and opportunity.

Policy 4.4: Design walkways and parking facilities to minimize danger to pedestrians.

**Community Safety Element**

Objective 2: Reduce structural and non-structural hazards to life safety, minimize property damage and resulting social, cultural and economic dislocations resulting from future disasters.

Policy 2.5: Assess the risks presented by other types of potentially hazardous structures and reduce the risks to the extent possible.

Objective 3: Ensure the protection of life and property from disasters through effective emergency response. Provide public education and training about earthquakes and other natural disasters and how individuals, businesses and communities can reduce the impacts of disasters.

Policy 3.6: Maintain and expand the city’s fire prevention and fire fighting capability with adequate personnel and training. Assure the provision of adequate water for fighting fires.

**Community Safety Element 2007 Draft Update**

Objective 1: Reduce structural and non-structural hazards to life safety and minimize property damage resulting from future disasters.

Policy 1.13: Abate structural and non-structural hazards in City-owned structures.

Objective 2: Be prepared for the onset of disaster by providing public education and training about earthquakes and other natural and man-made disasters, by readying the city’s infrastructure and by ensuring the necessary coordination is in place for ready response.

Policy 2.7: Maintain and expand the city’s fire prevention and fire fighting capability with adequate personnel and training. Assure the provision of adequate water for fighting fires.
Downtown Area Plan

The Preservation Alternative would also be less consistent with key goals of the Downtown Area Plan including, but not limited to:

Objective 9: Provide quality open space in sufficient quantity and variety to meet the needs of downtown workers, residents, and visitors.

Policy 9.1: Require usable indoor and outdoor open space, accessible to the public, as part of new downtown development.

Policy 9.2: Provide different kinds of open space downtown.

Objective 10: Assure that open spaces are accessible and usable.

Policy 10.2: Encourage the creation of new open spaces that become a part of an interconnected pedestrian network.

Objective 14: Create and maintain a comfortable pedestrian environment.

Policy 14.1: Promote building forms that will maximize sun access to open spaces and other public areas.

Policy 14.2: Promote building forms that will minimize the creation of surface winds near the base of buildings.

Objective 16: Create and maintain attractive, interesting urban streetscapes.

Policy 16.4: Use designs and materials and include activities at the ground floor to create pedestrian interest.

Policy 16.5: Encourage the incorporation of publicly visible art works in new private development and in various public spaces downtown.

Objective 23: Reduce hazards to life safety and minimize property damage and economic dislocation resulting from future earthquakes.

Policy 23.4: Review and amend at regular intervals all relevant public codes to incorporate the most current knowledge and highest standards of seismic design, and support seismic research through appropriate actions by all public agencies.

Finally, the Preservation Alternative is infeasible because it fails to achieve some of the key objectives of the SFMOMA Expansion Project. As described below, galleries in the Howard Street wing of the building would not meet the space requirements needed to fully accommodate the larger sculptures and paintings in the SFMOMA permanent collection and the Fisher
Collection. In addition, SFMOMA would not be able to proceed with the alternative while meeting established time and budget constraints due to the complexity of engineering and constructing the alternative:

- The width of the museum’s Howard Street frontage would be reduced from 97 feet under the proposed Project to 57 feet. Structural elements would further reduce the street entry to approximately 45 feet at the ground level, eliminating the museum’s proposed entrance along the promenade connecting Natoma and Howard Streets, and the lobby. The public exhibition of “Sequence,” by Richard Serra (one of the major works from the Fisher Collection) in a ground floor publicly-accessible gallery space would not be possible under this alternative because the width of the lobby gallery would be too small. (Sequence is a 13-foot-tall steel plate sculpture with horizontal dimensions of 65 feet by 41 feet that must be located at the ground level both for structural and seismic safety reasons.) Therefore, under the Preservation Alternative, Sequence could not be exhibited in the museum.

- The promenade connecting Natoma and Howard Streets, associated open space, and museum access point would not be developed because insufficient space would be available for such a feature.

- Above the ground floor, the bay widths of the galleries fronting Howard Street would be reduced to approximately 45 feet wide, 20 feet narrower than the museum’s preference for new galleries. The smaller floor plates, combined with the undesirability of placing galleries any higher than the seventh floor, would require eliminating nearly all support space from the lower seven floors of the expansion, such that those galleries would be without nearby back-of-house support space, compromising their utility.

3. Partial Fire Station Demolition Alternative (SFMOMA Expansion Site)

The primary objective of the Partial Fire Station Demolition Alternative is to retain the front half of Fire Station No. 1 (located at 676 Howard Street) in order to reduce less-than-significant impacts to historic resources associated with demolition of the building (which is a contributor to a potential non-contiguous San Francisco 1952 Firehouse Bond Thematic Historic District), while allowing SFMOMA to expand. The alternative would demolish the northern half of Fire Station No. 1 (along Hunt Street) and retain and adaptively reuse the front half of the fire station extending 50 feet north from Howard Street. The first and second floors of the fire station would become part of the museum expansion project. The 8 levels of the museum expansion above the second floor of the fire station would step around the retained footprint, resulting in a setback of approximately 50 feet at 676 Howard Street. As would occur under the proposed Project, the structure located at 670 Howard Street (the Heald Building) would be demolished, and the museum addition would extend over Hunt Street to connect the 151 Third Street structure to the new notched wing fronting onto Howard Street. The museum would expand to the same degree as the proposed Project, with up to approximately 230,000 square feet of additional gallery and support space. Under this alternative, the height of the expansion would be approximately the same as the proposed project, at approximately 200 feet (10 stories).
The 676 Howard Street building is a 2-story, reinforced concrete structure and would need to be significantly modified to accommodate the removal of half the existing structure. New structural walls or columns would be introduced to stabilize the north (cut) face of the existing structure. Because the existing and new buildings would have different structural systems, rows of new structural elements would be introduced parallel to the east and north faces of the preserved 676 Howard Street building, and these elements would be seismically separated from the retained portion of the structure.

The interior of the 676 Howard Street building at the ground floor would not become part of the Howard Street lobby/gallery, but instead would be a separate gallery differentiated and separated from the rest of the ground floor, resulting in a fragmented Howard Street frontage. Alternatively, the museum could locate a satellite retail store in the ground floor of 676 Howard Street. The second floor of the partially preserved 676 Howard Street building, which would have a ceiling height of less than 9 feet (making it unusable as a gallery), would be used for support, administrative, or storage functions. Similar to the Preservation Alternative, no promenade would be developed that would connect Natoma and Howard Streets, as under the proposed Project. Finally, because the retained portion of 676 Howard Street would not accommodate Fire Station No. 1, the Fire Station Relocation and Housing Project would be implemented similar to the proposed project, and Fire Station No. 1 would relocate to 935 Folsom Street.

