

Final Environmental Impact Report

SCH No. 2010022070



City of South San Francisco
Department of Economic and Community Development
315 Maple Avenue
South San Francisco, CA 94083

March 2011



CONTENTS

Page

Chapters 1 through 20 can be found in the Draft EIR

Chapter 21: Introduction to the Final EIR21-1
 Purpose of the Final EIR21-1
 EIR Review Process21-2
 Report Organization21-3

Chapter 22: Revisions to the Draft EIR22-1
 Revisions to the Draft EIR22-1
 Changes to Chapter 2: Executive Summary22-1
 Changes to Chapter 3: Project Description.....22-2
 Changes to Chapter 9: Geology and Soils22-3
 Changes to Chapter 15: Population, Public Services, Recreation22-4
 Changes to Chapter 16: Transportation and Circulation22-4

Chapter 23: Response to Comments.....23-1
 Introduction23-1
 Response to Specific Comments23-2

Chapter 24: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program24-1
 Introduction24-1
 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Table24-3

Appendices

Appendices A through G can be found in the Draft EIR

This page intentionally left blank.

INTRODUCTION TO THE FINAL EIR

PURPOSE OF THE FINAL EIR

The California Environmental Quality Act and the Guidelines promulgated thereunder (together “CEQA”) require an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to be prepared for any project which may have a significant impact on the environment. An EIR is an informational document, the purposes of which, according to CEQA are “to provide public agencies and the public in general with detailed information about the effect which a proposed project is likely to have on the environment; to list ways in which the significant effects of such a project might be minimized; and to indicate alternatives to such a project.” The information contained in this EIR is intended to be objective and impartial, and to enable the reader to arrive at an independent judgment regarding the significance of the impacts resulting from the proposed project.

This document, together with the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) published in January 2011, shall constitute the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as amended (commencing with Section 21000 of the California Public Resources Code) and the CEQA Guidelines for the proposed Oyster Point Specific Plan (OPSP), including the first phase of development (Phase I Project) in the City of South San Francisco, California and the related Redevelopment Plan amendment. The applicant is Oyster Point Ventures, LLC and the City of South San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. The Lead Agency is the City of South San Francisco.

The applicant is seeking amendments of the City’s General Plan, Redevelopment Plan and Oyster Point Marina Specific Plan, as well as several entitlements to enable development of the OPSP, including but not limited to approval of a subdivision or parcel map, design review, a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan, a Development Agreement, and a Disposition and Development Agreement to enable redevelopment of the OPSP and Phase I Project site. The OPSP would include replacing the existing light industrial/office park with an office/research and development (R&D) development, improvements to the site circulation, utilities, and landfill cap, provision of a flexible use recreation area and bay-front open space, and replacement of uses in the Oyster Point Marina area, potentially including one or two hotels with an aggregate of up to 350 rooms. Approval must be given by the City of South San Francisco and trustee agencies, including the Regional Water Quality Control Board and Bay Conservation and Development Commission before construction may begin.

EIR REVIEW PROCESS

Draft EIR

A Draft EIR was made available for public review in January 2011. During the public review period for the Draft EIR (ending March 10, 2011), the City received verbal comments from the South San Francisco Planning Commission and written comments.

Final EIR

This Final EIR contains all comments received by the City on the Draft EIR and also includes responses to these comments, together with necessary changes or revisions to the text of the Draft EIR document. Changes to the text of the Draft EIR are included in Chapter 22 of this Final EIR, shown in underline for new text or ~~strikeout~~ for deleted text. None of the revisions or responses to comments contained in this Final EIR would be considered “significant new information” under section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines and therefore no recirculation of the Draft EIR would be required.

This Final EIR will be presented to the Planning Commission and City Council at public hearings to consider recommendation for and certification of this document as a technically adequate, full disclosure document consistent with the requirements of CEQA. Assuming certification of this EIR as complete and adequate under CEQA, this document together with the Draft EIR will constitute the EIR for this Project. The Planning Commission may recommend and the City Council may require additional changes or modifications to this Final EIR prior to certification.

An EIR does not control the agency’s ultimate discretion on the OPSP. As required under CEQA, the agency must respond to each significant effect identified in the EIR by making findings and if necessary and warranted, by adopting a statement of overriding considerations. In accordance with California law, the EIR must be certified before any action on the project can be taken. However, EIR certification does not constitute project approval.

REPORT ORGANIZATION

This Final EIR consists of the following chapters, commencing after Chapter 20 of the Draft EIR:

Chapter 21: Introduction to the Final EIR. This chapter outlines the purpose, organization and scope of the Final EIR document and important information regarding the public review and approval process.

Chapter 22: Revisions to the Draft EIR. This chapter includes corrections, clarifications or additions to text contained in the Draft EIR based on comments received during the public review period.

Chapter 23: Response to Comments. This chapter provides reproductions of letters received on the Draft EIR. The comments are numbered in the right margin. The responses to comments are also provided in this chapter immediately following each comment letter, and are keyed to the numbered comments.

Chapter 24: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. This chapter contains the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) to be adopted to ensure that the mitigation measures identified in the EIR are implemented.

REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT EIR

REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT EIR

The following are minor text changes, additions or modifications made to the Draft EIR for the Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project. An explanation of the changes made in response to comments can be found in Chapter 23.

Comments, including the original location in the Draft EIR of the text to be changed, are in *italics*. Deletions are noted by ~~striketrough~~. Additions are underlined.

CHANGES TO CHAPTER 2: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- *Page 2-1, paragraph 4*

The following revision is made to clarify the timing of completion of the ferry terminal.

The South San Francisco Ferry Terminal with service to/from San Francisco and the East Bay is currently under construction and ~~scheduled~~ is anticipated to be completed at the Oyster Point Marina ~~in early~~ by the end of 2011.

- *Page 2-1, paragraph 4*

The following revision is made to clarify the number of berths in the Oyster Point Marina.

The Oyster Point Marina is located on the north side of the Oyster Point Marina area and contains ~~600~~ 465 berths, a boat ramp, fuel dock and fishing pier.

- *Page 2-12*

Mitigation measure Traf-26 is hereby revised in Table 2.1, consistent with revisions to page 16-51.

- *Page 2-36*

Impact Geo-14 and mitigation measure Geo-14 were accidentally omitted from the summary table. They are hereby added to Table 2.1, as follows.

Potential Environmental Impacts	Recommended Mitigation Measures	Resulting Level of Significance
Impact Geo-14: Soil Erosion. The OPSP would involve mass grading at a location that drains stormwater to the San Francisco Bay. Demolition of existing structures and pavements could expose underlying landfill cap soils to the elements. Excavation of soil for construction of new buildings and pavement sections would also be performed and temporary stockpiles of loose soil will be created. Soils exposed during site grading would be subject to erosion during storm events. Grading would disturb site soils potentially leading to impacts to the San Francisco Bay. This would be a potentially significant impact during and following site construction activities.	Geo-14: Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. In accordance with the Clean Water Act and the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), the Applicant shall file a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) prior to the start of construction. The SWPPP shall include specific best management practices to reduce soil erosion. This is required to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity (Construction General Permit, 99-08-DWQ).	Less than Significant

Impact Geo-16 and mitigation measure Geo-16 are hereby added to Table 2.1, consistent with revisions to page 9-19.

CHANGES TO CHAPTER 3: PROJECT DESCRIPTION

- Page 3-2, paragraph 3

The following revision is made to clarify the timing of completion of the ferry terminal.

The South San Francisco Ferry Terminal with service to/from San Francisco and the East Bay is currently under construction and ~~scheduled~~ is anticipated to be completed at the Oyster Point Marina ~~in early~~ by the end of 2011.

- Page 3-2, paragraph 2

The following revision is made to clarify the number of berths in the Oyster Point Marina.

The Oyster Point Marina is located on the north side of the Oyster Point Marina area and contains ~~600~~ 465 berths, a boat ramp, fuel dock and fishing pier.

- Page 3-2, 1st bullet point

The following revision is made to clarify that demolition of the Yacht Club is not proposed.

- demolition of the existing inn located at 425 Marina Drive, the office buildings at 360 Oyster Point Boulevard and 401 Marina Boulevard, the boat and motor mart at 671 Marina Boulevard, ~~the Yacht Club at 911 Marina Boulevard,~~ and the light-industrial buildings at 375-389 Oyster Point Boulevard,

- Page 3-3, Table 3.1

The following revisions are made to clarify the number of berths in the Oyster Point Marina and that demolition of the Yacht Club is not proposed.

Table 3.1: Development Assumptions

Building	Size (square feet if not otherwise specified)
Uses to Remain	
Oyster Point Bait and Tackle	1,440
Oyster Cove Marina	235 berths
Oyster Point Marina	600 465 berths
Phase I	
Office/R&D Building	508,000 to 600,000
Auxiliary Commercial	10,000
Oyster Pt Marina Beach	approximately 3.1 acres
Recreation Area	approximately 3 acres
Additional Phases	
New Hotel(s)	350 rooms
Commercial/Retail/Restaurant in Hotel	40,000
Office/R&D Building (Phase II)	700,000
Office/R&D Building (Phase III)	525,000
Office/R&D Building (Phase IV)	517,000
Uses to Remain until Hotel Construction, then be Rebuilt on Site	
Oyster Point Yacht Club	4,000
Oyster Point Maintenance	2,500

CHANGES TO CHAPTER 9: GEOLOGY AND SOILS

- Page 9-19

The following text is hereby added to specify that the design of the bayside open space would need to comply with recommendations of a qualified costal engineering consultant.

SUSTAINABILITY OF BAYSIDE OPEN SPACE

Impact Geo-16: Bayside Open Space Wave Stability. The bayside open space area could be subject to wave action, which could erode improvements and potentially lead to instability. The potential for erosion and instability of the bayside open space area is considered a ***potentially significant impact***.

Mitigation Measures

Geo-16: Compliance with Recommendations of a Coastal Engineer. A design-level investigation of the sustainability of the proposed bayside open space in the local wave environment shall be prepared by a qualified coastal engineer. Elements of this analysis shall include an investigation of the

local wave environment at the proposed bayside open space location, development and verification of numerical models of local wave action based on comparisons of measured and predicted wave heights, and application of the predictive numerical models to refine the open space design. Depending on the results of this investigation, the design of the bayside open space may need to incorporate protection measures such as structural elements (e.g., concrete seatwalls) and/or buffer zones (i.e., lengths of flat beach between the dynamic beach slope and any needed structural elements). The design plans shall incorporate appropriate recommendations from this investigation.

If the recommendations require any construction in-water or near the shoreline, these may require subsequent permitting from BCDC and/or USACE and would also be subject to mitigation measures Bio-12, -13a, -13b, 14a, -14b, -14c, -15a, -15b, and -15c.

Conformity with mitigation measure Geo-16 would reduce the impact of erosion and wave action on the bayside open space to a level of ***less-than-significant***.

CHANGES TO CHAPTER 15: POPULATION, PUBLIC SERVICES, RECREATION

- Page 15-7

The following text is hereby added to specify that the Bay Trail runs through the area and has its own plan.

The San Francisco Bay Trail runs through the OPSP area and is programmed through the regionally adopted San Francisco Bay Trail Plan (ABAG, 1989)

CHANGES TO CHAPTER 16: TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

- Page 16-15

The following text is hereby added to reference the Bay Trail specifically.

The San Francisco Bay Trail is an existing multi-use bicycle and pedestrian facility along the shoreline in the OPSP area and is programmed through the regionally adopted San Francisco Bay Trail Plan (ABAG, 1989)

- Page 16-20

The following change is made to Table 16.11 to correct the LOS reference as shown.

Intersection	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
	Base Case	Base Case + Phase I Project	Base Case	Base Case + OPSP
S. Airport Blvd./U.S.101 NB Hook Ramps/Wondercolor (Signal)	D-35.1 ⁽¹⁾	€ D-35.2	C-34.5	C-34.5

- Page 16-33

The following text is hereby added to address the continuity of the Bay Trail during construction.

Impact Traf-2b: Construction Disruption of Bay Trail. Continuity of the Bay Trail could be disrupted by construction activities in the OPSP area. This is considered a **potentially significant impact.**

Mitigation Measures

Traf-2b: Bay Trail Continuity Provisions in Construction Management Plan.
Continuity of the Bay Trail shall be included in construction management plans for all phases of development in the OPSP. When feasible, construction shall avoid disrupting the Bay Trail and when not feasible, the construction management plan shall specify plans for clear and safe detours for bicyclists and pedestrians and be ADA accessible.

Conformity with mitigation measure Traf-2b will reduce the impact of disruption of the Bay Trail during construction activities to a level of ***less-than-significant.***

- Pages 16-46 and 16-47

The following revision is made to correct inconsistencies in the discussion of resultant operation following implementation of mitigation measure Traf-19.

Mitigation Measure

Traf-19: **Intersection Level of Service.** (see Figure 24 in Appendix E) The following improvements would ~~partially~~ mitigate OPSP-specific impacts and reduce them to a level of insignificance. These measures are currently not included as part of the East of 101 Transportation Improvement Program. The OPSP shall provide a fair share contribution towards all measures currently not part of the TIP.

Oyster Point Boulevard / Veterans Boulevard

- Restripe the northbound 2-lane private driveway approach to contain an exclusive left turn lane and a combined left / through / right turn lane.
- Widen the eastbound Oyster Point Boulevard approach and provide an exclusive right turn lane.

Resultant 2035 Base Case + OPSP Operation:

AM Peak Hour: LOS D-52.6 seconds control delay, which would ~~not~~ be acceptable operation.

PM Peak Hour: LOS D-36.8 seconds control delay, which would be acceptable operation.

Impact ~~reduced~~ reduced to a less-than-significant level.

- Pages 16-51

The following revision is made to correct the reference to the Traffic Improvement Program in mitigation measure Traf-26.

Mitigation Measure

Traf-26: **Vehicle Queuing** (see Figure 24 in Appendix E). The following improvements would partially mitigate OPSP-specific impacts, but not reduce them to a level of insignificance. ~~These measures~~ All of these improvements (other than measures to the Southbound Flyover Off-Ramp, the eastbound departure and the southbound approach) are ~~not~~ included as part of the current East of 101 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The OPSP shall also provide a fair share contribution towards all measures currently not part of the TIP.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

INTRODUCTION

This chapter contains response to the Commissioner comments from the February 17, 2011 Planning Commission hearing and written comments on the Draft EIR. Where revisions to the Draft EIR are appropriate, such changes are summarized below and the actual text changes are included in Chapter 22.

The City of South San Francisco received five (5) letters commenting on the Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project Draft EIR during the comment period. The comments are organized in chronological order as follows:

Meeting PC: Planning Commission Meeting February 17, 2011

Letter A: John Bergener, San Francisco International Airport

Letter B: Rob Wood, Native American Heritage Commission

Letter C: Ming Yeung, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)

Letter D: Peter Grenell, San Mateo County Harbor District

Letter E: Laura Thompson, San Francisco Bay Trail Project

RESPONSES TO SPECIFIC COMMENTS

The following pages contain comments on the Draft EIR. Each comment is numbered and responses to these comments are provided following each comment letter.

In some instances, responding to a comment received on the Draft EIR resulted in a revision to the text of the Draft EIR. In other cases, the information provided in the responses is deemed adequate in itself, and modification of the Draft EIR text was not necessary.

MEETING PC: PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING FEBRUARY 17, 2011

A public hearing to collect comment on the Draft EIR was held before the South San Francisco Planning Commission on February 17, 2011. There were no comments received during the public portion of the hearing. The Commissioners made a few comments, some of which related to the specifics of the project description or broader plans for the East of 101 area. The official minutes of this meeting are not yet available, so the Planning Commission's comments relating to the environmental analysis have been summarized below with responses following.

Comment PC-1

The Commission asked how the fact that the area is low would affect the ability to provide sewer service and whether settling was an issue for sewer pipes.

Response to Comment PC-1

The project proposes relocation of the existing on-site pump station #1 at 383 Oyster Point Boulevard and installation of an additional pump station in the Oyster Point Marina area, as discussed on pages 17-9 and 17-10. Additionally, Mitigation Measures Util-2a and Util-2b require upgrading of the off-site pump station #2 and sewer lines to assure adequate capacity for cumulative growth in the East of 101 Area including the OPSP.

On the area that is a former landfill, the Phase I Project will involve relocating of landfill materials and reconstruction of the landfill cap. As part of that process, new utility pipes will be installed. Mitigation Measures Geo-11, Geo-12 and Geo-13 (page 9-17) address settling and other concerns regarding sustainability of utility infrastructure by encouraging location of utilities in common tranches, requiring the use of flexible pipe, and increasing gradient flow to offset differential settlements. These measures are designed to ensure that new utility lines and connections continue to function properly as further settlement occurs over time.

Comment PC-2

The Commission noted that the construction period for total build-out of the OPSP would continue over a long period with some intermittent gaps in between and wanted to be sure noise and air quality/health impacts had been analyzed and minimized for the entire construction period for both the nearby tenants as well as families that may use the Bay Trail and proposed recreation facilities. He asked whether the pacing of construction activity could be evaluated to minimize these impacts.

Response to Comment PC-2

The proposed construction schedule for the Phase I Project was input into air quality modeling and considered for determination of the noise impacts, as discussed in the Draft EIR on pages 6-16 through 6-21 and 14-16 through 14-19, respectively. As construction of the office/R&D project is proposed to occur in four approximately equally sized phases, it is reasonable to anticipate that impacts would be similar for each phase.

Mitigation measures have been recommended that would reduce potential construction-period impacts for each construction phase including Air-4a and -4b to reduce dust, diesel particulate matter and odors (pages 6-19 and 6-20) and Noise-5 to reduce noise levels generated by construction activities (page 14-18). These would apply to Phase I construction as well as subsequent phases. These mitigation measures would ensure impacts related to construction period emissions and noise are reduced to the extent feasible. However, while potential noise impacts have been reduced to the

extent feasible, the noise from construction activities can still be intermittently disruptive. Because of the duration of the construction period for a project that would be implemented over many years, the noise impact has been determined to be significant and unavoidable.

As for the pacing of construction, it is anticipated this will be informed by economic impetus as well as the realities of coordinating such large construction projects and could only be constrained to a minimal degree. It is more a qualitative question of whether slightly less noise over a longer period would be more palatable than slightly more noise over a shorter period when we are discussing a matter of many years. Successive phasing as proposed from the south to the northern part of the site will help move noise and emissions sources away from the new uses coming on-line as each phase is completed and limit impacts over time to the extent possible. There is no recommendation for modification of the construction phasing from that proposed.

Comment PC-3

The Commission followed-up on the previous question relating to the low level of the area by asking whether the area would need to be re-diked and if so how that would impact the Bay Trail and liquefaction.

Response to Comment PC-3

Development in the OPSP area will generally avoid development or other activities within tidal areas, marshland or in-water, with the exception of possible changes to docks in the Oyster Point Marina, which are not proposed as a part of the Phase I Project and for which there are no specific design or construction proposals. If, during the approval process for specific development projects, it is determined that activities will encroach into these areas, appropriate review and permits will be pursued.

The grading plan can be found in the Draft EIR, Figure 3.5. The changes to the grading in relation to anticipated future sea level rise can be seen graphically on Figures 12.1 and 12.2 on pages 12-13 and 12-14, which demonstrate how the proposed grading will protect proposed uses including enhancements to the Bay Trail, from future sea level rise.

The potential for liquefaction at the site is discussed on page 9-8, as excerpted below:

“Based on the subsurface data obtained from the previous drilled borings at Oyster Point (noted above among the references reviewed), the existing landfill materials, residual soils, Bay Mud, and Franciscan Complex bedrock have a low potential for liquefaction. Therefore, damage due to liquefaction at Oyster Point is considered low. It should be noted that the landfill is contained by soil dikes along the water-side site perimeter. These perimeter dikes are reported to have been constructed of Bay Mud, which has low potential for liquefaction. Prior to new site development, geotechnical studies shall be undertaken to confirm the material types used in the construction of the perimeter dikes to verify the assumed low potential for liquefaction.”

Mitigation Measure Geo-4 outlines the specifics of compliance with recommendations of a geotechnical investigation including static and seismic stability of the perimeter dikes (pages 9-11 and 9-12).



