



VOLUME I **DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Academy of Art University Project

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
CASE NO. **2008.0586E**

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2010092080

Draft EIR Publication Date:	FEBRUARY 25, 2015
Draft EIR Public Hearing Date:	APRIL 16, 2015
Draft EIR Public Comment Period:	FEBRUARY 25, 2015–APRIL 27, 2015



**SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING
DEPARTMENT**

Written comments should be sent to:

Sarah B Jones Environmental Review Officer | 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 | San Francisco, CA 94103
or Sarah.B.Jones@sfgov.org



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

DATE: February 25, 2015
TO: Distribution List for the Academy of Art University Project Draft EIR
FROM: Sarah B. Jones, Environmental Review Officer
SUBJECT: Request for the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Academy of Art University Project (Planning Department File No. 2008.0586E)

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

This is the Draft of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Academy of Art University Project. A public hearing will be held on the adequacy and accuracy of this document. After the public hearing, our office will prepare and publish a document titled "Responses to Comments," which will contain a summary of all relevant comments on this Draft EIR and our responses to those comments. It may also specify changes to this Draft EIR. Those who testify at the hearing on the Draft EIR will automatically receive a copy of the Responses to Comments document, along with notice of the date reserved for certification; others may receive a copy of the Responses to Comments and notice by request or by visiting our office. This Draft EIR together with the Responses to Comments document will be considered by the Planning Commission in an advertised public meeting and will be certified as a Final EIR if deemed adequate.

After certification, we will modify the Draft EIR as specified by the Responses to Comments document and print both documents in a single publication called the Final EIR. The Final EIR will add no new information to the combination of the two documents except to reproduce the certification resolution. It will simply provide the information in one document, rather than two. Therefore, if you receive a copy of the Responses to Comments document in addition to this copy of the Draft EIR, you will technically have a copy of the Final EIR.

We are aware that many people who receive the Draft EIR and Responses to Comments have no interest in receiving virtually the same information after the EIR has been certified. To avoid expending money and paper needlessly, we would like to send copies of the Final EIR in Adobe Acrobat format on a CD to private individuals only if they request them. Therefore, if you would like a copy of the Final EIR, please fill out and mail the postcard provided inside the back cover to the Environmental Planning division of the Planning Department within two weeks after certification of the EIR. Any private party not requesting a Final EIR by that time will not be mailed a copy. Public agencies on the distribution list will automatically receive a copy of the Final EIR.

Thank you for your interest in this project.

VOLUME I

**DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
REPORT**

Academy of Art University Project

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
CASE NO. **2008.0586E**

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2010092080



**SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING
DEPARTMENT**

Draft EIR Publication Date:	FEBRUARY 25, 2015
Draft EIR Public Hearing Date:	APRIL 16, 2015
Draft EIR Public Comment Period:	FEBRUARY 25, 2015–APRIL 27, 2015

Written comments should be sent to:

Sarah B Jones Environmental Review Officer | 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 | San Francisco, CA 94103
or Sarah.B.Jones@sfgov.org