This alternative would incrementally reduce identified less-than-significant effects to historic resources associated with demolition of Fire Station No. 1 at 676 Howard Street, which is a contributor to the potential 1952 Firehouse Bond Act Thematic Historic District. However, the remaining impacts resulting from this alternative and including impacts to Land Use, Cultural Resources, Noise, Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Wind and Shadow and Public Services would be almost identical to those impacts resulting from the proposed Project.

In addition, as with the Preservation Alternative, because the Partial Fire Station Demolition Alternative would eliminate both the development of the promenade connecting Natoma and Howard Streets (and associated open space) and the public exhibit of “Sequence,” by Richard Serra (one of the major works from the Fisher Collection) in a ground floor publicly accessible gallery space, this alternative would reduce publicly accessible gallery space and open space. The Partial Fire Station Demolition Alternative is thus rejected because it is less consistent than the proposed Project with many of the objectives and goals of the General Plan, including but not limited to:

**Urban Design Element**

Policy 3.4: Promote building forms that will respect and improve the integrity of open spaces and other public areas.

Objective 4: Improvement of the neighborhood environment to increase personal safety, comfort, pride and opportunity.

Policy 4.4: Design walkways and parking facilities to minimize danger to pedestrians.
Policy 4.8: Provide convenient access to a variety of recreation opportunities.

Policy 4.13: Improve pedestrian areas by providing human scale and interest.

*Downtown Area Plan*

The Partial Fire Station Demolition Alternative would also be less consistent than the proposed Project with key goals of the Downtown Area Plan including, but not limited to:

Objective 9: Provide quality open space in sufficient quantity and variety to meet the needs of downtown workers, residents, and visitors.

Policy 9.1: Require usable indoor and outdoor open space, accessible to the public, as part of new downtown development.

Policy 9.2: Provide different kinds of open space downtown.

Objective 10: Assure that open spaces are accessible and usable.

Policy 10.2: Encourage the creation of new open spaces that become a part of an interconnected pedestrian network.

Objective 13: Create an urban form for downtown that enhances San Francisco’s stature as one of the world’s most visually attractive cities.

Objective 14: Create and maintain a comfortable pedestrian environment.

Objective 16: Create and maintain attractive, interesting urban streetscapes.

Policy 16.4: Use designs and materials and include activities at the ground floor to create pedestrian interest.

Policy 16.5: Encourage the incorporation of publicly visible art works in new private development and in various public spaces downtown.

Finally, the Partial Fire Station Demolition Alternative is infeasible because it fails to achieve some of SFMOMA’s key objectives with regard to the Project. As described below, as with the Preservation Alternative, galleries along the Howard Street frontage of the building would not meet the space requirements needed to fully accommodate the larger sculptures and paintings in the SFMOMA permanent collection and the Fisher Collection. In addition, SFMOMA would not be able to proceed with the alternative while meeting established time and budget constraints due to the complexity of engineering and constructing the alternative.
• The museum’s Howard Street frontage would be segregated into the partially preserved 676 Howard Street frontage (40 feet wide) and the new construction occupying the site of the Heald Building (670 Howard Street) (57 feet wide). Structural elements would further reduce the street entry to approximately 45 feet at the ground level, eliminating the museum’s proposed entrance along the promenade connecting Natoma and Howard Streets and lobby. The public exhibition of “Sequence,” by Richard Serra (one of the major works from the Fisher Collection) in a ground floor publicly-accessible gallery space would not be possible under this alternative because the width of the lobby gallery would be too small. (Sequence is a 13-foot-tall steel plate sculpture with horizontal dimensions of 65 feet by 41 feet that must be located at the ground level both for structural and seismic safety reasons.) Therefore, under the Partial Fire Station Demolition Alternative, Sequence could not be exhibited in the museum.

• The promenade connecting Natoma and Howard Streets, associated open space, and museum access point would not be developed because insufficient space would be available for such a feature.

• Above the ground floor, gallery bay widths would be reduced to approximately 45 feet in width at the front 50 feet of the galleries fronting Howard Street. Gallery bay widths would be 20 feet narrower than the project sponsor’s requirements for new galleries.

4. Adaptive Reuse Alternative (Fire Station Relocation and Housing Site)

The primary objective of the Adaptive Reuse Alternative is to retain—to the degree feasible—the existing structure located at 935 Folsom Street in order to reduce impacts to historic resources associated with the demolition of the building, while allowing Fire Station No. 1 to be relocated to the site. The Adaptive Reuse Alternative would thus convert the existing building at 935 Folsom Street to a new fire station. However, because the existing building (which comprises the entirety of the site) would be retained and used for the fire station, development of the 13-unit multifamily residential structure proposed as part of the Project would be precluded.

In order to accommodate a fire station, substantial changes to the existing building would be required. Because the soils underlying the site may be unstable and the existing building is not structurally sound due to lack of maintenance in recent years, the adaptive reuse of the existing 935 Folsom Street building for a code-compliant firehouse would require virtually all of the existing structure to be replaced. In particular, the Folsom Street façade would require substantial alteration to accommodate the new apparatus bay doors. Additionally, as part of this alternative, three new apparatus bay doors would be cut into the Folsom Street façade and other openings along Falmouth and/or Shipley Streets would be created and/or altered to accommodate new functions. The existing structure would require complete reconstruction in place, with a new deep pile and grade beam foundation, new floor and roof structures, and a full seismic retrofit to meet seismic standards for essential facilities. Further, large sections of the exterior concrete walls with severe cracking would require replacement.
There are also a variety of structural considerations that will need to be accounted for as part of the Adaptive Reuse Alternative. The existing concrete and wood structure rests on poor soils and exhibits severe deterioration and differential settlement. The conversion of the structure into a code-compliant essential facility firehouse would require a major reconstruction of the existing structure in-place, with the following structural implications:

- **New Foundations/Exterior Walls.** A new deep pile (thus requiring pile driving, similar to the proposed Project) and grade beam foundation would be required beneath the existing exterior concrete walls. The new pile and foundation would require the existing heavy walls to be undermined, realigned to vertical and supported above the ground to allow for the installation of the new foundation beneath them. Given the poor condition of the existing concrete walls and the severity of current settlement, large portions of the walls would likely not survive this procedure and would need to be completely replaced.

- **New Floors.** Given the poor underlying soils and the heavy fire equipment loads anticipated as part of the Adaptive Reuse Alternative, the ground floor would require a new 24-inch matt slab over the entire building footprint. The entire mezzanine/second floor structure would need to either be removed or replaced with an all-new structure to meet current codes.

- **New Roof and Clerestory Structure.** As noted above, the existing combustible roof structure would need to be replaced with a non-combustible structure suitable to an essential services facility.

- **New Windows and Doors.** All openings would require new windows and doors meeting current energy code requirements.

It is estimated that the cost of the Adaptive Reuse Alternative would be approximately $2.7 million more than the cost of the proposed Project. In addition, because the multi-family residential building would not be built, the estimated $800,000 value of the land for that project would not be recouped by SFMOMA.