San Francisco International Airport

February 22, 2011

Mr. Gerry Beaudin, AICP
Senior Planner
City of South San Francisco
Economic and Community Development Department
Planning Division
P. O. Box 711
South San Francisco, CA 94083

Subject: Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project, Draft Environmental Impact Report – City of South San Francisco

Dear Mr. Beaudin:

Thank you for notifying San Francisco International Airport (SFO or the Airport) of the availability of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Oyster Point Specific Plan (OPSP) and Phase I Project. We appreciate this opportunity to coordinate with the City of South San Francisco (the City) in considering and evaluating potential land use compatibility issues that this and similar projects may pose for the Airport.

Airport staff has reviewed the OPSP and Phase I Project DEIR that was made available for public review on January 25, 2011. This letter presents the Airport's comments on the proposed project.

As described in the DEIR, the OPSP consists of up to 2,300,000 square feet of Office/R&D, up to 350 rooms of hotel development, and various site improvements. Phase I would involve public realm improvements and development of up to 600,000 square feet of Office/R&D at the southeast corner of Oyster Point Boulevard and Gull Drive.

Located approximately two miles north of the Airport, the OPSP area is subject to the policies of the Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CLUP) for SFO. The SFO CLUP addresses issues related to compatibility between airport operations and surrounding land use development, considering noise impacts, safety of persons on the ground and in flight, height restrictions/airspace protection, and overflight notification. Land use development within the Airport Influence Area is currently governed by the CLUP adopted by the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) in 1996. The SFO CLUP is in the process of being updated and is anticipated to be completed by mid-2011. Since the CLUP update is likely to be completed and adopted before the Final EIR, it is advisable to consider the policies of the draft updated CLUP in preparing the environmental documentation for the Transit

AIRPORT COMMISSION CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

EDWIN M. LEE
MAYOR

LARRY MAZZOLA
PRESIDENT

LINDA S. CRAYTON
VICE PRESIDENT

ELEANOR JOHNS

RICHARD J. GUGGENHIME

PETER A. STERN

JOHN L. MARTIN
AIRPORT DIRECTOR

Post Office Box 8097 San Francisco, California 94128 Tel 650.821.5000 Fax 650.821.5005 www.flysfo.com

Mr. Gerry Beaudin, AICP
February 22, 2011
Page 2 of 2

Corridors Plan. As noted on page 3-13 of the DEIR, the OPSP will need to be referred to the San Mateo County Airport Land Use Commission for CLUP consistency review.

The Airport would like to collaborate with local agencies to ensure compatible land uses in neighboring areas. In order to protect airspace used for aircraft departure and arrival procedures, the height of new development surrounding the Airport must be maintained below defined obstacle clearance surfaces. The heights proposed in the OPSP will be consistent with South San Francisco General Plan Policy 3.5-I-4, which states: "Unless otherwise stipulated in a specific plan, allow building heights in the East of 101 area to the maximum limits permissible under Federal Aviation Regulations Part 77." According to a preliminary airspace analysis, the maximum permissible building height at the easternmost portion of the plan area is approximately 267 feet AMSL, increasing to approximately 480 feet AMSL at the northernmost portion of the plan area. The finished height of any proposed development should be maintained below these limits.

With regard to noise impacts, the OPSP area lies outside of the Airport's 65 dB CNEL noise contour. In addition, the OPSP does not propose any new residential uses in the OPSP area, which is consistent with General Plan Policy 3.5-I-3, which states: "Do not permit any residential uses in the East of 101 area." However, the OPSP area is still subject to intermittent noise from aircraft departing SFO. Proposed land uses, including hotels, should meet the interior noise requirements of the 2007 California Building Code and the South San Francisco General Plan.

The Airport appreciates your consideration of these comments. If I can be of assistance as the City considers airport land use compatibility as they relate to this project or future projects, please do not hesitate to contact me at (650) 821-7867 or at john.bergener@flysfo.com.

Sincerely,



John Bergener
Airport Planning Manager
San Francisco International Airport
Bureau of Planning and Environmental Affairs

cc: Nixon Lam, SFO, Manager of Environmental Affairs
Dave Carbone, Airport Land Use Commission

LETTER A: JOHN BERGENER, SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Response to Comment A-1

The current San Mateo County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan was prepared and adopted by the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) in its designated role as the Airport Land Use Commission for San Mateo County, California in December 1996. The OPSP was determined in this EIR to be consistent with regulations of the Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan related to environmental issues (see hazards/height discussion on pages 11-18 and 11-19 and noise discussion on page 14-19) and as noted in this comment, the project will undergo consistency review through the San Mateo County Airport Land Use Commission. On February 24, 2011, the C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee unanimously recommended that the C/CAG Board, acting as the Airport Land Use Commission, find that the Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project is consistent with the December 1996 Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan. The C/CAG Board is scheduled to consider the matter on March 10, 2011.

It is understood that the project referenced in the third paragraph was intended to be the Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project and not the Transit Corridors Plan. Note that it is anticipated the EIR for this project will be certified in March 2011, prior to adoption of a new Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan.

Response to Comment A-2

As noted on pages 11-18 and 11-19 of the Draft EIR, the building heights proposed are below the permissible limits.

Response to Comment A-3

As discussed on page 14-14 of the Draft EIR, the hotel will comply with the California State Building Code and the City of South San Francisco General Plan, which require interior noise levels to be maintained at or below 45 dBA CNEL. Noise modeling and comparison to the noise contour map in the South San Francisco General Plan indicate that predicted interior noise levels at the proposed hotel site would be below this level assuming standard hotel construction. See also Impact Noise-6 and the following discussion on 14-19 for additional information. No new residential uses are proposed or permitted as part of the OPSP.

**Native American Tribal Consultation List
San Mateo County
March 1, 2011**

Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan
Ann Marie Sayers, Chairperson
P.O. Box 28 Ohlone/Costanoan
Hollister , CA 95024
ams@indiancanyon.org
831-637-4238

Amah/Mutsun Tribal Band
Irene Zwiernie, Chairperson
789 Canada Road Ohlone/Costanoan
Woodside , CA 94062
amah_mutsun@yahoo.com
(650) 851-7747 - Home

Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe of the SF Bay Area
Rosemary Cambra, Chairperson
PO Box 360791 Ohlone / Costanoan
Milpitas , CA 95036
muwekma@muwekma.org
408-434-1668

The Ohlone Indian Tribe
Andrew Galvan
PO Box 3152 Ohlone/Costanoan
Fremont , CA 94539 Bay Miwok
chochenyo@AOL.com Plains Miwok
(510) 882-0527 - Cell Patwin

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is applicable only for consultation with Native American tribes under Government Code Section 65352.3.

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION

915 CAPITOL MALL, ROOM 364
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
(916) 653-4082
Fax (916) 657-5390



March 1, 2011

RECEIVED
MAR 02 2011
PLANNING DEPT.

Gerry Beaudin, Senior Planner
City of South San Francisco
P.O. Box 711
South San Francisco, CA 94083

RE: SCH# 2010022070 – Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project, City of South San Francisco

Dear Gerry Beaudin:

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) has reviewed the proposed General Plan Amendment for the project referenced above. Government Code §65352.3 requires that prior to the adoption or any amendment of a city or county's general plan, the city or county shall conduct consultations with California Native American tribes that are on the tribal consultation list maintained by the NAHC, see attached list. The purposes of these consultations are to preserve or mitigate impacts to Native American cultural places located within the city or county's jurisdiction. As part of the process, the NAHC also recommends the following actions:

- ✓ Contact the appropriate Information Center for a record search to determine:
 - If a part or all of the area of project effect (APE) has been previously surveyed for cultural resources.
 - If any known cultural resources have already been recorded on or adjacent to the APE.
 - If the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located in the APE.
 - If a survey is required to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.
- ✓ If an archaeological inventory survey is required, the final stage is the preparation of a professional report detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey.
 - The final report containing site forms, site significance, and mitigation measures should be submitted immediately to the planning department. All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum, and not be made available for public disclosure.
 - The final written report should be submitted within 3 months after work has been completed to the appropriate regional archaeological Information Center.
- ✓ Contact the NAHC for a Sacred Lands File check, USGS quadrangle name, township, range, and section information regarding the APE is required for this search.
- ✓ Documents should also include:
 - Provisions for the identification and evaluation of accidentally discovered archeological resources, per CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(f);
 - Provisions for monitoring all ground-disturbing activities in areas of identified archaeological sensitivity by a archaeologist meeting the professional qualifications as defined in the in the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines* for archaeology and a culturally affiliated Native American cultural resource specialist;
 - Provisions for the curation of recovered artifacts, per CEQA Guidelines 15126.4(5)(b)(3)(C), in consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans;
 - Provisions for discovery of Native American human remains. Health and Safety Code §7050.5, CEQA; and Guidelines §15064.5(e), and Public Resources Code §5097.98 mandates the process to be followed in the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains.

Sincerely,

Rob Wood
Associate Government Program Analyst

CC: State Clearinghouse

LETTER B: ROB WOOD, NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSIONResponse to Comment B-1

These comments outline standard practice for cultural review of a project. The recommended actions are incorporated in the Draft EIR, pages 8-1 to 8-6.

The Oyster Point EIR references the Ferry Terminal study conducted in the Project area in 2005. This previous Sacred Lands File check "failed to indicate the presence of Native American resources" in the area (While also referenced in the Draft EIR, the full reference to the Ferry Terminal EIR is: San Francisco Bay Area Water Transit Authority, prepared by EIP, *Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment, South San Francisco Ferry Terminal Project*, February 2006). Additionally, because the original shoreline in the area would have been 2000 feet west and 3000 feet south of the OPSP site (see pages 8-4 and 8-6 for additional information), there is a very low likelihood that undiscovered historical/Native American resources or remains will be encountered during construction activity. Nonetheless, the Draft EIR includes Mitigation Measures Culture-1a and Culture-1b, which require construction activity to be halted and appropriate action taken in the event any cultural resources or remains are discovered (page 8-6 of the Draft EIR).

The following message has been sent to the tribal consultation list attached to the comment letter, though as discussed above, no responses are anticipated:

Lamphier-Gregory has been contracted to prepare the environmental analysis for the Oyster Point Specific Plan (OPSP) in South San Francisco. The project area is situated at Oyster Point in unsectioned land, in Township 3 South, Range 5 West as depicted on the San Francisco South and Hunters Point USGS 7.5' topographic quadrangles (attached). The OPSP would include replacing the existing light industrial/office park with an up to 2,300,000 square foot office/research and development (R&D) development, improvements to the site circulation, utilities, and the landfill cap, provision of a flexible use recreation area and bay-front open space, and replacement of uses in the City's Oyster Point Marina area, potentially including one or two hotels with an aggregate of up to 350 rooms.

A previous Sacred Lands File check did not to indicate the presence of Native American Resources and historic assessment indicates the site is on fill at least 2000 feet into the Bay from the original shoreline and therefore the site is unlikely to include Native American remains or cultural resources.

We are contacting individuals identified by the Native American Heritage Commission as persons who might have information to contribute regarding potential Native American concerns in the project area. Any information or concerns that you may have regarding village sites, traditional properties or modern Native American uses in any portion of the project vicinity will be welcomed. If you know other individuals who are familiar with the vicinity, we would welcome this information as well.



Making San Francisco Bay Better

RECEIVED
MAR 09 2011
PLANNING DEPT.

March 7, 2011

Mr. Gerry Beaudin, Senior Planner
Department of Economic and Community Development
City of South San Francisco
P.O. Box 711
South San Francisco, California 94083

SUBJECT: Comments to the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project; SCH #2010022070
(BCDC Inquiry File No. SM.SS.6610.1)

Dear Mr. Beaudin:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Oyster Point Specific Plan (OPSP) Project, and more specifically, the first phase of development (Phase I Project) located at Oyster Point, in the City of South San Francisco, San Mateo County. The OPSP project would involve public-private redevelopment of approximately 80 acres within the Oyster Point Business Park and the Oyster Point Marina for research and development, office, commercial, hotel, recreational, and public open space uses. The Phase I project would involve improvements to the site circulation, utilities, and the landfill cap on Oyster Point, provision of a flexible use recreation area and open space, and development of up to 600,000 square feet of Office/R&D uses on a currently vacant parcel at the southeast corner of Oyster Point Boulevard and Gull Drive.

Below are the staff's comments on the DEIR. Some of these comments may address specific BCDC-issues that will need to be addressed either in the Final EIR, a more project-specific DEIR or through the BCDC permitting process. The Commission is a responsible agency for this project and will rely on the EIR when it considers the project. Although the Commission itself has not reviewed the DEIR, the staff comments are based on the McAteer-Petris Act, the Commission's *San Francisco Bay Plan* (Bay Plan), the Commission's federally-approved management program for the San Francisco Bay, and the federal Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA).

Commission Jurisdiction

The Commission's jurisdiction includes all tidal areas of the Bay up to the line of mean high tide (or in marshlands, the inland edge of marsh vegetation, up to five feet above mean sea level), all areas formerly subject to tidal action that have been filled since September 17, 1965, and a "shoreline band," which extends 100 feet inland from and parallel to the Bay shoreline.

Commission permits are required for construction of buildings, roadways, infrastructure and other improvements, changes in use, and dredging and dredged material disposal within its area of jurisdiction. To authorize a project, the Commission must be able to find the activities to be consistent with the McAteer-Petris Act and the policies and findings of the Bay Plan. In addition to any needed permits under its state authority, federal actions, permits, and grants that affect the Commission's jurisdiction are subject to review by the Commission, pursuant to the CZMA, for their consistency with the Commission's federally-approved management program for the Bay.

Based on the location of the project site, and as appropriately noted in the DEIR, a large portion of the project would occur within the Commission's jurisdiction and require Commission authorization. In order to fully evaluate the project's consistency with the Commission's laws and policies, staff will need to determine what components of the project fall within the Commission's Bay and shoreline band jurisdictions. The Commission will need a detailed site plan that depicts the Commission's Bay and shoreline band jurisdictions, describes the existing conditions and the proposed project, identifies areas where fill would be placed and removed, describes the proposed uses at the site, and clearly denote proposed public access areas and improvements.

Waterfront Park Priority Use Designation

In addition to the Commission's Bay and 100-foot shoreline band jurisdictions, portions of the project site appear to coincide with areas designated as "waterfront park" on Bay Plan Map No. 5. The Bay Plan Map policy for the site states, "Oyster Point Marina Park – Preserve and improve marina and shoreline park. Preserve picnicking, swimming, boating, hiking windsurfing, and fishing opportunities. Possible ferry terminal. Allow if compatible with park and marina use; serve with bus transit to reduce traffic and parking needs. Some fill may be needed. Provide signage regarding fish consumption advisories for anglers."

The Recreation section of the Bay Plan contains several policies regarding waterfront parks. In particular, Policy No. 4 states that, "... (2) To capitalize on the attractiveness of their bayfront location, parks should emphasize hiking, bicycling, riding trails, picnic facilities, swimming, environmental, historical and cultural education and interpretation, viewpoints, beaches, and fishing facilities. Recreational facilities that do not need a waterfront location, e.g., golf courses and playing fields, should generally be placed inland, but may be permitted in shoreline areas if they are part of a park complex that is primarily devoted to water-oriented uses." The policy also states that, "... San Francisco Bay Trail segments should be located near the shoreline unless that alignment would have significant adverse effects on Bay resources; in this case, an alignment as near to the shore as possible, consistent with Bay resource protection, should be provided" and "... Bus stops, kiosks and other facilities to accommodate public transit should be provided in waterfront parks to the maximum extent feasible. Public parking should be provided in a manner that does not diminish the park-like character of the site."

In order to fully evaluate the project's consistency with the waterfront park priority use designation at this site, staff will need to determine what components of the project fall within the waterfront park priority use areas. We have prepared a map that more accurately depicts the limit of BCDC's waterfront park priority use designation in this area. It would be helpful to have this map included or reflected in the site plan showing BCDC's Bay and 100-foot shoreline band jurisdiction and the proposed project components and an analysis of how the proposed project is consistent with the park priority use designation.

Bay Fill

Section 66605 of the McAteer-Petris Act states, among other things, that further filling of the Bay should only be authorized if the fill is the minimum necessary to achieve the purpose of the fill and if the harmful effects associated with the fill are minimized. According to the Act, Bay fill is limited to water-oriented uses (such as ports, water-related industry, and water-oriented recreation and public assembly), minor fill for improving shoreline appearance, or public access.

It is unclear at this time, how much Bay fill would be involved for the Oyster Point Project. It appears that most of the project components would involve upland construction. However, the DEIR mentions that some Bay fill may be involved for possible changes to two of the docks in the Oyster Point Marina, shoreline protection work, landscaping and/or grading of the site. As part of the permitting process for this project, the City of South San Francisco will be required to quantify the total amount of fill proposed to be placed with the project and to assess the impacts associated with its placement, to ensure the placement is consistent with our laws and policies. To the extent these numbers can be provided and evaluated in the EIR, that would be helpful.

Public Access and Views

Section 66602 of the McAteer-Petris Act states that, "...existing public access to the shoreline and the waters of the San Francisco Bay is inadequate and that maximum feasible public access to the Bay, consistent with a proposed project, should be provided..." The Bay Plan policies on public access state that, "the public access improvements provided as a condition of any approval "should be consistent with the project and the physical environment..." and "...should be designed and built to encourage diverse Bay-related activities and movement to and along the shoreline..." The Bay Plan policies on Appearance, Design and Scenic Views further state that "all bayfront development should be designed to enhance the pleasure of the user or viewer of the Bay" and that "maximum efforts should be made to provide, enhance, or preserve views of the Bay and shoreline, especially from public areas, from the Bay itself, and from the opposite shore."

The DEIR states that the OPSP would involve the dedication and construction of an approximately 3.1-acre parcel for use as waterfront public open space and improvements to the Bay Trail and surrounding open space throughout Oyster Point Marina and the proposed office/R&D project. The Phase I project would involve the construction of that 3.1-acre parcel as a public park (described above), as well as grading of an approximately 3-acre site east of the Office/R&D buildings for use as a flexible recreation area, and off-street pedestrian paths (including new portions of the Bay Trail) to connect the ferry terminal to the existing Bay Trail.

In its permit application, the City of South San Francisco will be required to more specifically quantify the total public access provided as part of the project (including widths, lengths and areas of improved or new Bay trail segments) and to assess its consistency with the Commission's laws and policies outlined above. It would be helpful if the EIR could provide an analysis of the amount and type of existing public access currently at the site and a comparison of the amount of new public access and improvements that would be created as a result of the project so that it is clear what changes would result from the project. If improvements to existing Bay trail segments are proposed, it would be helpful to understand what those improvements would consist of, including whether the trail segments would be widened or improved with landscaping or paving materials. It would also be helpful to understand the proposed programming and improvements for the proposed public park and flexible recreation area.

We have previously commented on the Bay trail connection along the south side of Oyster Point. We continue to encourage the applicant to create a connection from this location to Gull Drive or Marina Boulevard in order to create a looped Bay trail, rather than to require users to travel south or back around.

The DEIR identifies less-than-significant impacts that the project would have on scenic views and light and glare. Staff is concerned that the increase in development at the site from one-story buildings to more visible four- to ten-story buildings, the massing and form of these buildings, the use of building materials, and the location of these buildings, could impact the views from this site. The Final EIR should include further analysis on how the project is designed to "provide, enhance, or preserve views of the Bay and shoreline," such as by providing viewing opportunities to the Bay from public streets, from public plazas or open space areas, or elsewhere. The Final EIR should indicate where, if any, view corridors are provided from the public streets or areas to the Bay.

The Commission has a Design Review Board (DRB) that provides recommendations to the Commission on a project's design issues. The City should consider scheduling a meeting before the DRB on Phase I of the project to obtain design feedback, particularly if modification of the proposed project layout, roadway grid or Bay trail connections may be required to preserve Bay views or to incorporate additional public access areas.