Contents

Draft EIR Volume I

Abbreviations xiv

CHAPTER 1 Summary..... 1-1

 1.1 Project Synopsis 1-1

 1.2 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures 1-3

 1.3 Alternatives 1-60

 1.4 Areas of Known Controversy and Issues to Be Resolved..... 1-61

CHAPTER 2 Introduction 2-1

 2.1 Overview 2-1

 2.2 Environmental Review 2-3

 2.3 Type of EIR..... 2-4

 2.3.1 Program-Level Analysis 2-5

 2.3.2 Project-Level Analysis..... 2-5

 2.4 Environmental Review Process 2-6

 2.4.1 Notice of Preparation and Summary of Comments..... 2-6

 2.4.2 Public Review of the Draft EIR 2-8

 2.4.3 Final EIR (Responses to Comments Document) and Final EIR Certification 2-9

 2.5 Report Organization..... 2-10

CHAPTER 3 Project Description 3-1

 3.1 Project Overview 3-1

 3.2 Project Objectives..... 3-3

 3.3 Existing Setting 3-5

 3.3.1 Existing AAU Facilities 3-5

 3.3.2 Existing Regional Access and Transit 3-14

 3.3.3 Existing AAU Shuttle System 3-14

 3.3.4 Regulations Applicable to Postsecondary Educational Institutions in San Francisco..... 3-19

 3.4 Project Characteristics..... 3-21

 3.4.1 Overview of Institutional, Residential, and Recreational Space Expansion and Population Growth..... 3-22

 3.4.2 AAU Shuttle Service to Accommodate Program-Level and Project-Level Growth 3-26

 3.4.3 Study Areas (Program-Level Analysis) 3-39

 3.4.4 Project Sites (Project-Level Analysis)..... 3-77

 3.5 Tenant Improvements..... 3-147

3.6 Intended Uses of the EIR.....3-148
 3.6.1 Proposed Project Approvals.....3-149

CHAPTER 4 Environmental Setting and Impacts..... 4-1

4.0 Introduction to the Analysis 4-1
 4.0.1 Scope of the EIR 4-1
 4.0.2 Format of the Environmental Analysis..... 4-4

4.1 Plans and Policies 4.1-1
 4.1.1 Introduction..... 4.1-1
 4.1.2 City and County of San Francisco Plans and Policies 4.1-1
 4.1.3 Regional Plans and Policies..... 4.1-52

4.2 Land Use..... 4.2-1
 4.2.1 Environmental Setting 4.2-1
 4.2.2 Regulatory Framework 4.2-11
 4.2.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures..... 4.2-12

4.3 Aesthetics..... 4.3-1
 4.3.1 Environmental Setting 4.3-1
 4.3.2 Regulatory Framework 4.3-40
 4.3.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures..... 4.3-40

4.4 Population, Housing, and Employment 4.4-1
 4.4.1 Environmental Setting 4.4-1
 4.4.2 Regulatory Framework 4.4-9
 4.4.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures..... 4.4-13

4.5 Cultural and Paleontological Resources 4.5-1
 4.5.1 Environmental Setting 4.5-3
 4.5.2 Regulatory Framework 4.5-40
 4.5.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures..... 4.5-60

4.6 Transportation and Circulation..... 4.6-1
 4.6.1 Environmental Setting 4.6-1
 4.6.2 Regulatory Framework 4.6-46
 4.6.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures..... 4.6-47

Draft EIR Volume II

4.7 Noise 4.7-1
 4.7.2 Environmental Setting 4.7-6
 4.7.3 Regulatory Framework 4.7-19
 4.7.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures..... 4.7-23

4.8 Air Quality 4.8-1
 4.8.1 Environmental Setting 4.8-1
 4.8.2 Regulatory Framework 4.8-17
 4.8.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures..... 4.8-26

4.9 Greenhouse Gas Emissions 4.9-1
 4.9.1 Environmental Setting 4.9-1

4.9.2	Regulatory Framework	4.9-3
4.9.3	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	4.9-8
4.10	Wind and Shadow	4.10-1
4.10.1	Environmental Setting.....	4.10-1
4.10.2	Regulatory Framework	4.10-4
4.10.3	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	4.10-6
4.11	Recreation	4.11-1
4.11.1	Environmental Setting.....	4.11-1
4.11.2	Regulatory Framework	4.11-9
4.11.3	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	4.11-11
4.12	Utilities and Service Systems	4.12-1
4.12.1	Environmental Setting.....	4.12-1
4.12.2	Regulatory Framework	4.12-5
4.12.3	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	4.12-11
4.13	Public Services	4.13-1
4.13.1	Environmental Setting.....	4.13-1
4.13.2	Regulatory Framework	4.13-15
4.13.3	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	4.13-17
4.14	Biological Resources.....	4.14-1
4.14.1	Environmental Setting.....	4.14-1
4.14.2	Regulatory Framework	4.14-8
4.14.3	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	4.14-12
4.15	Geology and Soils.....	4.15-1
4.15.1	Environmental Setting.....	4.15-1
4.15.2	Regulatory Framework	4.15-16
4.15.3	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	4.15-21
4.16	Hydrology and Water Quality.....	4.16-1
4.16.1	Environmental Setting.....	4.16-1
4.16.2	Regulatory Framework	4.16-16
4.16.3	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	4.16-23
4.17	Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....	4.17-1
4.17.1	Environmental Setting.....	4.17-1
4.17.2	Regulatory Framework	4.17-18
4.17.3	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	4.17-27
4.18	Mineral and Energy Resources.....	4.18-1
4.18.1	Environmental Setting.....	4.18-1
4.18.2	Regulatory Framework	4.18-4
4.18.3	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	4.18-9
4.19	Agricultural and Forest Resources.....	4.19-1
4.19.1	Environmental Setting.....	4.19-1
4.19.2	Regulatory Framework	4.19-1
4.19.3	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	4.19-1