The Adaptive Reuse Alternative would reduce impacts to historic resources associated with demolition of the 935 Folsom Street building; however, this reduction will be incremental and will not reduce such impacts to a less-than-significant level given the amount of physical changes required to adapt the existing building to an essential facility. Aside from this incremental reduction in impacts to historic resources, the Adaptive Reuse Alternative would result in many of the same environmental effects that would result from the Project.

With relatively the same level of impact, then, the Adaptive Reuse Alternative would cost substantially more than the Project, would provide no housing units at the Project site to meet the City’s target for new housing construction, and would provide a facility that will be less seismically sound than a new fire station as proposed under the Project due to the high degree of additional seismic and other structural reinforcement required. The Adaptive Reuse Alternative is thus rejected because it is less consistent than the proposed Project with many of the objectives and goals of the General Plan, including but not limited to:
Community Safety Element

Objective 2: Reduce structural and non-structural hazards to life safety, minimize property damage and resulting social, cultural and economic dislocations resulting from future disasters.

Policy 2.5: Assess the risks presented by other types of potentially hazardous structures and reduce the risks to the extent possible.

Community Safety Element 2007 Draft Update

Objective 1: Reduce structural and non-structural hazards to life safety and minimize property damage resulting from future disasters.

Policy 1.13: Abate structural and non-structural hazards in City-owned structures.

East SoMa Area Plan

The Adaptive Reuse Alternative would also be less consistent with key goals of the East SoMa Area Plan including, but not limited to:

Objective 1.1: Encourage production of housing and other mixed-use development in East SoMa while maintaining its existing special mixed-use character.

Objective 1.2: Maximize housing development potential in keeping with neighborhood character.

Policy 1.2.1: Encourage development of new housing throughout East SoMa.

Objective 2.4: Lower the cost of the production of housing.

Policy 2.4.4: Facilitate housing production by simplifying the approval process wherever possible.

Housing Element

Objective 1: Identify and make available for development adequate sites to meet the city’s housing needs, especially permanently affordable housing.

Policy 1.10: Support new housing projects, especially affordable housing, where households can easily rely on public transportation, walking and bicycling for the majority of daily trips.

Objective 4: Foster a housing stock that meets the needs of all residents across lifecycles.

Policy 4.1: Develop new housing, and encourage the remodeling of existing housing, for families with children.
Policy 4.6: Encourage an equitable distribution of growth according to infrastructure and site capacity.

Objective 11: Support and respect the diverse and distinct character of San Francisco’s Neighborhoods.

Policy 11.1: Promote the construction and rehabilitation of well-designed housing that emphasizes beauty, flexibility, and innovative design, and respects existing neighborhood character.

Objective 13: Prioritize sustainable development in planning for and constructing new housing.

Policy 13.1: Support “smart” regional growth that locates new housing close to jobs and transit.

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

Finally, the Adaptive Reuse Alternative is infeasible because it fails to meet some of SFMOMA’s key objectives with respect to the Project. The alternative, because it would cost approximately $2.7 million above the cost of the proposed Project (and would not allow for the recoupment of costs associated with the housing site) would not be considered to be cost-effective for SFMOMA. Similarly, because the alternative would retain the footprint of the existing 935 Folsom Street building, the development potential of the Shipley Street frontage of the site would be eliminated. In addition, the alternative would achieve the objective related to the construction of a seismically sound essential facility to a lesser degree than the proposed Project due to the high degree of additional seismic and other structural reinforcement required.

V. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDE\ING 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. All mitigation measures proposed in the Final EIR for the proposed Project are adopted as part of this approval action. Furthermore, the Commission has determined that any remaining significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable are acceptable due to the following specific overriding economic, technical, legal, social and other considerations.

The SFMOMA Expansion will not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts, and will have the following benefits:

A. The Project will provide up to 130,000 square feet of additional indoor gallery space to enable SFMOMA to better exhibit its permanent collection, provide galleries to display the Doris and Donald Fisher Collection, increase space for special exhibitions, and attract donations to the museum of additional works of modern art and modern art collections. These galleries will be open to the public. Accordingly, the Project makes a significant contribution to the public’s access to the visual arts in San Francisco.

B. By its Resolution No. 34-09 adopted on January 27, 2009, the Board of Supervisors acknowledged the magnitude that the exhibition of the Fisher Collection would have on the City’s cultural landscape and the positive impacts it would have on tourist revenue and other key general fund revenue sources, found that the Fisher Collection would be a valuable public addition to the City’s civic well being, and urged the City to evaluate locations within the City that might suitably house the Fisher Collection. The Project fulfills these policy goals of the City as set forth in Resolution No. 34-09.

C. The Project will allow SFMOMA, a major non-profit cultural institution, to expand, consolidate and enhance its gallery, administrative, support, and visitor spaces contiguous to the existing museum building at 151 Third Street.

D. The Project will enhance the cultural diversity of the city and the Yerba Buena neighborhood.

E. The Project will provide a publicly-accessible ground floor lobby or gallery space to exhibit “Sequence,” a Richard Serra sculpture, which measures approximately 65 by 41 feet and rises to height of approximately 13 feet.

F. By replacing a vacant building and two surface parking pads with additional gallery, support and retail space, the Project will directly enhance the neighborhood’s character.

G. SFMOMA proposes approximately 230,000 square feet of new construction, such that the project would occupy less than 70 percent of the building envelope permitted by existing zoning. In addition, although permitted at a height of 500 and 320 feet, the Project has a height of approximately 200 feet and consists of 10 levels and a basement. This overall height of the Project is within the range of development on the block, including the 42-story St. Regis Hotel and Residences, the 29-story W Hotel, and the Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Building.
H. The form of the new building would be compatible with many structures in the vicinity of the site. In addition, the design of the Project would maintain a visual connection from Yerba Buena Gardens between the foreground museum view and background view of other existing buildings.

I. The Project will be of a superior architecture and design. It will be clad in glass fiber reinforced concrete, which is known for its load-bearing properties and resistance to weathering elements. Both the Howard and Minna Street frontages would feature extensive glazing, allowing for views into the building from the street.

J. The Project will not degrade the vistas associated with any existing parks or open space. Additionally, the Project will not cast any new shadow on the Yerba Buena Gardens or any other public open space.

K. The Project will provide pedestrian access to the museum from all four surrounding streets (Third, Minna, Natoma, and Howard Streets) and will continue to provide convenient access from within the museum building to the existing sculpture garden on the roof of the 147-151 Minna Street parking garage.

L. With increased pedestrian access, easier access for museum staff and expanded gallery space, the Project would enhance arts activities and facilities within the existing SFMOMA and contribute to the cluster of arts facilities in the Yerba Buena Area.

M. The Project provides approximately 5,738 square feet of additional publicly accessible open space in a public plaza, terrace, and promenade to be located immediately east of the museum expansion on the ground and second floors accessed off of Howard and Natoma Streets. Additionally, private open space will be provided in the existing 17,250 square foot sculpture garden and two new sculpture gardens to be located on the third and seventh floors of the expansion (approximately 5,700 square feet and 3,500 square feet, respectively).