Other Bay Plan Policies

The following are several other categories of issues that may be raised by the proposed project's DEIR that the Commission has addressed through its Bay Plan policies:

1. **Fish, Other Aquatic Organisms and Wildlife.** The policies in this section address the benefits of fish, other aquatic organisms and wildlife and the importance of protecting the Bay's subtidal habitats, native, threatened or endangered species and candidates for listing as endangered or threatened. The DEIR indicates that there are a number of special-status wildlife species known or expected to occur regularly on or near the OPSF area and that impacts to biological resources would be mitigated to less than significant levels with the incorporation of mitigation measures such as pre-construction surveys for special-status species, construction work windows, and the use of best management practices, in consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and the National Marine Fisheries Services (NMFS). The Commission generally relies on the advice of these agencies with respect to impacts on special-status species and requires the submittal of a final Biological Opinion to deem a permit application complete. The DEIR should sufficiently address how the construction and use of the proposed project would minimize impacts to special-status species and habitat in the Bay, including impacts from the placement of any Bay fill and shoreline protection.
2. **Water Quality.** The policies in this section address water quality and require Bay water pollution to be prevented to the greatest extent feasible. Policy 3 in particular requires new projects to be sited, designed, constructed and maintained to prevent or minimize the discharge of pollutants in the Bay by controlling pollutant sources at the project site, using appropriate construction materials, and applying best management practices. The Final EIR should include measures to mitigate for water quality impacts. The Commission will rely on the advice of the RWQCB to determine whether the project is consistent with its water quality policies.
3. **Water Surface Area and Volume.** Policy 1 in this section states that the surface area of the Bay and the total volume of water should be kept as large as possible and that filling that reduces area and water volume of the Bay should be allowed only for purposes providing substantial public benefits and only if there is no reasonable alternative. The DEIR indicates that a total of 0.27 acres of open water (including intertidal habitats), and

0.76 acres of armored rock levee slope are present within the OPSP area, outside of the boundaries of the Phase I activities and may be potentially impacted. The Final EIR should discuss how the proposed project would minimize Bay fill placement and maintain or improve water circulation in the Bay. If beach creation is proposed along the northwest side of Oyster Point, the DEIR should analyze whether this would be feasible and sustainable into the future, given erosion levels and wave action along the shoreline.

4. **Tidal Marshes and Tidal Flats, Subtidal Areas and Mitigation.** Policy 1 of the Tidal Marshes and Tidal Flats section states, "tidal marshes and tidal flats should be conserved to the fullest possible extent." Policy 2 of the Subtidal Areas section states, "subtidal areas that are scarce in the Bay or have an abundance and diversity of fish, other aquatic organisms and wildlife (e.g., eelgrass beds, sandy deep water or underwater pinnacles) should be conserved. Filling, changes in use, and dredging projects in these areas should therefore be allowed only if: (a) there is no feasible alternative; and (b) the project provides substantial public benefits." If adverse impacts to Bay natural resources, such as to water surface area, volume, or circulation, fish, other aquatic organisms, and wildlife habitat, or subtidal areas, tidal marshes or tidal flats, cannot be avoided, Policy 1 of the Mitigation section of the Bay Plan states, "they should be minimized to the greatest extent practicable [and] measures to compensate for unavoidable adverse impacts to the natural resources of the Bay should be required."

The DEIR indicates that development of the OPSP would result in the disturbance or loss of wetland or aquatic habitats that would be potentially significant. The Final EIR should include details of the size and kind of marsh habitat that may be impacted, a discussion of how these areas will be conserved, and describe how impacts to these areas would be minimized to the greatest extent practicable. If unavoidable adverse impacts would result, the City will need to mitigate for these impacts, as required by our Bay Plan policies.

5. **Safety of Fills and Sea Level Rise.** Policy 4 in this section states that structures on fill or near the shoreline should have adequate flood protection including consideration of future relative sea level rise as determined by competent engineers. The policy states, "as a general rule, structures on fill or near the shoreline should be above the wave runup level or sufficiently set back from the edge of the shore so that the structure is not subject to dynamic wave energy. In all cases, the bottom floor level of structures should be above the highest estimated tide elevation. Exceptions to the general height rule may be made for developments specifically designed to tolerate periodic flooding."

In order to approve the project, the Commission will need to find that the public access and Bay fill project elements are designed with adequate flood protection including consideration of future sea level rise. The Final EIR should explain how these project elements are designed to sufficiently address sea level rise and flooding during the life of the project (including storm surges and subsidence of the site). This discussion could include an analysis of how the structures or public access areas could be raised, or designed to withstand flooding, or set at an elevation to accommodate sea level rise. If the structures or public access areas cannot be constructed at an elevation high enough to withstand periodic flooding, the City should explain why this cannot be done at this time, and how they would be adapted in the future.

Again, we thank you for providing staff with the opportunity to review the DEIR on the Oyster Point Specific Plan project. Above are our comments at this time and based on the information provided to us in the DEIR. As the project becomes more developed, additional Bay Plan policies may be applicable and should be considered. We encourage you to meet with us

Mr. Gerry Beaudin
City of South San Francisco
Comments on Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project DEIR
March 7, 2011
Page 6

as soon as you ready to discuss future permitting requirements. Please feel free to contact me at (415) 352-3616, or email me at mingy@bcd.ca.gov if you have any questions regarding this letter or the Commission's policies and permitting process.

Sincerely,



MING YEUNG
Coastal Program Analyst

MY/ra

cc: Scott Morgan, State Clearinghouse

LETTER C: MING YEUNG, SAN FRANCISCO BAY CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION (BCDC)

Response to Comment C-1

Development in the OPSP area will generally avoid development or other activities within the Bay or mean high tide, with the exception of possible changes to docks in the Oyster Point Marina, discussed below. If, during the approval process for specific development projects, it is determined that activities will encroach into this area or into the 100 foot shoreline band, appropriate permits will be pursued from BCDC along with any required plans.

Because possible changes to two of the docks in the Oyster Point Marina were being contemplated during preparation of the Draft EIR, the potential environmental impacts associated with potential in-water construction for these docks were analyzed in the Draft EIR at a programmatic level of detail, consistent with the level of detail currently known about these contemplated changes. These potential actions are not part of the Phase I Project and there is currently no specific design or construction proposal for such docks. If changes to the docks are indeed proposed at a later date, the specifics will need to undergo appropriate review and permitting.

Response to Comment C-2

The Waterfront Park Priority designation was discussed on pages 13-2 to 13-3 of the Draft EIR. The City will continue to coordinate with BCDC during the approval/permitting process to ensure consistency with exact boundaries of waterfront priority designations.

Response to Comment C-3

No Bay fill is currently proposed as a part of the OPSP or Phase I Project. If, during the approval process for specific development projects, it is determined that any subsequent activity will require Bay fill, such as for changes to the docks (the specifics of which are not currently available), appropriate review and permitting will be pursued at that time.

Response to Comment C-4

This is not a comment on the environmental analysis. Appropriate detail will be provided for any permitting through BCDC.

Response to Comment C-5

This is not a comment on the environmental analysis. When final development plans for the future hotel development site and flexible use recreation area are planned/programmed, details of the public access through these sites will be considered, including connections to/from Marina Boulevard and the Bay Trail and/or through the Phase I Office/R&D site to Gull Drive.

Response to Comment C-6

Full and detailed analysis of aesthetic impacts was included in the Draft EIR on pages 4-1 through 4-20, including visual models from four locations. This analysis meets the requirements for CEQA review. Additional detail and discussion can be provided as required for any subsequent permitting through BCDC. With the planned roadway realignment, bayside open space, recreational area and Bay Trail improvements, the project will provide, enhance and preserve views of the Bay and shoreline.

Response to Comment C-7

The Draft EIR included a full and detailed analysis of potential biological impacts on pages 7-1 to 7-38 and Appendix C of the Draft EIR. This information included recommended mitigation measures and aspects of the proposed project's construction and use that would avoid or minimize impacts to special-status species and habitat. This analysis also included a full assessment of in-water impacts that could result if changes to the docks are subsequently proposed including measures to minimize potential impacts (see pages 7-31 to 7-37).

Response to Comment C-8

The Draft EIR included a full and detailed analysis of potential impacts to water quality and recommended measures to reduce these impacts on pages 12-6 through 12-11, including measure Hydro-1 requiring best management practices during installation of foundation piers, Hydro-2 requiring preparation and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, Hydro-3 requiring compliance with NPDES requirements for erosion control measures, and measures requiring monitoring for leachate from the landfill (Haz-4a, Haz-4d and Haz-4e).

Response to Comment C-9

No Bay fill is currently proposed as a part of the OPSP or Phase I Project. If, during the approval process for specific development projects, it is determined that any subsequent activity pursuant to the OPSP will require Bay fill, such as for changes to the docks (the specifics of which are not currently available), appropriate review and permitting will be pursued at that time.

Response to Comment C-10

Impact and Mitigation Measure Geo-16 have been added to address the stability of the bayside open space and require investigation by and compliance with recommendations of a coastal engineer. See the revisions in Chapter 22 of this document. Compliance with mitigation measure Geo-16 will reduce potential impacts related to instability of the bayside open space to a level of less than significant.

Response to Comment C-11

Development in the OPSP area will generally avoid development or other activities within tidal areas, marshland or in-water, with the exception of possible changes to docks in the Oyster Point Marina, discussed below. If, during the approval process for specific development projects, it is determined that activities will encroach into these areas, appropriate review and permits will be pursued.

Because possible changes to two of the docks in the Oyster Point Marina were being contemplated during preparation of the Draft EIR, the potential environmental impacts associated with potential in-water construction for these docks were analyzed in the Draft EIR at a programmatic level of detail, consistent with the level of detail currently known about these contemplated changes. These potential actions are not part of the Phase I Project and there is currently no specific design or construction proposal for such docks. If changes to the docks are indeed proposed at a later date, the specifics will need to undergo appropriate review and permitting.

Response to Comment C-12

The potential impact of future sea level rise is discussed in full on pages 12-11 through 12-15 of the Draft EIR. Figure 12.2 of the Draft EIR demonstrates protection of the entire development area under proposed grading conditions, including the public access areas, under potential sea level rise scenarios.



San Mateo County Harbor District

Board of Harbor Commissioners

Pietro Parravano, President
James Tucker, Vice President
Leo Padreddi, Treasurer
Robert Bernardo, Secretary
Sally Campbell, Commissioner

Peter Grenell, General Manager

March 8, 2011

Gerry Beaudin, Senior Planner
Dept. of Economic and Community Development
City of South San Francisco
315 Maple Avenue
South San Francisco CA, 94083

***Re: Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Report SCH No. 2010022070, Oyster Point
Specific Plan and Phase I Project***

Dear Mr. Beaudin,

Herewith are our comments on the Draft EIR for the Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project.

1. Project Description (PD), p. 3-2, para. 3: WETA ferry terminal will be completed **by the end of 2011, note in "early" 2011.**
2. PD, p. 3-2, para. 2: OPM has 465 berths, NOT 600. Others were removed for ferry terminal.
3. PD, p. 3-2, Prog. SP, para. 2: The Oyster Point Yacht Club mentioned here for demolition is under lease to the Harbor District. Does the City contemplate condemnation?
4. PD, p. 3-3, T3-1: OPM has 465 berths, NOT 600.
5. PD, p. 3-3, T3-1: There is NO mention of a development site for the Harbor District. This should be included.
6. PD, p. 3-3, Public Redevelopment: NO mention of Harbor District development site.
7. PD, p. 3-3, Public Redevelopment: re: replacing yacht club and maintenance bldg., what is the City proposing? The yacht club is under lease to the Harbor District, and the maintenance bldg. is an active Harbor District facility. Does the City intend to relocate these uses elsewhere, if so where? If not, what does the City propose to do (a) regarding compensation and (b) providing for the Harbor District's essential facility needs? What intended uses to replace these facilities?
8. PD, p. 3-4 (top): re: possible changes to two docks at the marina mentioned herein, what are the City's intentions regarding what changes and their financing?



San Mateo County Harbor District

Board of Harbor Commissioners

Pietro Parravano, President
James Tucker, Vice President
Leo Padreddii, Treasurer
Robert Bernardo, Secretary
Sally Campbell, Commissioner

Peter Grenell, General Manager

9. PD, p. 3-4: re: enhancement of existing uses at eastern end of OPM, what enhancement is the City proposing to these uses, which include a boat launch ramp, bait shop and convenience store, public restroom, vehicle parking, recreational fishing pier, bay trail segment, picnic tables, landscaping, and windsurfing launch ramp?
10. PD, p. 3-4, PH 1 project: re: construction impacts, if these result in loss of boater tenants, what plan does the City have for compensating the Harbor District for lost revenue?
11. PD, p. 3-12, Intended Uses of EIR, para. 1: re: approvals, what is the Facilities Agreement referred to in "JPA amendment/Facilities Agreement?" More generally, what does this "amendment/agreement constitute? Specifically, what does the City foresee as the Harbor District's future role, and extent of authority and responsibilities relative to the various proposed development and handling of impacts and mitigation?
12. PD, p. 3-19, Fig. 3.3: The east parking lot is not shown in PH 1. Why not finish, i. e., pave it in PH 1, and capture economies of scale and facility marketing benefits?
13. Executive Summary and Impact Overview (ES), p. 2-1, Summary Description (SD), para. 4: The marina has 465 berths, not 600.
14. ES, p. 2-1, SD: Ferry terminal will be completed by the end of 2011, not in "early" 2011.
15. ES, OPSP Impacts and Mitigation Measures, Significant and Unavoidable Impacts, p. 2-2, Noise: re: construction impacts with increased noise at live-aboard boats, if boater tenants leave the facility, what does the City intend to do about compensating the District for lost revenue?
16. ES, Measures, Reduced Impacts, p. 2-3, Air Quality: Same question and concern as in #15.
17. ES, Impacts, p. 2-10, TRF-13+, p. 2-16, Light-Glare-2, p. 2-17, Air-2: Same question and concern as in #15 and #16.
18. ES, Impacts, p. 2-58, Hydro-4, Risk of Flooding: PH I does not cover the whole northern shoreline along the marina. What does the City intend for mitigation for the eastern end of that portion of the shoreline?
19. Overall comment: the draft EIR appears to be somewhat superficial given the potential traffic, hazardous materials, geological impacts, and extent of intended infrastructure development. This may open the door to challenges of inadequacy.
20. No developer is identified as "a private developer": Is there some reason for this?



San Mateo County Harbor District

Board of Harbor Commissioners

Pietro Parravano, President
James Tucker, Vice President
Leo Padreddi, Treasurer
Robert Bernardo, Secretary
Sally Campbell, Commissioner

Peter Grenell, General Manager

21. The lack of more extensive analysis of future projects, although explained, raises the potential for "segmentation" legal issues. Could more substance be provided for consideration to lessen this potential?
22. The draft EIR project description does not provide for a Harbor District development site as previously discussed with the City and referenced in the MOU, nor does it appear to provide for continued marine-related uses beyond the existing docks (there is a reference to possible improvements to two docks). At a minimum, any resulting development that reduces District revenue or potential revenue could result in negative responses from the State Department of Boating and Waterways with respect to impacts on the District's debt service capability.
23. The revised EIR should take into account short term possibilities for Oyster Point enhancement in connection with the Americas Cup competition.

These are our comments at this time. Please contact us if you have questions or desire further information.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, which appears to read "Peter Grenell".

Peter Grenell
General Manager

Cc: Robert Johnson
Jim R. Karpiak

LETTER D: PETER GRENEILL, SAN MATEO COUNTY HARBOR DISTRICTResponse to Comment D-1

Clarification of the timing of completion of the ferry terminal has been added. See the revisions in Chapter 22 of this document.

Response to Comment D-2

Clarification of the number of berths at Oyster Point Marina has been added. See the revisions in Chapter 22 of this document.

Response to Comment D-3

Clarification that demolition of the Oyster Point Yacht Club is not proposed has been added. See the revisions in Chapter 22 of this document.

Response to Comment D-4

Clarification of the number of berths at Oyster Point Marina has been added. See the revisions in Chapter 22 of this document.

Response to Comment D-5

The comment has been evaluated, but does not raise an environmental issue, nor address the adequacy of the environmental analysis. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21091(d)(2), and CEQA Guidelines Section 15088, no further response is required.

Response to Comment D-6

The comment has been evaluated, but does not raise an environmental issue, nor address the adequacy of the environmental analysis. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21091(d)(2), and CEQA Guidelines Section 15088, no further response is required.

Response to Comment D-7

Clarification that demolition of the Oyster Point Yacht Club is not proposed has been added. See the revisions in Chapter 22 of this document.

Response to Comment D-8

The comment has been evaluated, but does not raise an environmental issue, nor address the adequacy of the environmental analysis. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21091(d)(2), and CEQA Guidelines Section 15088, no further response is required.

Response to Comment D-9

The comment has been evaluated, but does not raise an environmental issue, nor address the adequacy of the environmental analysis. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21091(d)(2), and CEQA Guidelines Section 15088, no further response is required.

Response to Comment D-10

The comment has been evaluated, but does not raise an environmental issue, nor address the adequacy of the environmental analysis. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21091(d)(2), and CEQA Guidelines Section 15088, no further response is required.

Response to Comment D-11

The comment has been evaluated, but does not raise an environmental issue, nor address the adequacy of the environmental analysis. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21091(d)(2), and CEQA Guidelines Section 15088, no further response is required.

Response to Comment D-12

The comment has been evaluated, but does not raise an environmental issue, nor address the adequacy of the environmental analysis. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21091(d)(2), and CEQA Guidelines Section 15088, no further response is required.

Response to Comment D-13

The comment has been evaluated, but does not raise an environmental issue, nor address the adequacy of the environmental analysis. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21091(d)(2), and CEQA Guidelines Section 15088, no further response is required.

Response to Comment D-14

The comment has been evaluated, but does not raise an environmental issue, nor address the adequacy of the environmental analysis. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21091(d)(2), and CEQA Guidelines Section 15088, no further response is required.

Response to Comment D-15

The comment has been evaluated, but does not raise an environmental issue, nor address the adequacy of the environmental analysis. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21091(d)(2), and CEQA Guidelines Section 15088, no further response is required.

Response to Comment D-16

The comment has been evaluated, but does not raise an environmental issue, nor address the adequacy of the environmental analysis. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21091(d)(2), and CEQA Guidelines Section 15088, no further response is required.

Response to Comment D-17

The comment has been evaluated, but does not raise an environmental issue, nor address the adequacy of the environmental analysis. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21091(d)(2), and CEQA Guidelines Section 15088, no further response is required.

Response to Comment D-18

Impact Hydro-4 is discussed in full on pages 12-11 through 12-15 of the Draft EIR, including Figure 12.2 that demonstrates protection of the entire development area under proposed grading conditions, including the eastern end of the shoreline.

Response to Comment D-19

The environmental analysis was completed to satisfy requirements under the California Environmental Quality Act for the Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project, including infrastructure improvements, which includes full and detailed analysis of traffic on pages 16-1 through 16-58 and Appendix E of the Draft EIR including identification of significant and unavoidable impacts to US 101 and the ramps and/or intersections serving them and identification of 18 additional potentially significant impacts and the mitigation to reduce these to less than significant; full and detailed analysis of hazardous materials on pages 11-1 through 11-19 of the Draft EIR including impacts and mitigation for potentially significant impacts related to hazardous and potentially hazardous landfill materials; and full and detailed analysis of geological impacts on 9-1 through 9-19 of the Draft EIR including impacts and mitigation relating to construction over variable subsurface conditions including landfill materials that may subside over time and in a seismically active region. Additionally, the adequacy of the proposed utility infrastructure was examined in a full and detailed analysis included in the Draft EIR on pages 17-1 through 17-16 and Appendix G.

The comment does not raise any specific environmental issue to which a specific written response can be provided; accordingly no further response is required

Response to Comment D-20

Page 1-1, 2nd paragraph identifies the applicant as “Oyster Point Ventures, LLC and the City of South San Francisco Redevelopment Agency.” Chapter 3: Project Description describes in more detail the proposed public-private redevelopment.

Response to Comment D-21

As outlined in the first paragraph of page 3-1 of the Draft EIR, the Phase I Project has been analyzed on a project level in the EIR. Because elements of the future phases within the OPSP are conceptual at this point, these have been analyzed on a programmatic level. While conceptual, as much detailed information as possible has been included for future phases to ensure a more exhaustive consideration of effects and alternative for the entire OPSP than would have been possible if each phase had been considered separately. See the detailed description of the programmatic OPSP on pages 3-2 through 3-4 and 3-19 of the Draft EIR. Programmatic analysis is explicitly allowed for projects of this type under section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines, and is a common practice for large multi-phase Specific Plans that would not be considered “segmentation” under CEQA.