CHAPTER 5 Other CEQA Considerations5-1

- 5.1 Growth-Inducing Impacts..... 5-1
 - 5.1.1 Population Generation and Housing..... 5-1
 - 5.1.2 Short-Term Employment Generation 5-3
 - 5.1.3 Long-Term Employment Generation..... 5-3
 - 5.1.4 Removal of Obstacles to Population Growth 5-3
- 5.2 Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes 5-4
- 5.3 Significant Unavoidable Environmental Impacts..... 5-4
- 5.4 Areas of Known Controversy and Issues to Be Resolved 5-5

CHAPTER 6 Alternatives..... 6-1

- 6.1 Alternatives to the Project 6-2
 - 6.1.1 Alternatives Considered 6-6
 - 6.1.2 Alternatives Rejected from Further Consideration in This EIR 6-7
 - 6.1.3 Alternatives Evaluated in Detail in This EIR..... 6-11
- 6.2 Comparison of the Proposed Project and the Project Alternatives:
Project Objectives 6-73
- 6.3 Environmentally Superior Alternative..... 6-79

CHAPTER 7 Report Preparers..... 7-1

- 7.1 Lead Agency 7-1
- 7.2 Other City Agencies..... 7-1
- 7.3 EIR Consultants 7-1
- 7.4 Project Sponsor 7-2
- 7.5 Project Attorney..... 7-2
- 7.6 Project Design Team 7-2
- 7.7 Project IMP Team 7-3
- 7.8 Project Transportation Team 7-3

Appendices

- Appendix A Notice of Preparation, Revised NOP, and Summary of NOP Comments
- Appendix B Shuttle Bus Service Policy

Figures

Figure 3-1 Project Location.....3-4

Figure 3-2 Existing AAU Campus Sites.....3-7

Figure 3-3 Existing Shuttle Routes3-16

Figure 3-4 Study Areas and Project Sites.....3-23

Figure 3-5a Future Shuttle Route Option 1 (Dispersed Distribution) Shuttle Routes.....3-28

Figure 3-5b Future Shuttle Route Option 1 (Dispersed Distribution) Shuttle Routes.....3-29

Figure 3-5c Future Shuttle Route Option 1 (Dispersed Distribution) Shuttle Routes.....3-30

Figure 3-5d Future Shuttle Route Option 1 (Dispersed Distribution) Shuttle Routes.....3-31

Figure 3-6a Future Shuttle Route Option 2 (Transit Corridor Distribution) Shuttle Routes.....3-32

Figure 3-6b Future Shuttle Route Option 2 (Transit Corridor Distribution) Shuttle Routes.....3-33

Figure 3-6c Future Shuttle Route Option 2 (Transit Corridor Distribution) Shuttle Routes.....3-34

Figure 3-6d Future Shuttle Route Option 2 (Transit Corridor Distribution) Shuttle Routes.....3-35