N. The Project will contribute to future opportunities for resident employment because the addition of gallery, retail and related space will create additional job openings at SFMOMA.

O. The Project will enhance San Francisco’s role as a tourist and visitor center. It is anticipated that after visitorship stabilizes following opening of the Project to the public, annual visitor numbers would increase by approximately 20 percent.

P. As a component of the Project, SFMOMA will provide the SFFD with a replacement station for Fire Station No. 1 at no cost to the Fire Department and in a cost-effective manner for SFMOMA. This in turn will result in the replacement of the seismically vulnerable Fire Station No. 1 with a structurally sound fire station meeting current life safety standards applicable to an “essential facility.”

Q. The Project is consistent with and implements many objectives and policies of the General Plan, including but not limited to the following:
Arts Element

Objective I-1: Recognize the arts as necessary to the quality of life for all segments of San Francisco.

Policy I-1.2: Officially recognize on a regular basis the contributions arts make to the quality of life in San Francisco.

Policy I-1.3: Increase public awareness of the arts in San Francisco by greater promotion of existing arts programs and services in the community and schools.

Objective I-2: Increase the contribution of the arts to the economy of San Francisco.

Policy I-2.1: Encourage and promote opportunities for the arts and artists to contribute to the economic development of San Francisco.

Policy I-2.2: Continue to support and increase the promotion of the arts and arts activities throughout the City for the benefit of visitors, tourists and residents.

Objective III-2: Strengthen the contribution of arts organizations to the creative life and vitality of San Francisco.

Policy III-2.2: Assist in the improvement of arts organizations’ facilities and access in order to enhance the quality and quantity of arts offerings.

Policy III-2.3: Recognize that arts organizations are representative of the City’s diversity, creativity and vitality.

Objective VI-1: Support the continued development and preservation of artists’ and arts organizations’ spaces.

Policy VI-1.11: Identify, recognize, and support existing arts clusters and, wherever possible, encourage the development of clusters of arts facilities and arts related businesses throughout the city.

Commerce and Industry Element

Objective 1: Manage economic growth and change to ensure enhancement of the total city living and working environment.

Policy 1.1: Encourage development which provides substantial net benefits and minimizes undesirable consequences. Discourage development which has substantial undesirable consequences that cannot be mitigated.

Objective 2: Maintain and enhance a sound and diverse economic base and fiscal structure for the city.
Policy 2.3: Maintain a favorable social and cultural climate in the city in order to enhance its attractiveness as a firm location.

*Urban Design Element*

Objective 3: Moderation of major new development to complement the city pattern, the resources to be conserved, and the neighborhood environment.

Policy 3.1: Promote harmony in the visual relationships and transitions between new and older buildings.

Policy 3.4: Promote building forms that will respect and improve the integrity of open spaces and other public areas.

Objective 4: Improvement of the neighborhood environment to increase personal safety, comfort, pride and opportunity.

Policy 4.4: Design walkways and parking facilities to minimize danger to pedestrians.

Policy 4.8: Provide convenient access to a variety of recreation opportunities.

Policy 4.10: Encourage or require the provision of recreation space in private development.

Policy 4.13: Improve pedestrian areas by providing human scale and interest.

*Downtown Area Plan*

The Project is also consistent with and implements many objectives and policies of the Downtown Area Plan, including but not limited to the following:

Objective 1: Manage economic growth and change to ensure enhancement of the total city living and working environment.

Policy 1.1: Encourage development which produces substantial net benefits and minimizes undesirable consequences. Discourage development which has substantial undesirable consequences which cannot be mitigated.

Objective 4: Enhance San Francisco’s role as a tourist and visitor center.

Objective 9: Provide quality open space in sufficient quantity and variety to meet the needs of downtown workers, residents and visitors.

Policy 9.1: Require usable indoor and outdoor open space, accessible to the public, as part of new downtown development.
Policy 9.2: Provide different kinds of open space downtown.

Policy 9.5: Improve the usefulness of publicly owned rights-of-way as open space.

Objective 10: Ensure that open spaces are accessible and usable.

Policy 10.2: Encourage the creation of new open spaces that become part of an interconnected pedestrian network.

Objective 13: Create an urban form for downtown that enhances San Francisco’s stature as one of the world’s most visually attractive cities.

Policy 13.1 Relate the height of buildings to important attributes of the city pattern and to the height and character of existing and proposed development.

Objective 14: Create and maintain a comfortable pedestrian environment.

Policy 14.2: Create building forms that will minimize the creation of surface winds near the base of buildings.

Objective 15: Create a building form that is visually interesting and harmonizes with surrounding buildings.

Policy 15.1: Assure that new buildings contribute to the visual unity of the city.

Objective 16: Create and maintain attractive, interesting urban streetscapes.

Objective 16.4: Use designs and materials and include activities at the ground floor to create pedestrian interest.

Objective 16.5: Encourage the incorporation of publicly visible art works in new private development and in various public spaces downtown.

Objective 22: Implement a downtown streetscape plan to improve the downtown pedestrian circulation system, especially within the core, to provide for efficient, comfortable, and safe movement.

Policy 22.3: Ensure convenient and safe pedestrian crossings.

Policy 22.5: Improve the ambience of the pedestrian environment.

Although the Fire Station Relocation and Housing Project will result in significant and unavoidable impacts to the environment, it will have the following benefits that outweigh those impacts:
A. The Project will replace the seismically vulnerable existing Fire Station No. 1 with a new structurally sound fire station meeting life safety standards applicable to an “essential facility.” The fire station will be provided at no cost to the SFFD.

B. Location of the Replacement Fire Station No. 1 on Folsom Street between Fifth and Sixth Streets provides superior response times for most of the service calls received by Fire Station No. 1, compared to the existing station location at 676 Howard Street, which is a congested location further away from the location of most service calls.

C. The Project will enlarge Fire Station No. 1 from two vehicles bays to three vehicle bays, and all essential firefighting and emergency services equipment will be located on the ground floor adjacent to the vehicle bays.

D. The Project provides adequate sleeping, living, cooking, fitness, locker, and bathroom facilities for both male and female firefighters.

E. The Project provides 15 off-street parking spaces for firefighters, compared to no dedicated off-street parking spaces at the existing 676 Howard Street station.

F. The design of the new fire station expresses both the stability and dignity of an important civic building and the unique character of a fire house. The building will be set back from the property line by 5 feet to accommodate a bioswale along Falmouth Street, which would be planted with native plants.

G. The Project will provide up to 13 units of new housing with a large portion of these units being family-sized units.

H. The residential building will be consistent with the character of the neighborhood since surrounding uses include numerous live/work lofts and multi-family residential buildings.