Response to Comment D-22

The comment has been evaluated, but does not raise an environmental issue, nor address the adequacy of the environmental analysis. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21091(d)(2), and CEQA Guidelines Section 15088, no further response is required.

Response to Comment D-23

This is not a comment on the environmental analysis. This non-CEQA issue will be coordinated between the City and Harbor District. If temporary enhancements are subsequently proposed in connection with the Americas Cup competition, these may require subsequent environmental review.



March 9, 2011

Gerry Beaudin, Senior Planner
Department of Economic and Community Development
City of South San Francisco
315 Maple Avenue
South San Francisco, CA 94083

**Subject: Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project
Draft Environmental Impact Report**

Dear Mr. Beaudin:

On behalf of the San Francisco Bay Trail Project, I am submitting comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project. The San Francisco Bay Trail is a visionary plan for a shared-use bicycle and pedestrian path that will one day allow continuous travel around San Francisco Bay. Currently, 310 miles of trail have been completed. Eventually, the Bay Trail will extend over 500 miles to link the shoreline of nine counties, passing through 47 cities and crossing seven toll bridges.

We are particularly interested in this development project and its bicycle and pedestrian circulation plans because it will affect over 10 miles of continuous, well-used Bay Trail linking to a regional ferry transit terminal.

The following comments are suggested for inclusion in the Final Environmental Impact Report:

Programmatic Specific Plan

- o Improvements to the Bay Trail and surrounding open space throughout Oyster Point Marina and the proposed office/R&D project The FEIR should clarify the sections of the Bay Trail that will be improved as part of this project. In order for the trail network to be functional, trail resurfacing and widening should also occur beyond the project area to avoid user conflicts on old narrow trail sections.

Phase I Project

- o Enhancement of existing uses at the eastern edge of Oyster Point The Bay Trail should be improved at the eastern edge of Oyster Point to create consistent and uniform trail access to the new development.
- o Landfill consolidation and grading Segments of the Bay Trail are currently inundated during high tide events making it unusable during these times. The FEIR should address this issue and ensure that the grading plan elevates the edge of the shoreline to protect a permanent Bay Trail alignment.

- o Off-street pedestrian paths (including portions of the Bay Trail) will connect the ferry terminal to the existing Bay Trail These trail sections should be at least 12 feet wide and should be multi-use trails (not just pedestrian paths) that will function as a recreation and transportation corridor with direct connection to the new development and the ferry terminal.

Chapter 15: Population, Public Services and Recreation

- o Recreation Impact Analysis The FEIR should outline a commitment to maintaining the continuity of the Bay Trail during construction. When this is not feasible, it should define clear and safe detours for bicyclists, pedestrians and people in wheelchairs to travel through the area, maintain visual access to the shoreline and safely travel separated from vehicle traffic.
- o The San Francisco Bay Trail Plan (ABAG, 1989) should be mentioned as a regionally adopted plan that has policies relevant to the Oyster Point Specific Plan.

Chapter 16: Traffic

- o Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities The Bay Trail should be specifically referenced in this section as an existing multi-use bicycle and pedestrian facility along the shoreline.
- o Bicycle Facilities, Impact Traf-3 A mitigation measure should be included requiring that the Bay Trail bicycle/pedestrian pathway be completed and improved *beyond* the Oyster Point Specific Plan project area as referenced in the DEIR on page 3-3. The specific plan project area is a small area located within a larger system of the Bay Trail at Oyster Point Marina. Efforts should be made to improve the alignment in the general vicinity to ensure sufficient capacity for the projected increase in bicycle and pedestrian use as a result of the new development. The FEIR should provide a map indicating the extent of these improvements.
- o A map showing the location of all new sidewalks, bicycle lanes and improved multi-use path in the Oyster Point Marina area should be included in the FEIR.

Thank you for considering these comments and please contact me at 510-464-7935 or laurat@abag.ca.gov if you have questions about this letter or the Bay Trail in general.

Sincerely,



Laura Thompson
Bay Trail Project Manager

LETTER E: LAURA THOMPSON, SAN FRANCISCO BAY TRAIL PROJECTResponse to Comment E-1

The City will continue to coordinate with the San Francisco Bay Trail Project to detail plans for improvement of the Bay Trail at this site.

While not considered an environmental impact for this project or required mitigation, the City will continue to work with the Bay Trail Project to improve the Bay Trail throughout the City of South San Francisco.

Response to Comment E-2

Improvements to the Bay Trail at the eastern edge are included in Phase I of the project. The City will continue to coordinate with the San Francisco Bay Trail Project to detail plans for improvement of the Bay Trail at this site.

Response to Comment E-3

The potential impact of future sea level rise is discussed in full on pages 12-11 through 12-15 of the Draft EIR. Figure 12.2 of the Draft EIR demonstrates protection of the entire development area under proposed grading conditions, including the Bay Trail, under potential sea level rise scenarios. The City will continue to coordinate with the San Francisco Bay Trail Project to detail plans for improvement of the Bay Trail at this site.

Response to Comment E-4

The City will continue to coordinate with the San Francisco Bay Trail Project to detail plans for improvement of the Bay Trail and connections to it at this site.

Response to Comment E-5

Impact and Mitigation Measure Traf-2b have been added to address the continuity of the Bay Trail during construction. See the revisions in Chapter 22 of this document. Compliance with mitigation measure Traf-2b will reduce this potential impact a level of less than significant.

Response to Comment E-6

A discussion of the regionally adopted San Francisco Bay Trail Plan has been added, as requested. See the revisions in Chapter 22 of this document.

Response to Comment E-7

A discussion of the San Francisco Bay Trail Plan has been added, as requested. See the revisions in Chapter 22 of this document.

Response to Comment E-8

While not considered an environmental impact for this project or required mitigation, the City will continue to work with the Bay Trail Project to improve the Bay Trail throughout the City of South San Francisco.

Response to Comment E-9

The City will continue to coordinate with the San Francisco Bay Trail Project to detail plans for improvement of the Bay Trail at this site.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

INTRODUCTION

This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) fulfills Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 which requires adoption of a mitigation monitoring program when mitigation measures are required to avoid or reduce a proposed projects significant environmental effects. The MMRP is only applicable if the City of South San Francisco decides to approve the proposed Project.

The MMRP is organized to correspond to environmental issues and significant impacts discussed in the EIR. The table below is arranged in the following five columns:

- Recommended mitigation measures,
- Timing for implementation of the mitigation measures,
- Party responsible for implementation,
- Monitoring action,
- Party or parties responsible for monitoring the implementation of the mitigation measures, and
- A blank for entry of completion date as mitigation occurs.

This page intentionally left blank.

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
Air-2: Health Risk Assessment for Proposed Sensitive Receptors. New projects within the OPSP area that would include sensitive receptors (e.g., daycare centers) shall analyze TAC and PM2.5 impacts and include mitigation measures to reduce exposures to less than significant levels. The following measures could be utilized in site planning and building designs to reduce TAC exposure: ○ New development of sensitive receptors located within OPSP area shall require site specific analysis to determine the level of TAC and PM2.5 exposure. This analysis shall be conducted following procedures outlined by BAAQMD. If the site specific analysis reveal significant exposures, based on BAAQMD guidance, then additional measures listed below shall be required. ○ Where exterior exposures are significant, consider site planning to buffer new sensitive receptors from TAC emissions. Active site uses and building air intakes shall be situated away from TAC sources ○ Provide tiered plantings of vegetation along the site boundaries closest to TAC sources. Preliminary laboratory studies show that redwood and/or deodar cedar trees can remove some of the fine particulate matter emitted from traffic under low wind speeds. Low wind speeds typically result in the highest particulate matter concentrations.	During design of development projects including sensitive receptors and prior to issuance of building permits	Applies to all construction	Completion of HAS for proposals including sensitive receptors	SSF Planning Division	
Air-4a: Implement BAAQMD-Recommended Measures to Control Particulate Matter Emissions during Construction. Measures to reduce diesel particulate matter and PM10 from construction are recommended to ensure that short-term health	Prior to issuance of building permit and during	Applies to all construction	Verify requirements are met during	SSF Building Division	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
impacts to nearby sensitive receptors are avoided. Dust (PM10) Control Measures: - Water all active construction areas at least twice daily and more often during windy periods. Active areas adjacent to residences should be kept damp at all times. - Cover all hauling trucks or maintain at least two feet of freeboard. - Pave, apply water at least twice daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas. - Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas and sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is deposited onto the adjacent roads. - Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (i.e., previously-graded areas that are inactive for 10 days or more). - Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles. - Limit traffic speeds on any unpaved roads to 15 mph. - Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible. - Suspend construction activities that cause visible dust plumes to extend beyond the construction site. - Post a publically visible sign(s) with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective	construction		construction		

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations. Additional Measures to Reduce Diesel Particulate Matter and PM2.5 and other construction emissions: ○ The developer or contractor shall provide a plan for approval by the City or BAAQMD demonstrating that the heavy-duty (>50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project wide fleet-average 20 percent NOx reduction and 45 percent particulate reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average for the year 2011 ○ Clear signage at all construction sites will be posted indicating that diesel equipment standing idle for more than five minutes shall be turned off. This would include trucks waiting to deliver or receive soil, aggregate, or other bulk materials. Rotating drum concrete trucks could keep their engines running continuously as long as they were onsite or adjacent to the construction site. ○ Opacity is an indicator of exhaust particulate emissions from off-road diesel powered equipment. Each project shall ensure that emissions from all construction diesel powered equipment used on the project site do not exceed 40 percent opacity for more than three minutes in any one hour. Any equipment found to exceed 40 percent opacity (or Ringelmann 2.0) shall be repaired immediately ○ The contractor shall install temporary electrical service whenever possible to avoid the need for independently		Applies to all construction that involves refuse relocation			

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
powered equipment (e.g. compressors). - Properly tune and maintain equipment for low emissions. Air-4b: Implement Odor-Control Measures During Refuse Relocation. The following measures shall be implemented during disturbance of the landfill for refuse relocation: - All areas shall remain under foundation layer cover until localized refuse relocation occurs. - Limit the horizontal area of opened foundation layer to at most an acre of horizontal area at any one time per area (an acre for the area being excavated and an acre for the area where trash is being relocated). - Excavation and fill zones shall be covered at the end of each day, either with secured tarping or with the foundation layer of soil. - Additional measures for odor control such as a foam cover or scented misters in active areas and/or covering of the materials in the haul trucks may be considered and implemented based upon actual field conditions. - Post a publically visible sign(s) with a 24-hour contact number for odor complaints. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations. Concerns/complaints related to odor from the work will be evaluated and protocol measures will be amended as necessary. - If 10 or more complaints are logged with BAAQMD within a 90-day period, BAAQMD will have regulatory authority that supersedes this mitigation measure consistent with BAAQMD Regulation 7.					

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
Bio-2a: Delineate Jurisdictional Boundaries. Prior to construction of any programmatic OPSP elements that are expected to potentially have direct impacts on USACE jurisdictional habitats, a focused delineation shall be performed to determine the precise limits of USACE jurisdiction at the site, and USACE approval of the jurisdictional boundaries will be obtained.	Prior to issuance of building permits and construction	Applies to all construction that involves disturbance or loss of wetland or aquatic habitats	Verification by USACE of jurisdictional boundary	SSF Planning Division	
Bio- 2b: Impact Avoidance/Minimization. Future OPSP elements near the Bay shoreline shall be designed with consideration of the boundaries of sensitive wetland and aquatic habitats in order to avoid and minimize impacts to these sensitive habitats to the extent practicable while still accomplishing OPSP objectives. For example, building and trail construction, landscaping activities, and other terrestrial activities shall be planned and designed to avoid impacting the sensitive habitats near the Bay shoreline to the extent feasible. For activities that cannot avoid impacting sensitive habitats due to their water-related purpose or location, such as construction or replacement of piers or docks in the marina, the amount of new fill or the footprint of new structures placed in or on the water shall be limited to the minimum necessary to achieve the objectives of that component. The City shall review plans for any proposed activities that will result in impacts to sensitive wetland and aquatic habitats to ensure that impacts have been avoided and minimized to the extent feasible.	Prior to issuance of building permits and construction	Applies to all construction that involves disturbance or loss of wetland or aquatic habitats	Verification that impacts are avoided or minimized	SSF Planning Division	
Bio-2c: Restoration of Temporarily Impacted Wetland/Aquatic Habitats. USACE-jurisdictional areas that are temporarily impacted during construction of programmatic elements shall be	If triggered by Bio-2a and Bio-2b, during	Applies to all construction that involves	Verification of purchased mitigation	SSF Planning Division	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
restored to preexisting contours and levels of soils compaction following build-out. The means by which such temporarily impacted areas will be restored shall be described in the mitigation plan described in Measure 2d below. Bio-2d: Compensation for Permanently Impacted Wetland/Aquatic Habitats. Unavoidable permanent fill of all habitats within USACE jurisdiction shall be replaced at a minimum 1:1 (mitigation area: impact area) ratio by creation or restoration of similar habitat around San Francisco Bay. Any aquatic, marsh, or mudflat habitat areas experiencing a net increase in shading as a result of docks or other structures constructed over or on the water shall require compensatory mitigation at a 0.5:1 (mitigation area: impact area) ratio; this ratio is less than the 1:1 required for permanent filling of such habitats because shaded areas are expected to retain some ecological habitat value. Mitigation could be achieved through a combination of on-site restoration or creation of wetlands or aquatic habitats (including removal of on-site fill or structures, resulting in a gain of wetland or aquatic habitats); off-site restoration/creation; funding of off-site restoration/creation projects implemented by others; and/or mitigation credits purchased at mitigation banks within the San Francisco Bay Region. Because impacts to aquatic habitats on-site could also potentially impact special-status fish and EFH (see Impacts to Essential Fish Habitat and Special-Status Fish below), all compensatory mitigation for impacts to aquatic habitat must also provide habitat for green sturgeon, Central California Coast steelhead, and longfin smelt that is of a quality at least as high as that impacted. For funding of off-site improvements or purchase of mitigation bank credits, the OPSP Applicant shall provide written evidence to the City that either (a) compensation has been established through	restoration of impacted wetland and aquatic areas; compensation for impacted areas prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy	disturbance or loss of wetland or aquatic habitats	credits or review and approval of mitigation plan		

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
the purchase of a sufficient number of mitigation credits in a mitigation bank to satisfy the mitigation acreage requirements of the OPSP activity, or (b) funds sufficient for the restoration of the mitigation acreage requirements of the OPSP activity have been paid to an entity implementing a project that would create or restore habitats of the type being impacted by the OPSP. For areas to be restored to mitigate for temporary or permanent impacts, the OPSP Applicant shall prepare and implement a mitigation plan. The OPSP Applicant shall retain a restoration ecologist or wetland biologist to develop the mitigation plan, and it shall contain the following components (or as otherwise modified by regulatory agency permitting conditions): 1. Summary of habitat impacts and proposed mitigation ratios, along with a description of any other mitigation strategies used to achieve the overall mitigation ratios, such as funding of off-site improvements and/or purchase of mitigation bank credits 2. Goal of the restoration to achieve no net loss of habitat functions and values 3. Location of mitigation site(s) and description of existing site conditions 4. Mitigation design: ○ Existing and proposed site hydrology ○ Grading plan if appropriate, including bank stabilization or other site stabilization features ○ Soil amendments and other site preparation elements as appropriate ○ Planting plan					