Figure 3-7 Study Area 1 (Lombard Street/Divisadero Street) Location3-43

Figure 3-8 Study Area 2 (Lombard Street/Van Ness Avenue) Location3-46

Figure 3-9 Study Area 3 (Mid Van Ness Avenue) Location3-49

Figure 3-10 Study Area 4 (Sutter Street/Mason Street) Location3-52

Figure 3-11 Study Area 5 (Mid Market Street) Location3-55

Figure 3-12 Study Area 6 (Fourth Street/Howard Street) Location.....3-58

Figure 3-13 Study Area 7 (Rincon Hill East) Location3-61

Figure 3-14 Study Area 8 (Third Street/Bryant Street) Location3-64

Figure 3-15 Study Area 9 (Second Street/Brannan Street) Location.....3-67

Figure 3-16 Study Area 10 (Fifth Street/Brannan Street) Location.....3-70

Figure 3-17 Study Area 11 (Sixth Street/Folsom Street) Location3-73

Figure 3-18 Study Area 12 (Ninth Street/Folsom Street) Location3-76

Figure 3-19 2801 Leavenworth Street—Proposed Site Plan.....3-82

Figure 3-20 2801 Leavenworth Street—Proposed First Floor Plan3-83

Figure 3-21 2801 Leavenworth Street—Proposed Second Floor Plan.....3-84

Figure 3-22 2801 Leavenworth Street—Proposed Mezzanine Floor Plan.....3-85

Figure 3-23 2801 Leavenworth Street—Proposed Third Floor Plan.....3-86

Figure 3-24 2801 Leavenworth Street—Proposed Leavenworth Street Elevation.....3-87

Figure 3-25 2801 Leavenworth Street—Proposed Beach and Jefferson Streets Elevation3-88

Figure 3-26 2801 Leavenworth Street—Proposed Interior Courtyard Elevation.....3-89

Figure 3-27 2801 Leavenworth Street—Proposed Exterior Courtyard Elevation.....3-90

Figure 3-28 2801 Leavenworth Street—Building Façade.....3-91

Figure 3-29 700 Montgomery Street—Proposed Site Plan3-95

Figure 3-30 700 Montgomery Street—Proposed Basement level Plan.....3-96

Figure 3-31 700 Montgomery Street—Proposed First Floor Plan.....3-97

Figure 3-32 700 Montgomery Street—Proposed Second Floor Plan3-98

Figure 3-33 700 Montgomery Street—Proposed Third Floor Plan.....3-99

Figure 3-34 700 Montgomery Street—Proposed Washington and Montgomery Streets
Elevation..... 3-100