Additionally, the Fire Station Relocation and Housing Project is consistent with and implements many objectives and policies of the General Plan, including but not limited to the following:

Community Facilities Element

Objective 5: Development of a system of firehouses which will meet the operating requirements of the fire department in providing fire protection services and which will be in harmony with related public service facilities and with all other features and facilities of land development and transportation provided for in other sections of the General Plan.

Community Safety Element

Objective 2: Reduce structural and non-structural hazards to life safety, minimize property damage and resulting social, cultural and economic dislocations resulting from future disasters.
Policy 2.5: Assess the risks presented by other types of potentially hazardous structures and reduce the risks to the extent possible.

Policy 2.7: Abate structural and non-structural hazards in City-owned structures.

Objective 3: Ensure the protection of life and property from disasters through effective emergency response. Provide public education and training about earthquakes and other natural disasters and how individuals, businesses and communities can reduce the impacts of disasters.

Policy 3.6: Maintain and expand the city’s fire prevention and fire fighting capability with adequate personnel and training. Assure the provision of adequate water for fighting fires.

Community Safety Element 2007 Draft Update

Objective 1: Reduce structural and non-structural hazards to life safety and minimize property damage resulting from future disasters.

Policy 1.13: Abate structural and non-structural hazards in City-owned structures.

Objective 2: Be prepared for the onset of disaster by providing public education and training about earthquakes and other natural and man-made disasters, by readying the city’s infrastructure and by ensuring the necessary coordination is in place for ready response.

Policy 2.7: Maintain and expand the city’s fire prevention and fire fighting capability with adequate personnel and training. Assure the provision of adequate water for fighting fires.

Policy 2.13: Support the recently developed Emergency Command Center, and ensure alternative command centers in case of an emergency.

Policy 2.21: Develop partnerships with private businesses, public service organizations and local nonprofits to meet disaster-time needs.

Urban Design Element

Objective 3: Moderation of major new development to complement the city pattern, the resources to be conserved, and the neighborhood environment.

Policy 3.1: Promote harmony in the visual relationships and transitions between new and older buildings.

Policy 3.4: Promote building forms that will respect and improve the integrity of open spaces and other public areas.

Objective 4: Improvement of the neighborhood environment to increase personal safety, comfort, pride and opportunity.
Policy 4.13: Improve pedestrian areas by providing human scale and interest.

*East SoMa Area Plan*

Objective 1.1: Encourage production of housing and other mixed-use development in East SoMa while maintaining its existing special mixed-use character.

Objective 1.2: Maximize housing development potential in keeping with neighborhood character.

Policy 1.2.1: Encourage development of new housing throughout East SoMa.

Policy 1.2.2: Ensure that in-fill housing development is compatible with its surroundings.

Policy 1.2.4: In general, where residential development is permitted, control residential density through building height and bulk guidelines and bedroom mix requirements.

Objective 2.3: Ensure that new residential developments satisfy an array of housing needs with respect to tenure, unit mix and community services.

Policy 2.3.3: Require that a significant number of units in new developments have two or more bedrooms, except Senior Housing and SRO developments unless all Below Market Rate Units are two or more bedrooms.

Objective 2.4: Lower the cost of the production of housing.

Policy 2.4.4: Facilitate housing production by simplifying the approval process wherever possible.

Objective 3.1: Promote an urban form that reinforces East SoMa’s distinctive place in the city’s larger form and strengthens its physical fabric and character.

Policy 3.1.6: New buildings should epitomize the best in contemporary architecture, but should do so with full awareness of, and respect for, the height, mass, articulation and materials of the best of the older buildings that surrounds them.

Objective 3.2: Promote an urban form and architectural character that supports walking and sustains a diverse, active and safe public realm.

Policy 3.2.3: Minimize the visual impact of parking.

Objective 5.2: Ensure that new development includes high quality private open space.

Policy 5.2.1: Require new residential and mixed-use residential development to provide on-site private open space designated to meet the needs of residents.
Objective 7.1: Provide essential community services and facilities.

*Housing Element*

Objective 1: Identify and make available for development adequate sites to meet the city’s housing needs, especially permanently affordable housing.

Policy 1.10: Support new housing projects, especially affordable housing, where households can easily rely on public transportation, walking and bicycling for the majority of daily trips.

Objective 4: Foster a housing stock that meets the needs of all residents across lifecycles.

Policy 4.1: Develop new housing, and encourage the remodeling of existing housing, for families with children.

Policy 4.6: Encourage an equitable distribution of growth according to infrastructure and site capacity.

Objective 5: Ensure that all residents have equal access to available units.

Policy 5.4: Provide a range of unit types for all segments of need, and work to move residents between unit types as their needs change.

Objective 11: Support and respect the diverse and distinct character of San Francisco’s Neighborhoods.

Policy 11.1: Promote the construction and rehabilitation of well-designed housing that emphasizes beauty, flexibility, and innovative design, and respects existing neighborhood character.

Policy 11.2: Ensure implementation of accepted design standards in project approvals.

Policy 11.3: Ensure growth is accommodated without substantially and adversely impacting existing residential neighborhood character.

Policy 11.5: Ensure densities in established residential areas promote compatibility with prevailing neighborhood character.

Policy 11.6: Foster a sense of community through architectural design, using features that promote community interaction.

Policy 11.8: Consider a neighborhood’s character when integrating new uses, and minimize disruption caused by expansion of institutions into residential areas.

Objective 12: Balance housing growth with adequate infrastructure that serves the city’s growing population.
Policy 12.1: Encourage new housing that relies on transit use and environmentally sustainable patterns of movement.

Policy 12.2: Consider the proximity of quality of life elements, such as open space, child care, and neighborhood services, when developing new housing units.

Policy 12.3: Ensure new housing is sustainably supported by the City’s public infrastructure systems.

Objective 13: Prioritize sustainable development in planning for and constructing new housing.

Policy 13.1: Support “smart” regional growth that locates new housing close to jobs and transit.

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

Having considered these benefits, the Commission finds that the benefits of the Project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects and that the adverse environmental effects are therefore acceptable.

**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 FINDINGS under the California Environmental Quality Act, including rejecting alternatives as infeasible, adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and adopting Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Programs attached as Exhibits A and B.

I hereby certify that the Planning Commission ADOPTED the foregoing Motion on November 10, 2011.
AYES: Miguel, Antonini, Borden, Fong, Moore, Sugaya

NAYS:

ABSENT: Olague

ADOPTED: November 10, 2011
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Mitigation Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Report Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M-CP-2</strong></td>
<td>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 consultant’s work shall be conducted in accordance with this measure at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer (ERO). [For the SFMOMA Expansion, the archaeological consultant’s work shall be conducted in accordance with this mitigation measure, and with the requirements of the project archaeological research design and treatment plan (Far Western Anthropological Research Group. <em>Archaeological Research Design and Treatment Plan for the Transit Center District Plan Area. February 2010</em>) at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer (ERO). In instances of inconsistency between the requirement of the project archaeological research design and treatment plan and of this archaeological 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 4 weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of construction can be extended beyond 4 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 <em>CEQA Guidelines</em> Section 15064.5 (a)(c).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project sponsor and archaeological consultant.</td>
<td>Prior to any soil-disturbing activities.</td>
<td>The ERO to review and approve all plans and reports.</td>
<td>Considered complete upon ERO approval of plans and reports.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Archaeological Testing Program. 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.