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
○ Irrigation and maintenance plan ○ Remedial measures/adaptive management, etc. 5. Monitoring plan (including final and performance criteria, monitoring methods, data analysis, reporting requirements, monitoring schedule, etc.) 6. Contingency plan for mitigation elements that do not meet performance or final success criteria.					
Bio-3a: Incorporate Best Management Practices for Water Quality During Construction. The Plan shall incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) for water quality to minimize impacts in the surrounding wetland environment, sloughs and channels, and the San Francisco Bay during construction. These BMPs shall include numerous practices that will be outlined within the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), including, but not limited to, the following mitigation measures: 1. No equipment will be operated in live flow in any of the sloughs or channels or ditches on or adjacent to the site. 2. No debris, soil, silt, sand, bark, slash, sawdust, cement, concrete, washings, petroleum products or other organic or earthen material shall be allowed to enter into or be placed where it may be washed by rainfall or runoff into aquatic or wetland habitat. 3. Standard erosion control and slope stabilization measures will be required for work performed in any area where erosion could lead to sedimentation of a waterbody. For example, silt fencing will be installed just outside the limits of grading and construction in any areas where such activities will occur upslope from, and within 50 ft of, any wetland, aquatic, or marsh habitat. This silt fencing will	Prior to issuance of building permit and during construction	Applies to all construction	Verification that requirements are met during construction	SSF Building Division and SSF Public Works Department	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
be inspected and maintained regularly throughout the duration of construction. 4. Machinery will be refueled at least 50 ft from any aquatic habitat, and a spill prevention and response plan will be developed. All workers will be informed of the importance of preventing spills and of the appropriate measures to take should a spill occur.					
Bio-3b: Minimize Soil Disturbance Adjacent to Wetland and Marsh Habitat. To the extent feasible, soil stockpiling, equipment staging, construction access roads, and other intensively soil-disturbing activities shall not occur immediately adjacent to any wetlands that are to be avoided by the OPSP. The limits of the construction area shall be clearly demarcated with Environmentally Sensitive Area fencing to avoid inadvertent disturbance outside the fence during construction activities.	During construction	Applies to all construction	Verification that Environmentally Sensitive Areas are avoided	SSF Public Works Department	
Bio-4: Ensure Adequate Stormwater Run-off Capacity. Increases in stormwater run-off due to increased hardscape shall be mitigated through the construction and maintenance of features designed to handle the expected increases in flows and provide adequate energy dissipation. All such features, including outfalls, shall be regularly maintained to ensure continued function and prevent failure following construction.	Prior to issuance of building permit and during construction	Applies to all construction	Verification that adequate stormwater run-off capacity is provided	SSF Public Works Department	
Bio-6: Pre-Construction Nesting Bird Survey. Pre-construction surveys for nesting birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 and/or Fish and Game Code of California within 100 feet of a development site in the OPSP area shall be conducted if	Prior to issuance of building permit if during nesting period	Applies to all construction	Completion of survey and, if birds present,	SSF Planning Division	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
construction commences during the avian nesting season, between February 1 and August 31. The survey should be undertaken no more than 15 days prior to any site-disturbing activities, including vegetation removal or grading. If active nests are found, a qualified biologist shall determine an appropriate buffer in consideration of species, stage of nesting, location of the nest, and type of construction activity. The buffers should be maintained until after the nestlings have fledged and left the nest.			provision of buffer		
Bio-7a: Pre-construction Burrowing Owl Surveys. Pre-construction surveys for burrowing owls shall be completed in potential habitat in conformance with the California Burrowing Owl Consortium protocol, no more than 30 days prior to the start of construction. If no burrowing owls are located during these surveys, no additional action would be warranted. However, if burrowing owls are located on or immediately adjacent to the site, mitigation measures Bio-7b and Bio-7c shall be implemented.	Prior to issuance of building permit	Applies to all construction	Completion of survey	SSF Planning Division	
Bio-7b: Buffer Zones. For burrowing owls present during the non-breeding season (generally 1 September to 31 January), a 150-ft buffer zone shall be maintained around the occupied burrow(s) if practicable. If such a buffer is not practicable, then a buffer adequate to avoid injury or mortality of owls shall be maintained, or the birds shall be evicted as described for Mitigation Measures Bio-7c, below. During the breeding season (generally 1 February to 31 August), a 250-ft buffer, within which no new activity shall be permissible, shall be maintained between OPSP activities and occupied burrows. Owls present on site after 1 February shall be assumed to be nesting unless evidence indicates otherwise. This	If triggered by Bio-7a, prior to issuance of building permit	Applies to all construction	Provision of buffer	SSF Planning Division	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
protected buffer area shall remain in effect until 31 August, or based upon monitoring evidence, until the young owls are foraging independently or the nest is no longer active.					
Bio-7c: Passive Relocation. If construction will directly impact occupied burrows, eviction of owls should occur outside the nesting season to prevent injury or mortality of individual owls. No burrowing owls shall be evicted from burrows during the nesting season (1 February through 31 August) unless evidence indicates that nesting is not actively occurring (e.g., because the owls have not yet begun nesting early in the season, or because young have already fledged late in the season). Relocation of owls during the non-breeding season shall be performed by a qualified biologist using one-way doors, which should be installed in all burrows within the impact area and left in place for at least two nights. These one-way doors shall then be removed and the burrows backfilled immediately prior to the initiation of grading.	If triggered by Bio-7a, prior to construction	Applies to all construction	Verification of compliant relocation	SSF Planning Division	
Bio-10a: Lighting Measures to Reduce Impacts to Birds. During design of any building greater than 100 feet tall, the OPSP Applicant shall consult with a qualified biologist experienced with bird strikes and building/lighting design issues to identify lighting-related measures to minimize the effects of the building's lighting on birds. Such measures, which may include the following and/or other measures, shall be incorporated into the building's design and operation. Use strobe or flashing lights in place of continuously burning lights for obstruction lighting. Use flashing white lights rather than continuous light, red light, or rotating	During preliminary design and prior to building permit issuance of any building greater than 100 feet tall	Applies to all buildings greater than 100 feet tall	Incorporation of lighting that minimizes bird impacts	SSF Planning Division	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
beams. - Install shields onto light sources not necessary for air traffic to direct light towards the ground. - Extinguish all exterior lighting (i.e., rooftop floods, perimeter spots) not required for public safety. - When interior or exterior lights must be left on at night, the operator of the buildings shall examine and adopt alternatives to bright, all-night, floor-wide lighting, which may include: - Installing motion-sensitive lighting. - Using desk lamps and task lighting. - Reprogramming timers. - Use of lower-intensity lighting. - Windows or window treatments that reduce transmission of light out of the building shall be implemented to the extent feasible.					
Bio-10b: Building Design Measures to Minimize Bird Strike Risk. During design of any building greater than 100 feet tall, the OPSP Applicant shall consult with a qualified biologist experienced with bird strikes and building/lighting design issues to identify measures related to the external appearance of the building to minimize the risk of bird strikes. Such measures, which may include the following and/or other measures, shall be incorporated into the building's design. Use non-reflective tinted glass.	During preliminary design and prior to building permit issuance of any building greater than 100 feet tall	Applies to all buildings greater than 100 feet tall	Incorporation of design features that minimize bird impacts	SSF Planning Division	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
○ Use window films to make windows visible to birds from the outside. ○ Use external surfaces/designs that “break up” reflective surfaces rather than having large, uninterrupted areas of surfaces that reflect, and thus may not appear noticeably different (to a bird) from, the sky.					
Bio-12: Measures to Reduce Impacts on Essential Fish Habitat. The following mitigation measures, adapted from Amendment 11 of the West Coast Groundfish Plan (PFMC 2006) and Appendix A of the Pacific Coast Salmon Plan (PFMC 2003), shall be implemented during in-water construction activities unless modified by the federal permitting agencies (NMFS or USACE). Avoidance of Salmonid Migration Periods. In-water work when juvenile salmonids are moving through the Bay on the way to the open ocean or when groundfish and prey species could be directly impacted shall be avoided. Because steelhead are potentially present, the allowed dredge window for this area of the San Francisco Bay is June 1 through November 30. All in-water construction shall occur during this window. If completion of in-water work within this period is not feasible due to scheduling issues, new timing guidelines shall be established and submitted to the NMFS and CDFG for review and approval. Worker Training. Personnel involved in in-water construction and deconstruction activities shall be trained by a qualified biologist in the importance of the marine environment to special-status fish, and birds and the environmental protection measures put in place to prevent impacts to these species, their habitats, and EFH. The training shall include, at a minimum, the following:	During in-water construction (if proposed)	Applies to all construction occurring “in water”	Verification of adherence to avoidance measures	SSF Planning Division	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
1. A review of the special-status fish and sensitive habitats that could be found in work areas 2. Measures to avoid and minimize adverse effects to special-status fish, birds, their habitats, and EFH 3. A review of all conditions and requirements of environmental permits, reports, and plans (i.e., USACE permits) Avoidance of Areas of Wetland and Aquatic Vegetation. All construction equipment used in conjunction with in-water work (pipelines, barges, cranes, etc.) shall avoid wetlands, marshes, and areas of sub-aquatic vegetation (including eelgrass beds).					
Bio-13a: Incorporation of Design Considerations that Minimize the Need for Percussive Construction Techniques. If programmatic OPSP elements after the Phase I Project include in-water construction of structures that require percussive techniques, structure design shall adhere to the following principles to the greatest extent practicable: 1. Engineer structures to use fewer or smaller piles, where feasible, and preferably, solid piles 2. Design structures that can be installed in a short period of time (i.e., during periods of slack tide when fish movements are lower). 3. The City, with consultation from a qualified biologist who is familiar with marine biology, shall review the final plan design to ensure that these design requirements have been incorporated into the plan.	Prior to issuance of building permit and construction of development projects including in-water construction (if proposed)	Applies to all construction occurring “in water”	Verification that measures incorporated in project design and carried out during in-water construction	SSF Building Division	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
Bio-13b: Utilization of Construction Tools and Techniques that Minimize Percussive Noise. If programmatic OPSP elements include construction of structures that require percussive techniques, construction activities shall employ the following techniques to the greatest extent practicable. 1. Drive piles with a vibratory device instead of an impact hammer if feasible, and use a cushioning block between the hammer and the pile. 2. Restrict driving of steel piles to the June 1 to November 30 work window, or as otherwise recommended by the NMFS (driving of concrete piles would not be subject to this condition). 3. If steel piles must be driven with an impact hammer, an air curtain shall be installed to disrupt sound wave propagation, or the area around the piles being driven shall be dewatered using a coffer dam. The goal of either measure is to disrupt the sound wave as it moves from water into air. 4. If an air curtain is used, a qualified biologist shall monitor pile driving to ensure that the air curtain is functioning properly and OPSP-generated sound waves do not exceed the threshold of 180183-decibels generating 1 micropascal (as established by NMFS guidelines the Fisheries Hydroacoustic Working Group; 2008). This shall require monitoring of in-water sound waves during pile driving. 5. Use of fewer piles, or smaller piles, or a different type of pile, with hollow steel piles appearing to create the most impact at a given size 6. Driving piles when species of concern are absent 7. Use of a vibratory hammer rather than an impact hammer		Applies to all construction with piles			

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
8. Use of a cushioning block between hammer and pile 9. Use of a confined or unconfined air bubble curtain; and 10. Driving piles during periods of reduced currents					
Bio-14a: Avoidance of Suitable Oyster Habitat. To the greatest extent practicable, OPSP activities shall avoid removing or disturbing riprap and other rocky substrates that serve as suitable oyster habitat. If impacts to oysters and their habitat are unavoidable, measures Bio-14b and Bio-14c shall be implemented. Bio-14b: Native Oyster Surveys. A detailed survey for native oysters shall be conducted in all suitable substrates within the OPSP area. This survey shall be conducted by a qualified oyster biologist at low tides that expose the maximum amount of substrate possible. Surveys can be conducted at any time of year, but late summer and early fall are optimal because newly settled oysters are detectable. This survey shall occur before any construction within aquatic habitats takes place to establish a baseline condition. If few or no oysters are observed on hard substrates that would remain in place after construction, no further mitigation is required. Bio-14c: Replacement of Suitable Oyster Habitat. If more than 100 oysters would be removed or are in areas where construction-generated sediment could settle out onto the oysters, compensatory mitigation shall be provided by the OPSP Applicant at a minimum 1:1 ratio. The OPSP Applicant shall retain a qualified oyster biologist to develop an Oyster Restoration Plan that shall be reviewed and approved by the City. This Plan shall include site selection, substrate installation, and monitoring procedures, and include the following components (unless otherwise modified by	Prior to issuance of building permit and during in-water construction (if proposed) then, if habitat impacted, completion and implementation of plan	Applies to all construction occurring "in water"	Verification of compliant survey or, if habitat impacted, verification of completed replacement plan	SSF Planning Division	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
NMFS): 1. A suitable site for installation of replacement substrate would be one with adequate daily tidal flow, a location that would not be affected by maintenance dredging or other routine marina maintenance activities, and one that is lacking in appropriate settlement substrate. A location outside of the breakwaters or in association with any eelgrass mitigation sites would be appropriate. 2. Although oysters may settle on a variety of materials, the most appropriate for restoration purposes is oyster shell. This is typically installed by placing the shell into mesh bags that can then be placed in piles on the seafloor of the mitigation site. Enough shell shall be installed under the guidance of a qualified oyster biologist to make up for the loss attributable to the OPSP. Mitigation shall occur after construction of all in-water elements of the OPSP. 3. The restoration site shall be monitored on a regular basis by a qualified oyster biologist for a minimum of two years, or until success criteria are achieved if they are not achieved within two years. Monitoring shall involve routine checks (bi-monthly during the winter and monthly during the spring and summer) to evaluate settlement, growth, and survival on the mitigation site. Success shall be determined to have been achieved when settlement and survival rates for oysters are not statistically significantly different between the mitigation site and the populations being impacted.					
Bio-15a: Water Quality Best Management Practices for Eelgrass. In addition to the water quality BMPs described above in Measure Bio-3a, the following BMPs shall minimize impacts to any eelgrass beds in the OPSP area. 1. Conduct all in-water work during periods of eelgrass dormancy	During in-water construction (if proposed)	Applies to all construction occurring "in water"	Adherence to measures during in-water construction	SSF Planning Division	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
(November 1-March 31) [Note: the majority of this period conflicts with the period during which in-water activities should not occur to avoid impacts to salmonids; only the period November 1-30 would avoid impacts during sensitive periods for both taxa.] 2. Install sediment curtains around the worksite to minimize sediment transport If these BMPs are not feasible, or if OPSP activities will occur in aquatic areas outside of the marina, mitigation measures 15b and 15c shall be undertaken.					
Bio-15b: Eelgrass Survey. Prior to any construction activities in aquatic habitats, a survey for eelgrass beds or patches shall be conducted within 750 ft of expected aquatic construction activities. The survey shall be conducted by a biologist(s) familiar with eelgrass identification and ecology and approved by NMFS to conduct such a survey. Survey methods shall employ either SCUBA or sufficient grab samples to ensure that the bottom was adequately inventoried. The survey shall occur between August and October and collect data on eelgrass distribution, density, and depth of occurrence for the survey areas. The edges of any eelgrass beds or patches shall be mapped. At the conclusion of the survey a report shall be prepared documenting the survey methods, results, and eelgrass distribution, if any, within the survey area. This report shall be submitted to NMFS for approval. If OPSP activities can be adjusted so that no direct impacts to eelgrass beds would occur, no further mitigation would be required. If direct impacts to eelgrass beds cannot be avoided, the following measures shall be implemented. Bio-15c: Compensatory Eelgrass Mitigation. If direct impacts to	If triggered by Bio-15a, prior to in-water construction	Applies to all construction occurring "in water"	Completion of survey and, if impacts occur, fulfillment of compensatory mitigation	SFF Planning Division	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
eelgrass beds cannot be avoided, compensatory mitigation shall be provided in conformance with the Southern California Eelgrass Mitigation Policy. Mitigation shall entail the replacement of impacted eelgrass at a 3:1 (mitigation: impact) ratio on an acreage basis, based on the eelgrass mapping described in mitigation measure 8B above, and detailed designs of the feature(s) that would impact eelgrass beds. Such mitigation could occur either off site or on site (NMFS 2005b). Off-site mitigation could be achieved through distribution of a sufficient amount of funding to allow restoration or enhancement of eelgrass beds at another location in the Bay. If this option is selected, all funds shall be distributed to the appropriate state or federal agency or restoration-focused non-governmental agency (i.e., CDFG restoration fund, California Coastal Conservancy, Save the Bay, etc). The OPSP Applicant shall provide written evidence to the City that either a) compensation has been established through the purchase of a sufficient number of mitigation credits to satisfy the mitigation acreage requirements of the OPSP activity, or funds sufficient for the restoration of the mitigation acreage requirements of the OPSP activity have been paid. These funds shall be applied only to eelgrass restoration within the Bay. If on-site mitigation is selected as the appropriate option, the OPSP Applicant shall retain a qualified biologist familiar with eelgrass ecology to prepare and implement a detailed Eelgrass Mitigation Plan. Unless otherwise directed by NMFS, the Eelgrass Mitigation Plan shall follow the basic outline and contain all the components required of the Southern California Eelgrass Mitigation Policy (as revised in 2005), including: identification of the mitigation need, site, transplant methodology, mitigation extent (typically 3:1 on an acreage basis), monitoring protocols (including frequency, staffing,					

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
reviewing agencies, duration, etc), and success criteria. A draft Eelgrass Mitigation Plan shall be submitted to NMFS, for its review and approval prior to implementation, with a copy to the City. Once the plan has been approved, it shall be implemented in the following appropriate season for transplantation. Restored eelgrass beds shall be monitored for success over a 5-year period.					
Culture-1a: Halt Construction Activity, Evaluate Find and Implement Mitigation. In the event that any previously unidentified paleontological or archaeological resources are uncovered during site preparation, excavation or other construction activity, all such activity shall cease until these resources have been evaluated by a qualified paleontologist or archaeologist and specific mitigation measures can be implemented to protect these resources. Culture-1b: Halt Construction Activity, Evaluate Find and Take Appropriate Action in Coordination with Native American Heritage Commission. In the event that any human remains are uncovered during site preparation, excavation or other construction activity, all such activity shall cease until these resources have been evaluated by the County Coroner, and appropriate action taken in coordination with the Native American Heritage Commission.	During construction	Applies to all construction	Halt to construction if resources found	SSF Building Division	
Geo-2a: Compliance with California Building Code. OPSP development shall meet requirements of the California Building Code, including the California Building Standards, published by the International Conference of Building Officials, and as modified by the amendments, additions and deletions as adopted by the City of South San Francisco, California. Incorporation of seismic	Prior to issuance of building permit	Applies to all construction	Adherence to code, completion of report and issuance of permit	SSF Building Division	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
construction standards will reduce the potential for catastrophic effects of ground shaking, such as complete structural failure, but will not completely eliminate the hazard of seismically induced ground shaking. Geo-2b: Compliance with a design-level Geotechnical Investigation report prepared by a Registered Geotechnical Engineer and with Structural Design Plans as prepared by a Licensed Professional Engineer. Proper foundation engineering and construction shall be performed in accordance with the recommendations of a Registered Geotechnical Engineer and a Licensed Professional Engineer. The structural engineering design, with supporting Geotechnical Investigation, shall incorporate seismic parameters compliant with the California Building Code. Geo-2c: Obtain a building permit. The OPSP applicant shall obtain a building permit through the City of South San Francisco Building Division. Plan Review of planned buildings and structures shall be completed by the Building Division for adherence to the seismic design criteria for planned commercial and industrial sites in the East of 101 area of the City of South San Francisco. According to the East of 101 area plan, Geotechnical Safety Element, buildings shall not be subject to catastrophic collapse under foreseeable seismic events, and will allow egress of occupants in the event of damage following a strong earthquake.					
Geo-3a: Compliance with recommendations of a Geotechnical Investigation and in conformance with Structural Design Plans. A design-level Geotechnical Investigation shall be prepared for the site under the direction of a California Registered Geotechnical Engineer and shall include analysis for liquefaction potential of the	Prior to issuance of building permit	Applies to all construction	Completion of adequate report, adherence of plans to the	SSF Building Division and SSF Public Works Department	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
site soils, particularly in the perimeter dikes. Proper foundation engineering and construction shall be performed in accordance with the recommendations of the Geotechnical Investigation. The Geotechnical Investigation shall be reviewed and approved by the City's Geotechnical Consultant and by the City Engineer. A Registered Structural Engineer shall prepare project structural design plans. Structures shall be designed to reduce the effects of anticipated seismic settlements. The Geotechnical Engineer shall review the Structural Design Plans and provide approval for the Geotechnical elements of the plans. The design plans shall identify specific mitigation measures to reduce liquefaction potential, if the potential for liquefaction is found to exist, or other ground failure modes such as lateral spreading, seismic densification or stability of the perimeter dike slopes. Mitigation measures may include ground improvement by methods such as stone columns or jet grouting. Geo-3b: Obtain a building permit. The OPSP applicant shall obtain a building permit through the City of South San Francisco Building Division. Plan Review of planned buildings and structures shall be completed by the Building Division for adherence to the seismic design criteria for planned commercial and industrial sites in the East of 101 area of the City of South San Francisco. According to the East of 101 area plan, Geotechnical Safety Element, buildings should not be subject to catastrophic collapse under foreseeable seismic events, and will allow egress of occupants in the event of damage following a strong earthquake.		Applies on a building by building basis	report and issuance of permit		
Geo-4: Compliance with recommendations of a Geotechnical Investigation. A design-level Geotechnical Investigation shall include an evaluation of static stability and seismic stability under a design magnitude earthquake event. Seismic analyses shall include	Prior to issuance of building permit	Applies to all construction	Completion of adequate report	SSF Building Division and SSF Public Works	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
pseudo-static analyses to estimate permanent slope displacements due to earthquake motions. The Geotechnical Engineer shall prepare recommendations to mitigate potential slope instability, if slope stability problems are identified. Mitigation measures may include ground improvement by methods such as stone columns or jet grouting. Design-level Geotechnical Investigations shall be completed during preliminary and final design stages and will confirm material types used in the construction of the perimeter dikes to verify that the slopes meet minimum criteria for stability under both static and seismic conditions. Knowledge of the stability of the perimeter dikes will guide the selection of any future measures to mitigate any deficiencies identified in the perimeter dike.				Department	
Geo-5a: Deep Foundations. Because of the magnitude of expected settlement of Bay Mud soils and waste fill materials that would occur under new building loads, the OPSP applicant must consider the use of deep foundations such as driven piles. Specific recommendations for suitable deep foundation alternatives and required penetrations will be provided during the course of a design-level geotechnical investigation and will depend on factors such as the depth and hardness of the underlying clays, sands or bedrock, and the corrosivity of the waste materials and Bay Mud soils. Suitable deep foundation types may include driven precast, prestressed concrete piles or driven closed-end steel pipe piles with the interior of the pile filled with concrete after driving. Deep foundations shall extend through all waste materials and Bay Mud and be tipped in underlying stiff to hard clays, dense sands or weathered bedrock. Where waste and Bay Mud soils underlie the site, wall and column loads as well as floor slabs shall be founded	Prior to issuance of building permit	Applies to all construction with piles	Adherence to specifications provided in measure	SSF Building Division	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
on deep foundations. Settlement of properly-designed and constructed deep foundation elements is typically less than about one-half inch. The majority of settlement typically occurs during construction as the loads are applied. Where landfill waste and Bay Mud are not present (possibly at extreme western and northwestern edges of the site) and competent soil or bedrock are present near the ground surface (within about 5 feet of finished grade elevation), shallow foundations such as footings or mats may be appropriate foundation types, as determined during the course of a design-level geotechnical investigation. Where proposed structures straddle a transition zone between these conditions, a combination of shallow and deep foundations may be required. Any transition zones shall be identified during site-specific geotechnical investigations for preliminary and final designs. Geo-5b: Predrilling and/or Pile Configuration. Piles either shall be predrilled through the fill and landfill materials to protect the piles from damage due to unknown materials, to reduce pushing waste material deeper, and to reduce pile alignment problems or shall have a pointed tip configuration. If a drill is used, it should only loosen and break up in-place obstructions that may cause pile damage. During recent subsurface investigations reported by Treadwell & Rollo (2009b) obstructions including concrete rubble was encountered throughout the landfill area, particularly in the northern end of the site. Even with predrilling, precast concrete piles could be damaged during installation at a landfill site such as Oyster Point. For preliminary planning purposes, a precast concrete pile breakage rate during installation of 10 to 15 percent may be considered applicable. Piles usually have to include pointed tip configurations to avoid					