Figure 3-35 700 Montgomery Street—Building Façade 3-101

Contents

Figure 3-36 625 Polk Street—Proposed Site Plan 3-105

Figure 3-37 625 Polk Street—Proposed Basement Level Plan 3-106

Figure 3-38 625 Polk Street—Proposed First Floor Plan..... 3-107

Figure 3-39 625 Polk Street—Proposed Second Floor Plan 3-108

Figure 3-40 625 Polk Street—Proposed Mezzanine Floor Plan..... 3-109

Figure 3-41 625 Polk Street—Proposed Third Floor Plan 3-110

Figure 3-42 625 Polk Street—Proposed Fourth Floor Plan 3-111

Figure 3-43 625 Polk Street—Proposed Fifth Floor Plan 3-112

Figure 3-44 625 Polk Street—Proposed Polk Street Elevation 3-113

Figure 3-45 625 Polk Street—Proposed Turk Street Elevation 3-114

Figure 3-46 625 Polk Street—Building Façade 3-115

Figure 3-47 150 Hayes Street—Proposed Site Plan..... 3-119

Figure 3-48 150 Hayes Street—Proposed Basement Level Plan 3-120

Figure 3-49 150 Hayes Street—Proposed First Floor Plan 3-121

Figure 3-50 150 Hayes Street—Proposed Second Floor Plan..... 3-122

Figure 3-51 150 Hayes Street—Proposed Mezzanine Floor Plan 3-123

Figure 3-52 150 Hayes Street—Proposed Fourth Floor Plan 3-124

Figure 3-53 150 Hayes Street—Proposed Fifth Floor Plan..... 3-125

Figure 3-54 150 Hayes Street—Proposed Sixth Floor Plan..... 3-126

Figure 3-55 150 Hayes Street—Proposed North Elevations..... 3-127

Figure 3-56 150 Hayes Street—Proposed South Elevations 3-128

Figure 3-57 150 Hayes Street—Proposed West Elevations..... 3-129

Figure 3-58 150 Hayes Street—Building Façade 3-130

Figure 3-59 121 Wisconsin Street—Proposed Site Plan..... 3-133

Figure 3-60 121 Wisconsin Street—Proposed West Elevation and North/South Views 3-134

Figure 3-61 121 Wisconsin Street—Proposed Interior Views 3-135

Figure 3-62 121 Wisconsin Street—Proposed Interior View of Eastern Trailer 3-136

Figure 3-63 121 Wisconsin Street—Proposed East Elevation 3-137

Figure 3-64 2225 Jerrold Avenue—Proposed Site Plan 3-141

Figure 3-65 2225 Jerrold Avenue—Proposed First Floor Plan..... 3-142

Figure 3-66 2225 Jerrold Avenue—Proposed Second Floor Plan 3-143

Figure 3-67 2225 Jerrold Avenue—Proposed North Elevation 3-144

Figure 3-68 2225 Jerrold Avenue—Proposed South, East, and West Elevations 3-145

Figure 3-69 2225 Jerrold Avenue—Building Façade 3-146

Figure 4.1-1 Area Plans in the AAU Study Areas and Project Sites.....4.1-8

Figure 4.1-2 Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure Areas Applicable to AAU
Study Areas and Project Sites 4.1-31

Figure 4.1-3 Existing Zoning Districts – Study Areas 1–4..... 4.1-35

Figure 4.1-4 Existing Zoning Districts – Study Area 5..... 4.1-36

Figure 4.1-5 Existing Zoning Districts – Study Areas 6–9..... 4.1-37

Figure 4.1-6 Existing Zoning Districts – Study Areas 10–12..... 4.1-38

Figure 4.1-7 Existing Zoning Districts – Project Sites 1–3..... 4.1-39

Figure 4.1-8 Existing Zoning Districts – Project Sites 4–6..... 4.1-40

Figure 4.1-9 Generalized Height and Bulk Districts..... 4.1-44

Figure 4.1-10 Special Use Districts in AAU Study Areas and Project Sites..... 4.1-45

Figure 4.1-11 Special Sign Districts in AAU Study Areas and Project Sites..... 4.1-49