(see above) (see above) (see above) (see above)
**Responsibility for Implementation** | **Mitigation Schedule** | **Monitoring/Report Responsibility** | **Status/Date Completed**
--- | --- | --- | ---

**M-CP-2 Continued**

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 and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible.

*Archaeological Monitoring Program.* 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 the commencement of any project-related soils disturbing activities. 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 project archaeological consultant, determined that project construction activities could have no effects on significant archaeological deposits;
### Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Mitigation Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Report Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-CP-2 Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 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 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.

**Archaeological Data Recovery Program.** The archaeological data recovery program shall be conducted in accordance 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 nondestructive 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.

- Project sponsor, archaeological consultant, ERO.  
  Prior to soil-disturbing activities.  
  The ERO to review and approve the archaeological data recovery program.  
  Considered complete upon ERO’s receipt of the written report of findings from the archaeological data recovery program or ERO’s direction to implement further measures.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Mitigation Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Report Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M-CP-2 Continued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Discard and Deaccession Policy.</strong> Description of and rationale for field and post-field discard and deaccession policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Interpretive Program.</strong> Consideration of an on-site/off-site public interpretive program during the course of the archaeological data recovery program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Security Measures.</strong> Recommended security measures to protect the archaeological resource from vandalism, looting, and non-intentionally damaging activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Final Report.</strong> Description of proposed report format and distribution of results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Curation.</strong> Description of the procedures and recommendations for the curation of any recovered data having potential research value, identification of appropriate curation facilities, and a summary of the accession policies of the curation facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects.</strong> 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) (Public Resources Code Section 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 Section 15064.5(d)). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects.</td>
<td>Project sponsor, construction contractor, and archaeological consultant.</td>
<td>During soil-disturbing activities.</td>
<td>ERO and County Coroner.</td>
<td>Considered complete upon latter of ERO’s drafting of memo or ERO’s direction to implement further measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Archaeological Resources Report.</strong> 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.</td>
<td>Project sponsor and archaeological consultant.</td>
<td>Following completion of any archaeological field program.</td>
<td>ERO to review Draft FARR and transmittals to specified agencies.</td>
<td>Considered complete upon ERO approval of Draft FARR and review of evidence of distribution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Mitigation Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Report Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M-CP-2 Continued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 one bound, one unbound, and one unlocked, searchable PDF copy on 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 high interpretive value of the resource, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NOISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M-NO-2a</th>
<th>Project sponsor and construction contractor.</th>
<th>At least 10 days prior to the start of construction, during construction, and prior to issuance of grading permits.</th>
<th>DBI to review notification procedure and vibration impact assessment.</th>
<th>Considered complete upon DBI approval of vibration impact assessment and review of evidence of notification.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The following two-part measure shall be implemented:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To reduce daytime noise impacts associated with construction activities to the maximum extent feasible, the following measures shall be implemented in addition to all measures set forth in the Noise Ordinance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o At least 10 days prior to the start of construction, the project sponsor shall notify occupants of properties within 100 feet of the project site’s lot line (comprising the following addresses: 151 Third Street and 670 and 676 Howard Street). Notification shall include an estimation of the duration of construction activities, including anticipated start and completion dates and the daily construction times.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Equipment and trucks used for project construction shall utilize the best available noise control techniques (e.g., improved mufflers, equipment redesign, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures, and acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds, wherever feasible).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Impact tools (e.g., jack hammers, pavement breakers, and rock drills) used for project construction shall be hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools. However, where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust shall be used; this muffler can lower noise levels from the exhaust by up to about 10 dBA. External jackets on the tools themselves shall be used where feasible, which could achieve a reduction of 5 dBA. Quieter procedures shall be used, such as drills rather than impact equipment, whenever feasible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M-NO-2a Continued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Stationary noise sources shall be located as far from sensitive receptors as possible, and they shall be muffled and enclosed within temporary sheds. Insulation barriers or other measures shall be incorporated to the extent feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Ground clearing, excavation, foundation pouring, building erection and exterior finishing activities shall be limited to between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project applicant shall prepare a vibration impact assessment to determine potential construction-related groundborne vibration impacts for all structures located within 25 feet of construction activities expected to generate more than 90 VdB. Measures shall be identified and implemented that would reduce groundborne vibration impacts from extreme noise generators by prescribing methods of construction to be utilized so as not to exceed the FTA’s groundborne vibration damage threshold of 90 VdB at the nearest façade of all adjacent structures. Such methods may include restrictions on the number or types of construction equipment that may operate at a time within 25 feet of structures, restrictions on equipment hours of operation, or requirements to use alternative construction techniques. The vibration impact assessment shall be submitted to the Planning Department for review and approval prior to issuance of grading permits.

### HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M-HZ-1a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The following actions shall be implemented by the project sponsor: 

**Step 1 (Preparation of a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment):** The project sponsor shall conduct a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment of the Hunt Street and Natoma Street parking pad portions of the project site. If residual contamination is identified on the project site that requires preparation and implementation of a Site Mitigation Plan, Step 2 (and subsequent steps) shall be implemented. | Project sponsor. | Prior to issuance of grading or building permits. | DPH to review Phase II Environmental Site Assessment and subsequent mitigation plan(s), as warranted, for adequacy. | Considered complete upon approval of Phase II Environmental Site Assessment and subsequent mitigation plan(s) by DPH and Planning Department. |
### Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M-HZ-1a Continued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Step 2 (Preparation of Site Mitigation Plan):** A Site Mitigation Plan shall be prepared, if warranted based on the results of the Phase II Environmental Site Assessment. The SMP shall include a discussion of the level of contamination of soils and groundwater on the project site and mitigation measures for managing contaminated soils on the site, 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 of methods); 2) the preferred alternative for managing contaminated soils on the site and a brief justification as to why; and 3) the specific practices to be used to handle, haul, and dispose of contaminated soils on the site. The SMP shall be submitted to the DPH for review and approval. A copy of the SMP shall be submitted to the Planning Department to become part of the case file.

**Step 3 (Handling, Hauling, and Disposal of Contaminated Soils):** The following measures shall be implemented:

1. **Specific work practices:** If, based on the results of the soil tests conducted, DPH determines that the soils on the project site are contaminated at or above potentially hazardous levels, the construction contractor shall be alert for the presence of such soils during excavation and other construction activities on the site (detected through soil odor, color, and texture and results of onsite 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) when such soils are encountered on the site. If excavated materials contain over 1 percent friable asbestos, they shall be treated as hazardous waste, and shall be transported and disposed of in accordance with applicable State and federal regulations. These procedures are intended to mitigate any potential health risks related to chrysotile asbestos, which may or may not be located on the site.