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
pushing landfill waste downward. These configurations are typically readily accommodated by pile driving contractors. Geo-5c: Indicator Pile Program. Prior to specifying the lengths of the production piles, drive indicator piles at the structure sites in order to observe the driving characteristic of the piles and the ability of the driving equipment when a driven pile is used. The driving criteria and pile length of production piles shall also be estimated from the information obtained from driving of the indicator piles. The contractor shall use the same equipment to drive both the indicator and production piles. Indicator pile lengths and locations shall be selected by the Geotechnical Engineer, in conjunction with the Structural Engineer and Contractor after the foundation plan has been finalized. The indicator pile program will serve to establish information on the following: ○ Estimates of production pile lengths; ○ Drivability of production piles; ○ Performance of pile driving equipment; and ○ Variation in driving resistance relative to depth and location of piles.					
Geo-6: Account for Drag Load on Deep Foundations. The Geotechnical Engineer shall account for accumulation of drag load in the structural design of the deep foundations elements (piles).	Prior to issuance of building permit	Applies to all construction with piles	Verification Geotechnical Engineer has addressed drag load	SSF Building Division	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
Geo-7: Incorporate Systems for Landfill Gas Control. Measures for the control of landfill gas shall be included in building design. Measures for the control of landfill gas typically include a collection system, floor slab shielding and interior alarms.	For projects on or adjacent to the landfill area, during preliminary project design and prior to issuance of building permit	Applies on a building by building basis	Verification that measures for the control of landfill gas are included	SSF Building Division and SSF Public Works Department	
Geo-8a: Avoid Significant New Loads on Landfill Waste and Bay Mud. A design-level Geotechnical Investigation shall include exploration to more thoroughly determine the thickness and areal extent of landfill waste and Bay Mud. To avoid inducing additional settlement to the settlement that is already on-going, grading plans shall include as little additional new fill as possible, and significant new structure loads or any structures that are settlement-sensitive shall be founded on deep foundations extended below the Bay Mud, as recommended in the design-level Geotechnical Investigation report. All grading shall be planned to avoid penetrating the landfill cap and to reduce the amount of long-term settlement in response to new fills. Because the Bay Mud and waste across most of the site are still settling under the weight of existing fill and waste decomposition and will settle more under new fills, additional settlement should be expected, with the creation of localized low-lying surface areas. Existing low areas shall be corrected during site grading to allow for proper drainage. Long-term maintenance planning for the development shall also include provisions for	Prior to issuance of building permit	Applies to all construction	Verification of adequate report	SSF Building Division and SSF Public Works Department	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
periodic grading to correct drainage problems and improve site grades, as outlined in the Disposition and Development Agreement. The Geotechnical Engineer will recommend other site-specific recommendations based on the results of the design-level Geotechnical Investigation to mitigate on-going settlement and any additional settlement to be expected in response to new development.					
Geo-8b: Design Building-Soil Interface to Allow Free Movement. The Structural Engineer shall provide that structures not supported on deep foundations not be structurally tied into pile-supported buildings, except as noted below, and shall be designed to allow free vertical movement between structures. Articulated ramps on walkways and building entrances at the interface between the pile and soil-supported areas can provide a smooth walkway over moderate differential settlements with some amount of maintenance. As the magnitude of the differential settlement increases, however, these ramps may need to be rebuilt or realigned to account for the larger elevation differential. Similar ramps may also reduce differential settlements between driveways and pile-supported parking lots. Over time, voids will tend to form beneath pile-supported buildings due to on-going settlement of the landfill. Use of wall skirts around the building perimeter will help to reduce the visual impact of these voids.	Prior to issuance of building permit	Applies to all construction	Verification of compliant construction plans	SSF Building Division	
Geo-9a: Monitoring and Testing. Special precautions shall be taken to monitor the safety conditions and to provide for the safety	For projects on the landfill area,	Applies to all construction on	Adherence to measures if	SSF Building Division and	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
of workers in the area. Additionally, if excavations encounter water, this water shall be tested for contaminants and may have to undergo specialized handling, treatment and/or disposal if it is contaminated. A system to disperse methane during construction shall be installed in or adjacent to the trenches.	prior to issuance of building permit and during construction	a landfill	water discovered during excavation	SSF Public Works Department	
Geo-9b: Locate Underground Utilities in Soil Cap. To the extent practicable, the utilities shall be constructed in the soil landfill cap to avoid direct contact of the utility lines and construction workers with the waste material. If construction of utilities in the waste material is necessary, proper design and construction precautions shall be taken to protect the system and the workers from the corrosive and hazardous conditions of the waste. Geo-9c: Seal Trenches and Underground Structures. Trenches and underground structures shall be sealed to preclude gas intrusion. Typical types of sealing procedures include providing a low permeability clay cover of 1 foot over the top of the pipe, or the utility trench be lined with a relatively impervious geomembrane. Underground manholes may be shielded from methane intrusion by placement of a membrane around the outside of the structure. To reduce gas migration off-site within the utility trenches, all trenches crossing the transition zone between the landfill and non-landfill portions of the property shall be sealed with a clay plug surrounding the pipe or other approved methods. In addition, plugs shall also be provided at the perimeters of buildings to reduce migration of gas through the utility trenches to beneath the buildings.	For projects on the landfill area, prior issuance of building permit and during construction	Applies to all construction on a landfill	Verification of compliant plans and adherence to approved plans during construction	SSF Building Division and SSF Public Works Department	
Geo-10: Provide For Continuity of Landfill Cap. Following planned landfill excavation and landfill cap repair, the project Civil	For projects on the landfill area,	Applies to all construction on	Verification of landfill cap	SSF Building Division and	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
Engineer shall require that excavations for building foundations, utility trenches and other underground structures be configured to maintain continuity of the landfill cap. The specific configuration will depend upon the excavation depth and orientation to underlying wastes. However, a low-permeability layer of soil or a geomembrane properly tied to surrounding cap areas may be required.	prior to issuance of building permit and during construction	a landfill	installation	SSF Public Works Department	
Geo-11: Common Trenches and Vaults. Where underground utilities are to be located in landfill areas, consideration shall be given to reducing the number of utilities trenches by locating utilities in common trenches to the extent practicable. In addition, vaulted systems shall be designed and maintained at such interfaces that provide flexible and/or expandable connections to the proposed buildings. In addition, the utility lines beneath buildings shall be suspended from hangers fastened to structural floor slabs.	For projects on the landfill area, during preliminary design and prior to issuance of building permit	Applies to all construction on a landfill	Verification of adherence to measures	SSF Building Division and SSF Public Works Department	
Geo-12: Flexible Materials and Joints. Utility lines shall be constructed of flexible pipe such as welded polyethylene to accommodate differential settlement within the waste material and landfill cap. At the border of the landfill, where differential settlements are expected to be large, the utility lines shall be designed to allow for rotation. As with buried utilities on a conventional site, proper bedding and backfilling shall be completed, as specified in a design-level geotechnical investigation report.	For projects on the landfill area, during preliminary design, prior to issuance of building permit and during construction	Applies to all construction on a landfill	Verification of adherence to measures	SSF Building Division and SSF Public Works Department	
Geo-13: Increase Flow Gradient. The Civil Engineer shall consider increasing the flow gradient in sewers and storm drains so	For projects on the landfill area,	Applies to all construction on	Verification of adherence	SSF Building Division and	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
that differential settlements will not disrupt the flow. An alternative is to provide a pumping system that does not rely on gravity flow. Such measures will reduce the impact of reduced flow gradient due to differential settlement to less than significant. This applies to the entire OPSP, including the Phase I Project.	during preliminary design, prior to issuance of building permit and during construction	a landfill	to measures	SSF Public Works Department	
Geo-14: Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. In accordance with the Clean Water Act and the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), the Applicant shall file a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) prior to the start of construction. The SWPPP shall include specific best management practices to reduce soil erosion. This is required to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity (Construction General Permit, 99-08-DWQ).	Prior to issuance of building permit and during construction	Applies to all construction	Verification that adequate plan prepared	SSF Building Division and SSF Public Works Department	
Geo-16: Compliance with Recommendations of a Coastal Engineer. A design-level investigation of the sustainability of the proposed bayside open space in the local wave environment shall be prepared by a qualified coastal engineer. Elements of this analysis shall include an investigation of the local wave environment at the proposed bayside open space location, development and verification of numerical models of local wave action based on comparisons of measured and predicted wave heights, and application of the predictive numerical models to refine the open space design. Depending on the results of this investigation, the design of the bayside open space may need to incorporate protection measures such as structural elements (e.g., concrete seawalls) and/or buffer	During preliminary design and prior to issuance of building permit	Applies to all construction in the bayside open space area	Verification that adequate study prepared	SSF Building Division and SSF Public Works Department	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
zones (i.e., lengths of flat beach between the dynamic beach slope and any needed structural elements). The design plans shall incorporate appropriate recommendations from this investigation. If the recommendations require any construction in-water or near the shoreline, these may require subsequent permitting from BCDP and/or USACE and would also be subject to mitigation measures Bio-12, -13a, -13b, 14a, -14b, -14c, -15a, -15b, and -15c.					
Haz-1a: Plan Review for Adherence to Fire and Safety Codes. Building space shall be designed to handle the intended use, with sprinklers, alarms, vents, and secondary containment structures, where applicable. These systems shall pass plan review through the City of South San Francisco Planning, Building and Fire Departments.	Prior to issuance of building permit	Applies on a building by building basis	Adherence to Fire and Safety Codes	and SSF Fire Department	
Haz-1b: Construction Inspection and Final Inspection Prior to Occupancy. During construction, the utilities including sprinkler systems shall pass pressure and flush tests to make sure they perform as designed. At the end of construction, occupancy shall not be allowed until a final inspection is made by the Fire Department for conformance of all building systems with the Fire Code and National Fire Protection Agency Requirements. The inspection shall include testing of sprinklers systems, alarm systems, ventilation and airflow systems, and secondary containment systems. The inspection shall include a review of the emergency evacuation plans. These plans shall be modified as deemed necessary.	During construction and prior to occupancy	Applies on a building by building basis	Fulfillment of inspections	SSF Building Division	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
Haz-1c: Hazardous Materials Business Plan Program. Businesses occupying the development shall complete a Hazardous Materials Business Plan for the safe storage and use of chemicals. The Business Plan shall include the type and quantity of hazardous materials, a site map showing storage locations of hazardous materials and where they may be used and transported from, risks of using these materials, material safety data sheets for each material, a spill prevention plan, an emergency response plan, employee training consistent with OSHA guidelines, and emergency contact information. Businesses qualify for the program if they store a hazardous material equal to or greater than the minimum reportable quantities. These quantities are 55 gallons for liquids, 500 pounds for solids and 200 cubic feet (at standard temperature and pressure) for compressed gases. Exemptions include businesses selling only pre-packaged consumer goods; medical professionals who store oxygen, nitrogen, and/or nitrous oxide in quantities not more than 1,000 cubic feet for each material, and who store or use no other hazardous materials; or facilities that store no more than 55 gallons of a specific type of lubricating oil, and for which the total quantity of lubricating oil not exceed 275 gallons for all types of lubricating oil. These exemptions are not expected to apply to on-site laboratory facilities. Businesses occupying and/or operating at the proposed development shall submit a business plan prior to the start of operations, and shall review and update the entire Business Plan at least once every two years, or within 30 days of any significant change, including without limitation, changes to emergency contact information, major increases or decreases in hazardous materials storage and/or changes in location of hazardous materials. Plans shall be submitted to the San Mateo County Environmental Health	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy by hazardous waste generating user	Applies to all qualifying businesses	Verification of adherence to measures	SSF Building Division	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
Department (SMCEHD) Business Plan Program, which may be contacted at (650) 363-4305 for more information. The SMCEHD shall inspect the business at least once a year to make sure that the Business Plan is complete and accurate. Haz-1d: Hazardous Waste Generator Program. Qualifying businesses shall register and comply with the hazardous waste generator program. The State of California DTSC authorized the SMCEHD to inspect and regulate non-permitted hazardous waste generators in San Mateo County based on the Hazardous Waste Control Law found in the California Health and Safety Code Division 20, Chapter 6.5 and regulations found in the CCR Title 22, Division 4.5. Regulations require businesses generating any amount of hazardous waste as defined by regulation to properly store, manage and dispose of such waste. SMCEHD staff also conducts surveillance and enforcement activities in conjunction with the County District Attorney's Office for businesses or individuals that significantly violate the above referenced law and regulations.					
Haz-1e: Compliance with Applicable Laws and Regulations. All transportation of hazardous materials and hazardous waste to and from the OPSP area shall be in accordance with CFR Title 49, US Department of Transportation (DOT), State of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and local laws, ordinances and procedures including placards, signs and other identifying information.	All phases as applicable	Applies to all qualifying transporters	Adherence to stated laws and regulations	SSF Fire Department	
Haz-2: Waste Excavation and Re-disposition. A plan shall be written for management of excavated wastes/refuse. Non-hazardous excavated waste shall be re-deposited in an alternate part of the site	Prior to issuance of building permit and	Applies to all construction	Completion of plan	SSF Public Works Department	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
and any hazardous waste shall be relocated off-site for appropriate disposal. The plan can be a section of the Site Management Plan (Mitigation Measure Haz-4a), or a stand alone document. The plan shall include measures to avoid releases of wastes or waste water into the environment and to protect workers and the public. The details of the plan shall be based, in part, on the amount of material to be removed and the final design of foundation structures, but will generally include the following, as deemed appropriate by the regulatory agencies, particularly DTSC and RWQCB: ○ To the greatest extent possible, use existing boring data to obtain pre-characterization of refuse for off-site disposal, and to pre-plan areas to be removed versus areas to be re-deposited on-site. ○ Divide excavation areas into daily sections; plan to complete excavation and backfilling a section during each working day. Minimize the time period that refuse is exposed. ○ Review existing boring data and existing site documentation to evaluate potential subsurface materials to be encountered. ○ Stake out area to be excavated. ○ If excavation is to be conducted at depths where groundwater is to be encountered, conduct dewatering to minimize worker potential direct contact with groundwater. Removed groundwater shall be treated in accordance with the requirements outlined in the Site Management Plan (Mitigation Measure Haz-4a). ○ Screen excavation site with a portable photoionization	during construction on the landfill area				

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
detector and combustible gas monitor for landfill gasses. Continue screening progress of each excavation section as work proceeds. Use foam suppressants or 6 inches minimum of daily soil cover for nuisance odors. ○ Provide carbon dioxide gas source (fire extinguisher or cylinder) to flood excavation as necessary to prevent migration of gases into atmosphere above excavation, minimize explosive or fire potential, and control nuisance and odors. ○ Begin excavation and segregate soil and /or clay cap material above refuse for reuse as foundation layer. ○ Upon reaching refuse, place refuse into dump truck standing by on-site. ○ Dispose of each truck load of refuse immediately after filling equipment. All loads to be covered when hauling. Refuse shall be either re-deposited on-site in a specified area, or hauled to an off-site disposal facility. ○ Prior to relocation, field verify each load for disposal classification type (landfill classification, Class 3 or Class 2). If waste for off-site disposal is characterized as either California or Federal Hazardous Waste as defined in the criteria described in CCR Title 22 Section 66261, then the hazardous waste shall be tracked using the Uniform Hazardous Waste Manifest System (USEPA Form 8700-22). ○ Hazardous and if necessary, non-hazardous waste shall be transported to the appropriate disposal facility using a permitted, licensed, and insured transportation company.					

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
Transporters of hazardous waste shall meet the requirements of 40 CFR 263 and 22 CCR 66263. Copies of uniform hazardous waste manifests signed by the designated waste disposal facility shall be retained for at least five years from the date the waste was accepted by the initial transporter. Copies of records pertaining to the characterization of hazardous or nonhazardous waste shall be retained for a minimum of three years. ○ Upon reaching over-excavation depth, place a minimum of 6-inch thick layer of appropriate backfill soil on excavation bottom to seal exposed refuse surface. Place soil by the end of the same day excavation is completed. ○ Upon completion of excavation, begin cap placement procedures. Specific measures shall be targeted to minimize the duration of waste exposure, plan for appropriate final destination of wastes based on the presence of contaminants of concern, allow for adjustment in plan based on unexpected occurrences, and to protect worker safety and the public. Additional work plan measures are discussed in Haz-4a. In addition, worker protection measures for soil and dewatering are discussed in Haz-6a. Measures specific to off-site air quality during construction are included in mitigation measure Air-4.					
Haz-3: Demolition Plan and Permitting. A demolition plan with permit applications shall be submitted to the City of South San	Prior to issuance of demolition	Applies to all demolition	Preparation of adequate plan	SSF Building Division	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
Francisco Building Department for approval prior to demolition. Prior to obtaining a demolition permit from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), an asbestos demolition survey shall be conducted in accordance with the requirements of BAAQMD Regulation 11, Rule 2. Prior to building demolition, hazardous building materials such as peeling, chipping and friable lead-based paint and asbestos containing building materials, if identified on the site, shall be removed in accordance with all applicable guidelines, laws, and ordinances. The Demolition Plan for safe demolition of existing structures shall incorporate recommendations from the site surveys for the presence of potentially hazardous building materials, as well as additional surveys if required by the City. The demolition plan shall address both on-site Worker Protection and off-site resident protection from both chemical and physical hazards. Contaminated building materials, if identified, shall be tested for contaminant concentrations and shall be disposed of to appropriate licensed landfill facilities. The Demolition Plan shall include a program of air monitoring for dust particulates and attached contaminants, as merited by the surveys. The need for dust control and suspension of work during dry windy days shall be addressed in the plan.	permit				
Haz-4a: Landfill Cap Upgrades. A landfill cap currently exists to prevent exposure of the public to impacted solids or groundwater. The cap shall be repaired and upgraded to meet CCR Title 27 requirements. CCR Title 27 requires closed landfills have a minimum 4 foot cap, consisting of a 2 foot base layer, a 1 foot clay layer with specified low hydraulic conductivity and a 1 foot erosion control layer. The minimum 4 feet of clean material that comprises the cap shall prevent exposure of the underlying material,	Prior to issuance of building permit and during construction on the landfill area.	Applies to all landfill cap upgrades	Installation of upgraded landfill cap	SSF Building Division and SSF Public Works Department	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
preventing releases at the surface. The low hydraulic conductivity layer shall also act to minimize generation of leachate.					
Haz-4b: Use Of Deep Foundations To Prevent Load Induced Settlement. Buildings on fill shall be supported using driven steel or concrete piles founded in stiff to hard clays, dense sands or weathered bedrock underlying the fill. Both the structural loads and building floor slabs shall be supported on piles. This will avoid placing additional building loads on fill material.	Prior to issuance of building permit for development on the landfill area.	Applies to all construction with piles	Verification that measures addressed in construction plans	SSF Building Division	
Haz-4c: Minimization of Irrigation Water Use. Landscaping of the site shall be selected to stabilize the soil, prevent erosion, and reduce the need for extensive irrigation. Excessive water could infiltrate the landfill cap and produce leachate. To prevent this, low-water vegetation shall be selected to reduce irrigation water. In addition the thickness of the erosion resistant layer in landscaped areas will be increased to minimize intrusion of roots into the lower layers of the cover.	Prior to issuance of building permit for development on the landfill area.	Applies to all landscaping	Verify low-water demand species in the landscape plan	SSF Planning Division	
Haz-4d: Monitoring for Leachate Migration. A series of natural and man-made barriers have been implemented to prevent migration of impacted leachate into the surrounding area. Based on monitoring at the site implemented per the PCMP, these measures are currently effective in preventing releases. Leachate shall continue to be monitored, as discussed in Haz-4e, below. Leachate containment for the landfill portion of the OPSP shall be upgraded as needed during and following construction, as per the requirements of RWQCB Order No. 00-046 and the PCMP.	After construction for development on the landfill area.	City	Maintenance of leachate barrier(s) and prevention of hazardous chemical release	SSF Public Works Department	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
Haz-4e: Operation and Maintenance Activities. Operation and maintenance (O&M) activities are expected to occur indefinitely at the site. Operation and maintenance activities shall include inspections and observations of site features to protect the landfill cap, prevent utility damage, maintain gravity flow of sewer systems, maintain the landfill gas barrier and venting systems, and monitor for leachate and groundwater contaminant concentrations. O&M shall act to prevent releases of hazardous materials by identifying deficits in engineering controls prior to release events.	After construction for development on the landfill area.	City is responsible for monitoring; all other activities are responsibility of property owner	Maintenance and prevention of hazardous chemical release	SSF Public Works Department	
Haz-5: California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CalARP). Future businesses at the development shall check the state and federal lists of regulated substances available from the SMCEHD. Chemicals on the list are chemicals that pose a major threat to public health and safety or the environment because they are highly toxic, flammable or explosive. Businesses shall determine which list to use in consultation with the SMCEHD. Should businesses qualify for the program, they shall complete a CalARP registration form and submit it to SMCEHD. Following registration, they shall submit a Risk Management Plan (RMP). RMPs are designed to handle accidental releases and ensure that businesses have the proper information to provide to emergency response teams if an accidental release occurs. All businesses that store or handle more than a threshold quantity (TQ) of a regulated substance shall develop a RMP and follow it. Risk Management Plans describe impacts to public health and the	After construction, prior to qualifying business occupancy	Applies to all qualifying businesses	Assurance qualifying businesses prepare RMP	SSF Planning Division	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
environment if a regulated substance is released near schools, residential areas, hospitals and childcare facilities. RMPs shall include procedures for keeping employees and customers safe, the handling regulated substances, staff training, equipment maintenance, checking that substances are stored safely, and responding to an accidental release.					
Haz-6a: Development and Implementation of Site Management Plans. A Site Management Plan shall be prepared that addresses the exposure risk to people and the environment resulting from future demolition, construction, occupancy, and maintenance activities on the property. The plans for the landfill portion of the OPSP shall be in accordance with RWQCB order No. 00-046, the PCMP and recommendations of the Environmental Consultant, and shall be reviewed and approved by the RWQCB, DTSC, the SMCEHD Groundwater Protection Program and the City of South San Francisco Public Works Department. Specific mitigation measures designed to protect human health and the environment shall be provided in the plan. At a minimum, the plan shall include the following: 1) Requirements for site specific Health and Safety Plans (HASP) shall be prepared in accordance with OSHA regulations by all contractors at the OPSP area. This includes a HASP for all demolition, grading and excavation on the site, as well as for future subsurface maintenance work. The HASP shall include appropriate training, any required personal protective equipment, and monitoring of contaminants to determine exposure. The HASP shall be reviewed and approved by a Certified Industrial Hygienist. The plan shall also designate provisions to limit worker entry and	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy of development on the landfill area.	Applies to all construction	Verification that adequate plan prepared	SSF Fire Department	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
exposure and shall show locations and type of protective fencing to prevent public exposure to hazards during demolition, site grading, and construction activities. 2) Requirements for site-specific construction techniques that would minimize exposure to any subsurface contamination shall be developed. This shall include dewatering techniques to minimize direct exposure to groundwater during construction activities, treatment and disposal measures for any contaminated groundwater removed from excavations, trenches, and dewatering systems in accordance with local and Regional Water Quality Control Board guidelines. Groundwater encountered in excavations shall not be discharged into the neighboring storm drain, but into a closed containment facility, unless proven to have concentrations of contaminants below established regulatory guidelines. Extracted contaminated groundwater shall be required to be stored in tanks or other sealed container until tested. If testing determines that the water can be discharged into the sanitary sewer system, then the applicant shall acquire a ground water discharge permit from the City of South San Francisco Sanitary Sewer District and meet local discharge limits before being allowed to discharge into the sanitary sewer. Water shall be analyzed for the chemicals of concern at the site, including benzene, ethylbenzene, xylenes, chlorobenzene, naphthalene and additional compounds as requested by the receiving facility or the City of South San Francisco. 3) Waste relocation. Relocation or removal of existing landfill waste/refuse will be required for landfill cap upgrades and for site construction. Excavated waste can either be re-deposited on site or disposed of at an active landfill facility. Off-site disposal will require pre-characterization of the waste for acceptance at an approved waste disposal facility. Waste manifests will be prepared					