2. **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 construction work hours.

3. **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.

4. **Soils replacement:** If necessary, clean fill or other suitable material(s) shall be used to bring portions of the project site, where contaminated soils have been excavated and removed, up to construction grade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Mitigation Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Report Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project sponsor and construction contractor.</td>
<td>(see above)</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a grading permit and during construction.</td>
<td>DPH to review construction plans and specifications for inclusion of appropriate protocols regarding handling, hauling, and disposal of contaminated soils.</td>
<td>Considered complete upon approval of construction plans and specifications by DBI.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M-HZ-1a Continued</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Mitigation Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Report Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(e) Hauling and 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 a permitted hazardous waste disposal facility registered with the State of California.</td>
<td>Project sponsor.</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of occupancy permit.</td>
<td>DPH to review closure/certification report.</td>
<td>Considered complete upon approval of closure/certification report by DPH.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### M-HZ-1b

If, based on the results of the soil tests conducted, the DPH determines that the soils on the project site are contaminated with contaminants at or above potentially hazardous levels, any contaminated soils designated as hazardous waste and required by DPH to be excavated shall be removed by a qualified Removal Contractor and disposed of at a regulated Class I hazardous waste landfill in accordance with U.S Environmental Protection Agency regulations, as stipulated in the SMP. The Removal Contractor shall obtain, complete, and sign hazardous waste manifests to accompany the soils to the disposal site. Other excavated soils shall be disposed of in an appropriate landfill, as governed by applicable laws and regulations, or other appropriate actions shall be taken in coordination with the DPH. If the DPH determines that the soils on the project site are contaminated with contaminants at or above potentially hazardous levels, a Site Health and Safety (H&S) Plan shall be required by the California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal-OSHA) prior to initiating any earthmoving activities at the site. The H&S Plan shall identify protocols for managing soils during construction to minimize worker and public exposure to contaminated soils. The protocols shall include at a minimum:

- Sweeping of adjacent public streets daily (with water sweepers) if any visible soil material is carried onto the streets.
- Characterization of excavated native soils proposed for use on site prior to placement to confirm that the soil meets appropriate standards.
- The dust controls specified in the Construction Dust Control Ordinance (176-08).
- Protocols for managing stockpiled and excavated soils. The H&S Plan shall identify site access controls to be implemented from the time of surface disruption through the completion of earthwork construction. The protocols shall include as a minimum: |
### Mitigation Measures

**M-HZ-1b Continued**
- Appropriate site security to prevent unauthorized pedestrian/vehicular entry, such as fencing or other barrier or sufficient height and structural integrity to prevent entry and based upon the degree of control required.
- Posting of “no trespassing” signs.
- Provision for on-site meetings with construction workers to inform them about security measures and reporting/contingency procedures.

If groundwater contamination is identified, the Site Health and Safety (H&S) Plan shall identify protocols for managing groundwater during construction to minimize worker and public exposure to contaminated groundwater. The protocols shall include procedures to prevent unacceptable migration of contamination from defined plumes during dewatering.

The H&S Plan shall include a requirement that construction personnel be trained to recognize potential hazards associated with underground features that could contain hazardous substances, previously unidentified contamination, or buried hazardous debris. Excavation personnel shall also be required to wash hands and face before eating, smoking, and drinking.

The H&S Plan shall include procedures for implementing a contingency plan, including appropriate notification and control procedures, in the event unanticipated subsurface hazards are discovered during construction. Control procedures shall include, but would not be limited to, investigation and removal of underground storage tanks or other hazards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Mitigation Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Report Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M-HZ-1c</strong></td>
<td>Project sponsor and construction contractor.</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a grading permit and during construction.</td>
<td>DPH to review construction plans and specifications for inclusion of appropriate protocols regarding decontamination of equipment.</td>
<td>Considered complete upon approval of construction plans and specifications by DBI.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the DPH determines that the soils on the project site are contaminated with contaminants at or above potentially hazardous levels, all trucks and excavation and soil handling equipment 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Mitigation Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Report Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-HZ-1d</td>
<td>Planning Department.</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of demolition permit.</td>
<td>Planning Department to condition future approvals to require appropriate removal and disposal of any equipment containing PCBs or mercury.</td>
<td>Considered complete upon conditioning of future development approvals by Planning Department.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City shall condition future development approvals to require that the project sponsor ensures that any equipment containing PCBs or mercury, such as fluorescent light ballasts, are removed and properly disposed of according to applicable federal, State, and local laws prior to the start of building demolition, and that any fluorescent light tubes, which could contain mercury, are similarly removed and properly disposed. Any other hazardous materials identified, either before or during work, shall be abated according to applicable federal, State, and local laws.
### IMPROVEMENT MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Measures</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Implementation Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Report Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvement Measure TR-1 (Pedestrians)</strong></td>
<td>Project sponsor, Planning Department, MTA, and DPW.</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of building permit.</td>
<td>Planning Department, MTA, and DPW to approve the design plans for the Third Street sidewalk extensions.</td>
<td>Considered complete upon approval of the design plans for the Third Street sidewalk extensions by Planning Department, MTA, and DPW.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Third Street Sidewalk Extension.** As an improvement measure to enhance the pedestrian environment, the project sponsor should work with MTA and DPW to design and construct a sidewalk extension on Third Street in front of the existing Third Street entrance into SFMOMA. The project sponsor should be required to fund the design and construction of this improvement.

The sidewalk extension should be about 7 feet in width (the parking lane is about 7 feet wide) and about 85 feet in length, and would be centered on the museum entrance (which is aligned with the midblock crosswalk). As part of this improvement, a consolidated 39-foot-wide passenger zone and 20-foot-wide red zone would be provided between the sidewalk extension and Minna Street. A 59-foot-wide passenger zone would be provided south of the sidewalk extension. The 85-foot long sidewalk extension, red zone and two passenger zones would eliminate six of the seven on-street metered parking spaces on Third Street that are adjacent to the project site (i.e., three spaces north of the existing midblock crosswalk and three spaces south of the midblock crosswalk).

**Howard Street Sidewalk Extension.** As an improvement measure to enhance the pedestrian environment, the project sponsor should work with MTA and DPW to design and construct a sidewalk extension on Howard Street in front of the new entrance into SFMOMA. Since modifications to the Howard Street sidewalk and roadway network are currently being considered as part of the Transit Center District Plan and ENTRIPS (Eastern Neighborhoods Transportation Implementation Planning Study), this improvement measure would be revisited by the Planning Department, MTA, and the project sponsor following completion of these studies. If the Planning Department and MTA determine that the sidewalk extension on Howard Street adjacent to the project site is feasible within the future context of Howard Street, it should be implemented by SFMOMA.

The Howard Street sidewalk extension would be in proximity to the proposed Howard Street entrance into the museum. The sidewalk extension should be 7 feet in width (the parking lane is about 7 feet wide) and about 40 feet in length, or as determined by MTA and DPW. Adjacent to the extension would be the proposed passenger loading zone about 50 feet in width. The 40-foot-long sidewalk extension and 50-foot-long passenger loading zone would

---

**Table:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Measures</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Implementation Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Report Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvement Measure TR-1 (Pedestrians)</strong></td>
<td>Project sponsor, Planning Department, MTA, and DPW.</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of building permit.</td>
<td>Planning Department, MTA, and DPW to approve the design plans for the Third Street sidewalk extensions.</td>
<td>Considered complete upon approval of the design plans for the Third Street sidewalk extensions by Planning Department, MTA, and DPW.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Third Street Sidewalk Extension.** As an improvement measure to enhance the pedestrian environment, the project sponsor should work with MTA and DPW to design and construct a sidewalk extension on Third Street in front of the existing Third Street entrance into SFMOMA. The project sponsor should be required to fund the design and construction of this improvement.

The sidewalk extension should be about 7 feet in width (the parking lane is about 7 feet wide) and about 85 feet in length, and would be centered on the museum entrance (which is aligned with the midblock crosswalk). As part of this improvement, a consolidated 39-foot-wide passenger zone and 20-foot-wide red zone would be provided between the sidewalk extension and Minna Street. A 59-foot-wide passenger zone would be provided south of the sidewalk extension. The 85-foot long sidewalk extension, red zone and two passenger zones would eliminate six of the seven on-street metered parking spaces on Third Street that are adjacent to the project site (i.e., three spaces north of the existing midblock crosswalk and three spaces south of the midblock crosswalk).

**Howard Street Sidewalk Extension.** As an improvement measure to enhance the pedestrian environment, the project sponsor should work with MTA and DPW to design and construct a sidewalk extension on Howard Street in front of the new entrance into SFMOMA. Since modifications to the Howard Street sidewalk and roadway network are currently being considered as part of the Transit Center District Plan and ENTRIPS (Eastern Neighborhoods Transportation Implementation Planning Study), this improvement measure would be revisited by the Planning Department, MTA, and the project sponsor following completion of these studies. If the Planning Department and MTA determine that the sidewalk extension on Howard Street adjacent to the project site is feasible within the future context of Howard Street, it should be implemented by SFMOMA.

The Howard Street sidewalk extension would be in proximity to the proposed Howard Street entrance into the museum. The sidewalk extension should be 7 feet in width (the parking lane is about 7 feet wide) and about 40 feet in length, or as determined by MTA and DPW. Adjacent to the extension would be the proposed passenger loading zone about 50 feet in width. The 40-foot-long sidewalk extension and 50-foot-long passenger loading zone would
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Measures</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Implementation Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Report Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvement Measure TR-1</strong> Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would occupy the 90-foot frontage of the SFMOMA Expansion site on Howard Street. This space is currently the driveway for the existing fire station, as well as three general metered parking spaces, which would be removed. The sidewalk extension would not affect traffic operations on Howard Street, and would reduce conflicts between parking vehicles and the adjacent travel lane.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Improvement Measure TR-4 (Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan)**

As an improvement measure to reduce the use of single-occupant vehicles and to increase the use of rideshare, transit, bicycle, and walk modes for employees, volunteers, and visitors, SFMOMA should formalize a TDM Plan that addresses travel to SFMOMA by employees and visitors. The project sponsor should retain the services of a transportation consultant to review existing TDM elements, prepare a TDM Plan, and recommend additional measures for consideration by SFMOMA. As part of the TDM Plan, the consultant could prepare a stand alone summary that could be incorporated into the employee manual, and also enhance the TDM information on the public website to better publicize alternative transportation options to visitors.

| Improvement Measure TR-5 (Construction) | | | | |
| The following construction period measures could be considered: | | | | |

*Traffic Control Plan for Construction.* As an improvement measure to reduce potential conflicts between construction activities and pedestrians, transit, and autos at the SFMOMA Expansion site, the contractor should prepare a traffic control plan for project construction. The project sponsor and construction contractor(s) would meet with DPW, MTA, the Fire Department, Muni Operations and other City agencies to coordinate feasible measures to reduce traffic congestion, including temporary transit stop relocations (not anticipated, but if determined necessary) and other measures to reduce potential traffic and transit disruption and pedestrian circulation effects during construction of the SFMOMA Expansion. The contractor would be required to comply with the City of San Francisco’s Regulations for Working in San Francisco Streets, which establish rules and permit requirements so that construction activities can be conducted safely and with the least possible interference to pedestrians, bicyclists, transit and vehicular traffic. The traffic control plan would address how passenger loading/unloading, and deliveries and service vehicles would be accommodated at the W Hotel during project construction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Measures</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Implementation Schedule</th>
<th>Monitoring/Report Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvement Measure TR-5 Continued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool and Transit Access for Construction Workers. As an improvement measure to minimize parking demand associated with construction workers, the construction contractor could be required by the project sponsor to encourage carpooling and transit access to the project sites by construction workers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Construction Updates for Adjacent Businesses and Residents. As an improvement measure to minimize construction impacts on access for nearby institutions and businesses, DPW could require the project sponsor to provide nearby residences and adjacent businesses with regularly-updated information regarding project construction, including construction activities, peak construction vehicle activities (e.g., concrete pours), travel lane closures, and lane closures. A web site could be created by project sponsor that would provide current construction information of interest to neighbors, as well as contact information for specific construction inquiries or concerns.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvement Measure TR-7 (Loading)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As an improvement measure to minimize the potential for conflicts within the Natoma loading area and to ensure that deliveries for SFMOMA and W Hotel are adequately accommodated:</td>
<td>Project sponsor.</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of occupancy permit.</td>
<td>Planning Department and MTA to review loading plans to ensure that conflicts would be minimized and that deliveries for SFMOMA and W Hotel would be adequately accommodated.</td>
<td>Considered complete upon approval of loading plans by Planning Department and MTA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SFMOMA shall provide an on-site loading dock manager to coordinate loading, manage the delivery demand, provide assistance for truck maneuvers into and out of the loading area, and coordinate trash collection activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SFMOMA shall ensure that the W Hotel has 24-hour access across the Natoma loading area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The SFMOMA on-site loading dock manager shall coordinate and integrate scheduling of truck deliveries for SFMOMA and the W Hotel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The SFMOMA on-site loading dock manager and overnight security staff shall actively manage the loading area 24 hours a day to ensure that trucks park efficiently and do not dwell in loading spaces, or block valet and loading access for the W Hotel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The SFMOMA on-site loading dock manager shall, to the extent possible, schedule deliveries destined to the Natoma loading area (e.g., restaurant deliveries) to before 7:00 a.m. to minimize conflicts with other daytime couriers such as Federal Express and United Parcel Service.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Delivery vehicles longer than 35 feet shall be prohibited from entering the Natoma loading area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>