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
to document transportation and disposal. On-site disposal shall require proper placement, compaction, and capping of the refuse material. In either case, segregation of Class 2 and Class 3 from Class 1 material for disposal purposes shall be performed on-site to the extent possible. No Class 1 material shall be relocated or re-deposited on-site. BAAQMD Regulation 8 Rule 34 section 118 documents a limited exemption for construction activities at landfill sites. This section specifies that when the construction activities are related to “installing, expanding, replacing, or repairing components of the landfill gas, leachate, or gas condensate collection and removal systems.” Excavation for cap upgrades falls under this exemption. Excavation for construction purposes will also likely fall under this exemption. As such it will be necessary to provide BAAQMD with construction plans and other documentation as detailed under this regulation for the purposes of obtaining a letter of exemption from BAAQMD. Excavation procedures are also discussed in Measure Haz-2. 4) Future subsurface work plan. The plan shall document procedures for future subsurface landscaping work, utility maintenance, etc., with proper notification, where applicable. The plan shall include a general health and safety plan for each expected type of work, with appropriate personal protective equipment, where applicable. This plan may be included in the operations and maintenance plan as appropriate.					
Haz-6b: Landfill Gas System. Section 21160 of Title 27 of the CCR requires that closed landfills implement and maintain landfill gas control. A landfill gas (LFG) venting system shall be placed under the bottom slabs of each structure built entirely or partially over landfill material, to collect and vent the build up of gases	Prior to issuance of building permit for development on	Applies on a building by building basis	Verification of gas control system included in design and	SSF Building Division and SSF Public Works	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
diffusing through the landfill cap. The LFG system shall include spray-applied vapor barrier membranes, horizontal collection and passive venting, gas detection and monitoring. The system shall either have backup active collection and venting or shall be designed to facilitate retrofitting with an active system, if measures warrant the retrofit. Potential migration of LFG into the building space shall be mitigated by the collection and venting system, and secondly by the spray-applied membrane. Subsurface landfill gases shall be vented by a network of perforated piping placed beneath the building slabs. The exhaust gases shall be manifolded to a series of riser piping that is to be vented above structure roofs. Passive landfill gas systems do not require permits, however if an active system is installed, either at the time of construction or as part of a retrofit, a BAAQMD permit will be needed.	the landfill area.		constructed	Department	
Haz-6c: Non-use of Groundwater. Water supply wells shall not be installed at the site. This will prevent direct contact between the public and site groundwater and leachate.	Before, during and after construction for development on the landfill area.	Applies to all parties	Verification that no wells installed	SSF Building Division	
Haz-6d: San Mateo County Environmental Health Department Closure of Existing Facilities. Any businesses on the site that are currently registered in the hazardous materials business plan program shall submit a closure work plan in accordance with the SMCEHD Business Closure Policy prior to vacating the property. The closure plan shall detail any necessary sampling and remediation. Closure shall not be granted until businesses have demonstrated there is no need for further remediation, and shall	Prior to qualifying business vacancy	Applies to all currently registered businesses	Completion of closure plan for qualifying business	SSF Fire Department	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
include documentation of the removal of any hazardous chemicals.					
Hydro-1: Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be used during installation of foundation piers to reduce the potential for gaps in the subsurface confining layers around the piers. BMP requirements shall be identified in the SWPPP and shall be developed by the applicant or their authorized representative. The exact BMPs to be implemented shall depend on final pier design and type, but can include pre-drilling and grouting of concrete piers, use of hollow steel piers, or other methods to reduce the risk of displaced refuse creating a void in the Bay Mud layer. The proposed BMPs shall be benchmarked against the California Department of Transportation Stormwater Quality Handbooks Construction Site Best Management Practices (BMPs) Manual (2003 and associated updates).	Prior to issuance of building permit and during construction for development on the landfill area.	Applies to all construction with piles	Adherence to BMPs during construction	SSF Building Division	
Hydro-2: Preparation and Implementation of Project SWPPP. Pursuant to NPDES requirements, the applicant of a project under the OPSP shall develop a SWPPP to protect water quality during construction. If the SWPPP will be developed after September 2, 2011, the SWPPP shall be developed by a California Qualified SWPPP Developer in accordance with the State Water Resources Control Board Construction General Permit 2009-009-DWQ. The project SWPPP shall include, but is not limited, to the following mitigation measures for the construction period: 1) Grading and earthwork shall be allowed with the appropriate SWPPP measures during the wet season (October 1 through April 30) and such work shall be stopped before pending storm events. 2) Erosion control/soil stabilization techniques such as straw	Prior to issuance of building permit and during construction	Applies to all construction	Verification that adequate plan prepared	SSF Building Division and SSF Public Works Department	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
mulching, erosion control blankets, erosion control matting, and hydro-seeding, shall be utilized in accordance with the regulations outlined in the Association of Bay Area Governments “Erosion & Sediment Control Measures” manual. Silt fences shall be installed down slope of all graded slopes. Hay bales shall be installed in the flow path of graded areas receiving concentrated flows and around storm drain inlets. 3) BMPs to be developed by the applicant shall be used for preventing the discharge or other construction-related NPDES pollutants beside sediment (i.e. paint, concrete, etc) to downstream waters. 4) After construction is completed, all drainage facilities shall be inspected for accumulated sediment and these drainage structures shall be cleared of debris and sediment. In accordance with the handbook C.3 Stormwater Technical Guidance, Version 2, permanent mitigation measures for stormwater shall be submitted as part of project application submittals with the Planning Permit Application and the Building Permit Application. Elements that shall be addressed in the submittals include the following: 5) Description of potential sources of erosion and sediment at the OPSP area. R&D activities and significant materials and chemicals that could be used at the proposed OPSP area shall be described. This shall include a thorough assessment of existing and potential pollutant sources. 6) Identification of BMPs to be implemented at the OPSP area based on identified industrial activities and potential pollutant sources. Emphasis shall be placed on source control BMPs, with treatment controls used as needed.					

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
7) Development of a monitoring and implementation plan. Maintenance requirements and frequency shall be carefully described including vector control, clearing of clogged or obstructed inlet or outlet structures, vegetation/landscape maintenance, replacement of media filters, etc. 8) The monitoring and maintenance program shall be conducted as described in Haz-4e. 9) Proposed pervious and impervious surfaces, including site design measures to minimize impervious surfaces and promote infiltration (except where the landfill cover is present). 10) Proposed locations and approximate sizes of stormwater treatment measures.					
Hydro-3: Compliance with NPDES Requirements. Applicants for a project under the OPSP shall comply with all Phase I NPDES General Construction Activities permit requirements established by the CWA and the Grading Permit requirements of the City of South San Francisco. Erosion control measures to be implemented during construction shall be included in the project SWPPP. The project SWPPP shall accompany the NOI filing and shall outline erosion control and storm water quality management measures to be implemented during and following construction. The SWPPP shall also provide the schedule for monitoring performance. Refer to Mitigation Measure Hydro-2 for more information regarding the project SWPPP. Implementation of Phase I NPDES General Construction Activities permit requirements would reduce construction-related impacts associated with erosion and/or siltation to less-than-significant.	Prior to issuance of building permit and during construction	Applies to all construction	Verification that NPDES measures being carried out	SSF Building Division and SSF Public Works Department	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
Noise-5: Construction Noise. To reduce noise levels generated by construction, the following standard construction noise control measures shall be included in all construction projects within the OPSP area. - Equip all internal combustion engine driven equipment with intake and exhaust mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment. - Unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines should be strictly prohibited. - Locate stationary noise generating equipment such as air compressors or portable power generators as far as possible from sensitive receptors. Construct temporary noise barriers to screen stationary noise generating equipment when located near adjoining sensitive receptors. Temporary noise barriers could reduce construction noise levels by 5 dBA. - Utilize "quiet" air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists. - Route all construction traffic to and from the OPSP area via designated truck routes where possible. Prohibit construction related heavy truck traffic in residential areas where feasible. - Control noise from construction workers' radios to a point that they are not audible at existing residences bordering the OPSP area. - The contractor shall prepare and submit to the City for approval a detailed construction plan identifying the schedule for major noise-generating construction activities.	During construction	Applies to all construction	Verify measures included in construction contracts, adherence to measures during construction	SSF Building Division	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
- Designate a "disturbance coordinator" who would be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator will determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and will require that reasonable measures warranted to correct the problem be implemented. Conspicuously post a telephone number for the disturbance coordinator at the construction site and include it in the notice sent to neighbors regarding the construction schedule. - For pile driving activities, consider a) pre-drilling foundation pile holes to minimize the number of impacts required to seat the pile, b) using multiple pile driving rigs to expedite this phase of construction, and/or c) the use of "acoustical blankets" for receivers located within 100 feet of the site.					
Traf-1: Transportation Demand Management Program. The OPSP sponsors shall implement a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program consistent with the City of South San Francisco Zoning Ordinance Chapter 20.400 Transportation Demand Management, and acceptable to C/CAG. These programs, once implemented, must be ongoing for the occupied life of the development. The C/CAG guidelines specify the number of trips that may be credited for each TDM measure.	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy	Applies to all parties	Approval of Final TDM Program	SSF Planning Division	
Traf-2: Pedestrian Facilities. To discourage mid-block crossing, pedestrian flow across Oyster Point Boulevard between the Phase III & IV garage and the Phase III & IV offices shall be regulated to	Prior to issuance of building permit for the	Developer	Verification that plans show	SSF Planning Department	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
the following extent. ○ Pedestrian access shall only be allowed at the north and south ends of the garage, adjacent to signalized or all-way stop intersections.	Phase III and IV garage		measures complied with	and SSF Public Works Department	
Traf-2b: Bay Trail Continuity Provisions in Construction Management Plan. Continuity of the Bay Trail shall be included in construction management plans for all phases of development in the OPSP. When feasible, construction shall avoid disrupting the Bay Trail and when not feasible, the construction management plan shall specify plans for clear and safe detours for bicyclists and pedestrians and be ADA accessible.	Prior to the issuance of building permit and during construction	Applies to all parties	Verification of inclusion in the construction management plan	SSF Planning Division and SSF Building Division.	
Traf-5: Internal Circulation System Signalization. The OPSP applicant shall provide signals at the Oyster Point Boulevard / Marina Boulevard and Oyster Point Boulevard / Phase II Access / Phases III / IV garage access intersections when volumes are approaching warrant criteria levels.	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy of Phase IV or building at which warrant criteria levels are approached, if earlier.	Oyster Point Blvd. / Marina Blvd. is 80% Developer and 20% City; other intersections are 100% Developer	Installation of signals	SSF Public Works Department	
Traf-6: Oyster Point Boulevard / Gateway Boulevard / U.S.101 Southbound Flyover Off-Ramp (see Table 16.23 and Figure 23 in Appendix E) The following improvements would mitigate the Phase I Project-specific impacts. All of these improvements (other than measures to the Southbound Flyover Off-Ramp, the eastbound	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy of final building of Phase I	TIP: East of 101 Fees; Non-TIP: 29.2% Developer, 4.1%	Payment of traffic impact fee, contribution of fair share	SSF Public Works Department	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
departure and the southbound approach) are included as part of the East of 101 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and will be funded via the Phase I Project's traffic impact fee contribution to this program. The Phase I Project shall also provide a fair share contribution towards all measures currently not part of the TIP. ○ Adjust signal timing. ○ Provide an additional through lane on the Oyster Point westbound approach (extending from Veterans Boulevard) and continue to the Dubuque/U.S.101 Northbound On-Ramp intersection. ○ Restripe the Oyster Point Boulevard eastbound approach from a left, 2 throughs and a combined through/right turn lane to a left, 2 throughs and an exclusive right turn lane. ○ Restripe the Southbound Flyover Off-Ramp approach from 2 through lanes and an exclusive right turn lane to two through lanes and a combined through/right turn lane. In conjunction with this measure, add a third eastbound departure lane on Oyster Point Boulevard (not part of TIP). ○ Add a second exclusive right turn lane on the southbound Genentech property driveway approach (not part of TIP). Resultant 2015 Base Case + Phase I Project Operation: AM Peak Hour: LOS E-79.8 seconds control delay, which is better than LOS F 91.7 seconds control delay Base Case operation. PM Peak Hour: LOS D-54.7 seconds control delay, which is acceptable operation.		City, 66.7% Other			
Traf-7: Oyster Point Boulevard / Veterans Boulevard (see Table	Prior to issuance	Developer	Payment of	SSF Public	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
16.23 and Figure 23 in Appendix E) The following improvements would mitigate the Phase I Project-specific impacts. These improvements are included as part of the East of 101 Transportation Improvement Program and will be funded via the Phase I Project's traffic impact fee contribution to this program. ○ Adjust signal timing. ○ Restripe the two-lane northbound driveway approach to provide an exclusive left turn lane and a combined left / through / right turn lane. Resultant 2015 Base Case + Phase I Project Signalized Operation: PM Peak Hour: LOS E-64.3 seconds control delay (which would be better than Base Case LOS F-88.5 seconds control delay operation)	of certificate of occupancy of final building of Phase I	(TIP)	traffic impact fee	Works Department	
Traf-8: Gateway Boulevard / S. Airport Boulevard / Mitchell Avenue. (see Table 16.23 and Figure 23 in Appendix E) The following improvement would mitigate the Phase I Project-specific impacts. This improvement is included as part of the East of 101 Transportation Improvement Program and will be funded via the Phase I Project's traffic impact fee contribution to this program. ○ Widen the southbound Gateway Boulevard approach to provide a second exclusive right turn lane. The approach would contain one left turn lane, one through lane and 2 exclusive right turn lanes. Resultant 2015 Base Case + Phase I Project Signalized Operation: PM Peak Hour: LOS D-38.4 seconds control delay, which is acceptable operation.	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy of final building of Phase I	Developer (TIP)	Payment of traffic impact fee	SSF Public Works Department	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
Traf-9: Improvements for Vehicle Queuing. (see Figure 23 in Appendix E) The following improvements would mitigate the Phase I Project-specific impact. These improvements are included in the East of 101 Transportation Improvement Program and will be funded via the Phase I Project's traffic impact fee contribution to this program: ○ Airport Boulevard / Sister Cities Boulevard / Oyster Point Boulevard ○ Adjust signal timing. Resultant 95th Percentile Vehicle Queuing – Oyster Point Boulevard Westbound Approach Lanes PM Peak Hour: Each westbound through lane or westbound through / right turn lane = 230 feet, which would be within the available 250 feet of storage per lane.	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy of final building of Phase I	Developer (TIP)	Payment of traffic impact fee	SSF Public Works Department	
Traf-10: Improvements for Vehicle Queuing. (see Figure 23 in Appendix E) The following improvements would mitigate the Phase I Project-specific impact. These improvements are included in the East of 101 Transportation Improvement Program and will be funded via the Phase I Project's traffic impact fee contribution to this program: ○ Oyster Point Boulevard / Dubuque Avenue ○ Adjust signal timing. Resultant 95th Percentile Vehicle Queuing – Oyster Point Boulevard Eastbound Approach Through Lane AM Peak Hour: Eastbound through lane queue = 206 feet, which is less than the 309-foot Base Case queue.	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy of final building of Phase I	Developer (TIP)	Payment of traffic impact fee	SSF Public Works Department	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
Traf-11: Improvements for Off-Ramp Queuing. The following improvements would mitigate the Phase I Project-specific impacts. These improvements are not included in the East of 101 Transportation Improvement Program. - U.S.101 Southbound Flyover Off-Ramp to Oyster Point Boulevard / Gateway Boulevard (see Table 16.23 and Figure 23 in Appendix E) The following improvements would mitigate the Phase I Project-specific impacts. All of these improvements (other than measures to the Southbound Flyover Off-Ramp, eastbound departure and southbound approach) are included as part of the East of 101 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and will be funded via the Phase I Project's traffic impact fee contribution to this program. The Phase I Project shall also provide a fair share contribution towards all measures currently not part of the TIP. - Provide an additional through lane on the Oyster Point westbound approach (extending from Veterans Boulevard) and continue to the Dubuque / U.S.101 Northbound On-Ramp intersection. - Adjust signal timing. - Restripe the Oyster Point Boulevard eastbound approach from a left, 2 throughs and a combined through / right turn lane to a left, 2 throughs and an exclusive right turn lane. - Restripe the Southbound Flyover Off-Ramp approach from 2 through lanes and an exclusive right turn lane to two through lanes and a combined through/right turn lane. In conjunction with this measure, add a third eastbound	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy of final building of Phase I	TIP: East of 101 Fees; Non-TIP: 29.2% Developer, 4.1% City, 66.7% Other	Payment of traffic impact fee; contribution of fair share	SSF Public Works Department	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
departure lane on Oyster Point Boulevard (not part of TIP). ○ Add a second exclusive right turn lane on the southbound Genentech property driveway approach (not part of TIP). Resultant Off-Ramp Queuing: AM Peak Hour: Backups to freeway mainline eliminated.					
Traf-12: Improvements for Off-Ramp Queuing. (see Figure 23 in Appendix E) The following improvements would mitigate the Phase I Project-specific impacts. These improvements are included in the East of 101 Transportation Improvement Program and will be funded via the Phase I Project's traffic impact fee contribution to this program. ○ U.S.101 Northbound Off-Ramp to Dubuque Avenue ○ Adjust signal timing. Resultant Off-Ramp Queuing: AM Peak Hour: Backups to freeway mainline eliminated.	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy of final building of Phase I	Developer (TIP)	Payment of traffic impact fee	SSF Public Works Department	
Traf-14: Improvements for Off-Ramp Operation At Mainline Diverge (see Figure 23 in Appendix E). ○ U.S.101 Northbound Off-Ramp to Dubuque Avenue ○ Provide a second off-ramp lane connection to the U.S.101 mainline. Off-ramp diverge capacity would be increased to at least 2,200 vehicles per hour, which would accommodate the Base Case + Phase I Project AM peak hour volume of 1,536 vehicles per hour. This measure will require the approval of Caltrans. Also, this measure is currently not included in the	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy of final building of Phase I	TIP: Payment of East of 101 Fees; Non-TIP: 30.9% Developer, 4.4% City, 64.7% Other	Payment of traffic impact fee; contribution of fair share	SSF Public Works Department	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
East of 101 Traffic Impact Fee list. It should be noted that because the improvement is within Caltrans' jurisdiction, the City of South San Francisco, as lead agency for the project, cannot guarantee that the mitigation will be implemented. While it is likely that Caltrans will implement the measure, thereby reducing the impact to a less than significant level, because the measure is beyond the lead agency's jurisdiction, for CEQA purposes, this impact is considered to be significant and unavoidable.					
Traf-18: Intersection Level of Service (see Figure 24 in Appendix E). The following improvements would partially mitigate OPSP-specific impacts, but not reduce them to a level of insignificance. Some of these measures are not included as part of the current East of 101 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The OPSP shall provide a fair share contribution towards all measures currently not part of the TIP. Oyster Point Boulevard / Gateway Boulevard / U.S.101 Southbound Flyover Off-Ramp: ○ Adjust signal timing. ○ Provide an additional through lane on the Oyster Point westbound approach (extending from Veterans Boulevard) and continue to the Dubuque/U.S.101 Northbound On-Ramp intersection. ○ Restripe the Oyster Point Boulevard eastbound approach from a left, 2 throughs and a combined through/right turn lane to a left, 2 throughs and an exclusive right turn lane. ○ Restripe the Southbound Flyover Off-Ramp approach from	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy of Phase IV or building at which warrant criteria levels are approached, if earlier	TIP: East of 101 Fees; Non-TIP: 29.2% Developer, 4.1% City, 66.7% Other	Payment of traffic impact fee and fair share contribution	SSF Public Works Department	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
2 through lanes and an exclusive right turn lane to two through lanes and a combined through/right turn lane. In conjunction with this measure, add a third eastbound departure lane on Oyster Point Boulevard (not part of TIP). ○ Add a second exclusive right turn lane on the southbound Genentech property driveway approach (not part of TIP). Resultant 2035 Base Case + OPSP Operation: AM Peak Hour: LOS F-194 seconds control delay, which would not be better than Base Case operation (LOS F-124 seconds delay). PM Peak Hour: LOS F-118 seconds control delay, which would not be better than Base Case operation (LOS F-108 seconds delay).					
Traf-19: Intersection Level of Service. (see Figure 24 in Appendix E) The following improvements would partially mitigate OPSP-specific impacts and reduce them to a level of insignificance. These measures are currently not included as part of the East of 101 Transportation Improvement Program. The OPSP shall provide a fair share contribution towards all measures currently not part of the TIP. ○ Oyster Point Boulevard / Veterans Boulevard ○ Restripe the northbound 2-lane private driveway approach to contain an exclusive left turn lane and a combined left / through / right turn lane. ○ Widen the eastbound Oyster Point Boulevard approach and provide an exclusive right turn lane. Resultant 2035 Base Case + OPSP Operation: AM Peak Hour: LOS D-52.6 seconds control delay, which would	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy of Phase IV or building at which warrant criteria levels are approached, if earlier	44.4% Developer, 6.3% City, 49.3% Other	Payment of fair share contribution	SSF Public Works Department	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
not be acceptable operation. PM Peak Hour: LOS D-36.8 seconds control delay, which would be acceptable operation.					
Traf-20: Intersection Level of Service. (see Figure 24 in Appendix E) The following improvement would mitigate OPSP-specific impacts. This measure is currently not included as part of the East of 101 Transportation Improvement Program. The OPSP shall provide a fair share contribution towards all measures currently not part of the TIP ○ Oyster Point Boulevard / Eccles Avenue ○ Provide an exclusive right turn lane on the eastbound Oyster Point Boulevard approach. Resultant 2035 Base Case + OPSP Operation: AM Peak Hour: LOS C-33.3 seconds control delay, which is acceptable operation.	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy of Phase IV or building at which warrant criteria levels are approached, if earlier	54.8% Developer, 7.8% City, 37.4% Other	Payment of fair share contribution	SSF Public Works Department	
Traf-21: Intersection Level of Service. (see Figure 25 in Appendix E) The following improvement would partially mitigate OPSP-specific impacts, but not reduce them to a level of insignificance. This measure is currently not included as part of the East of 101 Transportation Improvement Program. The OPSP shall provide a fair share contribution towards all measures currently not part of the TIP. ○ Airport Boulevard / Grand Avenue ○ Adjust signal timing.	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy of Phase IV or building at which warrant criteria levels are approached, if earlier	4.3% Developer, 0.9% City, 94.8% Other	Payment of fair share contribution	SSF Public Works Department	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
Restripe the 2-lane eastbound Grand Avenue approach to provide an exclusive left turn lane and a combined left / through / right turn lane. Resultant 2035 Base Case + OPSP Operation: AM Peak Hour: LOS E-63.4 seconds control delay, which is better than Base Case operation (LOS F-81.6 seconds delay). PM Peak Hour: LOS E-59.6 seconds control delay, which is better than Base Case operation (LOS E-60.7 seconds delay).					
Traf-22: Intersection Level of Service. (see Figure 25 in Appendix E) The following improvements would mitigate OPSP-specific impacts. These measures are currently not included as part of the East of 101 Transportation Improvement Program. The OPSP shall provide a fair share contribution towards all measures currently not part of the TIP. - Grand Avenue / Gateway Boulevard - Restripe the southbound Gateway Boulevard approach to contain 1 left turn lane, 1 through lane, a combined through / right turn lane and an exclusive right turn lane. Also restripe the northbound Gateway Boulevard approach to contain a left turn lane, a combined through / right turn lane and an exclusive right turn lane. Resultant 2035 Base Case + OPSP Operation: AM Peak Hour: LOS F-86.0 seconds control delay, which is better than Base Case operation (LOS F-121 seconds delay). PM Peak Hour: LOS D-43.1 seconds control delay, which is acceptable operation.	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy of Phase IV or building at which warrant criteria levels are approached, if earlier	10.5% Developer, 2.2% City, 87.3% Other	Payment of fair share contribution	SSF Public Works Department	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
Traf-23: Intersection Level of Service. (see Figure 25 in Appendix E) The following improvements would mitigate OPSP-specific impacts. These measures are currently not included as part of the East of 101 Transportation Improvement Program. The OPSP shall provide a fair share contribution towards all measures currently not part of the TIP. ○ E. Grand Avenue / Forbes Boulevard / Harbor Way ○ Adjust signal timing. ○ Restripe the southbound Forbes Boulevard approach to contain 2 exclusive right turn lanes, a through lane and a combined through / left turn lane. ○ Restripe the northbound Harbor Way approach to contain 2 exclusive right turn lanes, a combined through / left turn lane and an exclusive left turn lane. Resultant 2035 Base Case + OPSP Operation: AM Peak Hour: LOS D-52.2 seconds control delay, which is acceptable operation. PM Peak Hour: LOS C-24.6 seconds control delay, which is acceptable operation.	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy of Phase IV or building at which warrant criteria levels are approached, if earlier	5.8% Developer, 1.2% City, 93.0% Other	Payment of fair share contribution	SSF Public Works Department	
Traf-24: Intersection Level of Service. (see Figure 25 in Appendix E) The following improvement would mitigate OPSP-specific impacts. This measure is currently not included as part of the East of 101 Transportation Improvement Program. The OPSP shall provide a fair share contribution towards all measures currently not part of the TIP. ○ Airport Boulevard / San Mateo Avenue / Produce Avenue	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy of Phase IV or building at which warrant criteria levels	14.2% Developer, 2.9% City, 82.9% Other	Payment of fair share contribution	SSF Public Works Department	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
Adjust signal timing. Resultant 2035 Base Case + OPSP Operation: PM Peak Hour: LOS D-44.9 seconds control delay, which is acceptable operation.	are approached, if earlier				
Traf-25: Intersection Level of Service. (see Figure 25 in Appendix E) The following improvement would mitigate OPSP-specific impacts. This measure is currently not included as part of the East of 101 Transportation Improvement Program. The OPSP shall provide a fair share contribution towards all measures currently not part of the TIP. S. Airport Boulevard / U.S.101 Northbound Hook Ramps / Wondercolor Lane - Adjust signal timing. Resultant 2035 Base Case + OPSP Operation: AM Peak Hour: LOS D-54.9 seconds control delay, which is acceptable operation.	Prior to occupancy	5.4% Developer, 0.8% City, 93.8% Other	Payment of fair share contribution	SSF Public Works Department	
Traf-26: Vehicle Queuing (see Figure 24 in Appendix E). The following improvements would partially mitigate OPSP-specific impacts, but not reduce them to a level of insignificance. These measures are not included as part of the current East of 101 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The OPSP shall also provide a fair share contribution towards all measures currently not part of the TIP. Oyster Point Blvd. / Gateway Blvd. / U.S.101 Southbound Flyover	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy of Phase IV or building at which warrant criteria levels are approached, if earlier	TIP: East of 101 Fees; Non-TIP: 29.2% Developer, 4.1% City, 66.7% Other	Payment of fair share contribution	SSF Public Works Department	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
Off-Ramp: - Adjust signal timing. - Provide an additional through lane on the Oyster Point westbound approach (extending from Veterans Boulevard) and continue to the Dubuque/U.S.101 Northbound On-Ramp intersection. - Restripe the Oyster Point Boulevard eastbound approach from a left, 2 throughs and a combined through/right turn lane to a left, 2 throughs and an exclusive right turn lane. - Restripe the Southbound Flyover Off-Ramp approach from 2 through lanes and an exclusive right turn lane to two through lanes and a combined through/right turn lane. In conjunction with this measure, add a third eastbound departure lane on Oyster Point Boulevard (not part of TIP). - Add a second exclusive right turn lane on the southbound Genentech property driveway approach (not part of TIP). Resultant 95th Percentile Vehicle Queuing: AM Peak Hour: Eastbound through 95th percentile queue would be reduced to 1,102 feet, which would not be less than the Base Case queue of 756 feet.					
Traf-28: Improvements for Vehicle Queuing. (see Figure 24 in Appendix E) The following improvement would mitigate the OPSP-specific impact. This improvement is included in the East of 101 Transportation Improvement Program and will be funded via the OPSP's traffic impact fee contribution to this program: Airport Boulevard / Sister Cities Boulevard / Oyster Point	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy of Phase IV or building at which warrant	Developer (TIP)	Payment of traffic impact fee	SSF Public Works Department	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
Boulevard Adjust signal timing. Resultant 95th Percentile Vehicle Queuing – Oyster Point Boulevard Westbound Approach Lanes AM Peak Hour: Left turn lane queue = 242 feet, with a Base Case 95th percentile queue of 250 feet. PM Peak Hour: Left turn lane queue = 506 feet, with a Base Case 95th percentile queue of 524 feet. Each through lane queue = 280 feet, with a Base Case 95th percentile queue of 415 feet.	criteria levels are approached, if earlier				
Traf-34: Improvement to Diverge Capacity U.S.101 Northbound Off-Ramp to Dubuque Avenue. The following improvements would mitigate the OPSP-specific impact (see Figure 24 in Appendix E). Provide a second off-ramp lane connection to the U.S.101 mainline. Off-ramp diverge capacity would be increased to at least 2,200 vehicles per hour, which would accommodate the Base Case + OPSP AM peak hour volume of 1,556 vehicles per hour. This measure will require the approval of Caltrans. Also, this measure is currently not included in the East of 101 TIP. Therefore, the OPSP shall provide a fair share contribution towards this measure. It should be noted that because the improvement is within Caltrans' jurisdiction, the City of South San Francisco, as lead agency for the OPSP, cannot guarantee that the mitigation will be implemented. While it is likely that Caltrans will implement the measure, thereby reducing the impact to a less than significant level, because the measure is beyond the lead agency's jurisdiction, for CEQA purposes, this impact is considered to be significant and	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy of Phase IV or building at which warrant criteria levels are approached, if earlier	30.9% Developer, 4.4% City, 64.7% Other	Payment of fair share contribution	SSF Public Works Department	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
unavoidable.					
Traf-35: Improvement to On-Ramp Capacity Northbound On-Ramp from Oyster Point Boulevard / Dubuque Avenue (see Figure 24 in Appendix E). Provision of a second on-ramp lane would increase capacity to about 3,000 to 3,100 vehicles per hour. This measure will require the approval of Caltrans. Also, this measure is currently not included in the East of 101 TIP. Therefore, the OPSP shall provide a fair share contribution towards this measure. It should be noted that because the improvement is within Caltrans' jurisdiction, the City of South San Francisco, as lead agency for the OPSP, cannot guarantee that the mitigation will be implemented. While it is likely that Caltrans will implement the measure, thereby reducing the impact to a less than significant level, because the measure is beyond the lead agency's jurisdiction, for CEQA purposes, this impact is considered to be significant and unavoidable. There are no other physical improvements possible acceptable to Caltrans to accommodate the Base Case + OPSP volume of about 2,563 vehicles per hour.	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy of Phase IV or building at which warrant criteria levels are approached, if earlier	22.4% Developer, 4.6% City, 73% Other	Payment of fair share contribution	SSF Public Works Department	
Traf-36: Improvement to On-Ramp Capacity Southbound On-Ramp from Dubuque Avenue (see Figure 24 in Appendix E). This OPSP should provide a fair share contribution as determined by the City Engineer to the following measure. Provide a second on-ramp lane connection to the U.S.101 freeway. On-ramp capacity would be increased from 2,000 up to 3,000 vehicles per hour, with a Base Case + OPSP PM peak hour volume of about 2,125 vehicles per hour. This measure will require the approval of Caltrans. Also, this measure is currently not included in	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy of Phase IV or building at which warrant criteria levels are approached, if earlier	21.1% Developer, 4.3% City, 74.6% Other	Payment of fair share contribution	SSF Public Works Department	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
the East of 101 TIP. Therefore, the OPSP shall provide a fair share contribution towards this measure. It should be noted that because the improvement is within Caltrans' jurisdiction, the City of South San Francisco, as lead agency for the OPSP, cannot guarantee that the mitigation will be implemented While it is likely that Caltrans will implement the measure, thereby reducing the impact to a less than significant level, because the measure is beyond the lead agency's jurisdiction, for CEQA purposes, this impact is considered to be significant and unavoidable.					
Util-2a: Upsize Pump Station No. 2. To provide the required sewer capacity for the Plan, Pump Station No. 2 will need to be upsized to a firm capacity of 1.6. The Sewer Master Plan includes expanding Pump Station No. 2. Improvements under the Sewer Master Plan are funded through a flat-rate sewer connection fee for new development and a monthly impact fee. The amount of the impact fee is based on the quantity (flow) of wastewater generated. The occupants of the proposed OPSP development shall pay the sanitary sewer fees imposed by the City of South San Francisco in order to mitigate the cost of the pump station upgrade necessary to manage the wastewater flows generated by the OPSP. Util-2b: Oyster Point Subtrunk Replacement. To provide the required sewer capacity, the Oyster Point Subtrunk will need to be replaced with a larger sized trunk line, with sizes ranging from 12, 15, and 18-inches. The majority of these improvements are included in the Sewer Master Plan and are funded through a flat-rate sewer connection fee for new development and a monthly impact fee. The amount of the	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy of Phase IV or building at which warrant criteria levels are approached, if earlier	Developer 88.48% Developer, 11.52% City	Payment of sewer connection fee and fair share contribution	SSF Public Works Department	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
impact fee is based on the quantity (flow) of wastewater generated. The occupants of the proposed OPSP shall pay the sanitary sewer fees imposed by the City of South San Francisco in order to mitigate the cost of the sewer system upgrades necessary to manage the wastewater flows generated by the OPSP. An additional 700 feet of 8-inch diameter sewer trunk from Eccles Avenue to Gull Road needs to be upsized to a 12-inch diameter trunk sewer. This segment of sewer trunk was not included in the recommendations in the Sewer Master Plan. The applicants shall either work with the City to include this improvement in an Sewer Master Plan update or directly fund their fair share of the improvement.					
Vis-2a: Lighting Plan. In order to reduce sources of light and glare created by lighting within the OPSP area, the applicant shall specify fixtures and lighting that maintains appropriate levels of light at building entries, walkways, courtyards, parking lots and private roads at night consistent with minimum levels detailed in the City's building codes. These fixtures shall be designed to eliminate spillover, high intensity, and unshielded lighting, thereby avoiding unnecessary light pollution. Prior to issuance of building permits for each phase of construction within the OPSP, the applicant shall submit a Lighting Design Plan for review and approval by the City of South San Francisco Planning Department. The plan shall include, but not necessarily be limited to the following: ○ The Lighting Design Plan shall disclose all potential light sources with the types of lighting and their locations. ○ Typical lighting shall include low mounted, downward	Prior to issuance of building permits	Applies to all construction	Verification that compliant plans prepared and implemented	SSF Planning Division	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
casting and shielded lights that do not cause spillover onto adjacent properties and the utilization of motion detection systems where applicable. ○ No flood lights shall be utilized. ○ Lighting shall be limited to the areas that would be in operation during nighttime hours. ○ Low intensity, indirect light sources shall be encouraged. ○ On-demand lighting systems shall be encouraged. ○ Mercury, sodium vapor, and similar intense and bright lights shall not be permitted except where their need is specifically approved and their source of light is restricted. ○ Generally, light fixtures shall not be located at the periphery of the property and should shut off automatically when the use is not operating. Security lighting visible from the highway shall be motion-sensor activated. ○ Use “cut-off” fixtures designed to prevent the upward cast of light and avoid unnecessary light pollution where appropriate. ○ All lighting shall be installed in accordance with the building codes and the approved lighting plan during construction.					
Vis-2b: Glare Reduction. In order to reduce sources of daytime glare created by reflective building materials, the applicant shall specify exterior building materials for all proposed structures constructed for the Phase I Project and each subsequent phase of development under the OPSP that include the use of textured or	Prior to issuance of building permits	Applies to all construction	Verification that compliant plans prepared and implemented	SSF Planning Division	

Oyster Point Specific Plan and Phase I Project: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program					
Mitigation Measure	Timing/ Schedule	Implementation Responsibility	Verification		
			Monitoring Action	Monitoring Responsibility	Date Completed
other non-reflective exterior surfaces and non-reflective glass types, including double glazed and non-reflective vision glass. These materials shall be chosen for their non-reflective characteristics and their ability to reduce daytime glare. All exterior glass must meet the specifications of all applicable codes for non-reflective glass and would therefore reduce daytime glare emanating from the OPSP area.					