Figure 4.3-1 Study Area Photo Locations..... 4.3-4

Figure 4.3-2 Views of Study Area 1 – Lombard Street/Divisadero Street 4.3-5

Figure 4.3-3 Views of Study Area 2 – Lombard Street/Van Ness Avenue..... 4.3-7

Figure 4.3-4 Views of Study Area 3 – Mid Van Ness Avenue..... 4.3-10

Figure 4.3-5 Views of Study Area 4 – Sutter Street/Mason Street..... 4.3-11

Figure 4.3-6 Views of Study Area 5 – Mid Market Street..... 4.3-14

Figure 4.3-7 Views of Study Area 6 – Fourth Street/Howard Street 4.3-16

Figure 4.3-8 Views of Study Area 7 – Rincon Hill East..... 4.3-18

Figure 4.3-9 Views of Study Area 8 – Third Street/Bryant Street..... 4.3-20

Figure 4.3-10 Views of Study Area 9 – Second Street/Brannan Street 4.3-22

Figure 4.3-11 Views of Study Area 10 – Fifth Street/Brannan Street 4.3-24

Figure 4.3-12 Views of Study Area 11 – Sixth Street/Folsom Street..... 4.3-26

Figure 4.3-13 Views of Study Area 12 – Ninth Street/Folsom Street..... 4.3-28

Figure 4.3-14 Views of Project Site 1 – 2801 Leavenworth Street 4.3-30

Figure 4.3-15 Views of Project Site 2 – 700 Montgomery Street..... 4.3-32

Figure 4.3-16 Views of Project Site 3 – 625 Polk Street 4.3-34

Figure 4.3-17 Views of Project Site 4 – 150 Hayes Street..... 4.3-36

Figure 4.3-18 Views of Project Site 5 – 121 Wisconsin Street 4.3-38

Figure 4.3-19 Views of Project Site 6 – 2225 Jerrold Avenue 4.3-39

Figure 4.5-1 Historic Resources in Study Areas 1 and 2..... 4.5-23

Figure 4.5-2 Historic Resources in Study Areas 3 and 4..... 4.5-24

Figure 4.5-3 Historic Resources in Study Area 5..... 4.5-25

Figure 4.5-4 Historic Resources in Study Areas 6 and 7..... 4.5-26

Figure 4.5-5 Historic Resources in Study Areas 8 and 9..... 4.5-27

Figure 4.5-6 Historic Resources in Study Areas 10 and 11 4.5-28

Figure 4.5-7 Historic Resources in Study Area 12..... 4.5-29

Figure 4.5-8 Archeological Mitigation Zones in Relation to AAU Study Areas and Project Sites.... 4.5-58

Figure 4.6-1 Study Areas and Project Sites..... 4.6-3

Figure 4.6-2 Project Study Intersections..... 4.6-9

Figure 4.6-3 Existing Muni Screenlines..... 4.6-19

Figure 4.6-4 Shuttle Routes and Stops (Fall 2010) 4.6-26

Figure 4.6-5 Shuttle Routes and Stops (Fall 2013) 4.6-28

Figure 4.6-6 Bicycle Routes and Parking 4.6-37

Figure 4.7-1 Streets Subject to Daily Average Traffic Noise Levels in Excess of 60 Decibels
within Study Areas 1–4 4.7-8

Figure 4.7-2 Streets Subject to Daily Average Traffic Noise Levels in Excess of 60 Decibels
within Study Areas 5–7 4.7-9

Figure 4.7-3 Streets Subject to Daily Average Traffic Noise Levels in Excess of 60 Decibels
within Study Areas 8–12 4.7-10

Figure 4.7-4 Traffic Noise Map within Study Areas 1–4..... 4.7-11

Contents

Figure 4.7-5 Traffic Noise Map within Study Areas 5–7 4.7-12

Figure 4.7-6 Traffic Noise Map within Study Areas 8–12 4.7-13

Figure 4.7-7 Noise Measurement Locations 4.7-14

Figure 4.7-8 City of San Francisco Land Use Compatibility Guidelines..... 4.7-21

Figure 4.7-9 Academy of Art University Shuttle Bus Noise Measurements 4.7-34

Figure 4.8-1 Air Pollutant Exposure Zones – Citywide..... 4.8-12

Figure 4.8-2 Air Pollutant Exposure Zones – Study Areas 1–4 4.8-13

Figure 4.8-3 Air Pollutant Exposure Zones – Study Areas 5–7 4.8-14

Figure 4.8-4 Air Pollutant Exposure Zones – Study Areas 8–12 4.8-15

Figure 4.11-1 Nearby Parks and Recreation Facilities within the Vicinity of the Proposed Project ... 4.11-6

Figure 4.13-1 Fire Stations and Police District Stations 4.13-2

Figure 4.13-2 Libraries near the Study Areas and Project Sites 4.13-14

Figure 4.14-1 Sensitive Species Occurrences and Natural Areas 4.14-3

Figure 4.15-1 Regional Faults 4.15-7

Figure 4.15-2 Groundshaking Intensity (San Andreas) 4.15-10

Figure 4.15-3 Groundshaking Intensity (Hayward)..... 4.15-11

Figure 4.15-4 Liquefaction Hazards 4.15-12

Figure 4.15-5 Landslide Hazards 4.15-14

Figure 4.16-1 Watersheds and Groundwater Basins 4.16-4

Figure 4.16-2 Floodplains..... 4.16-8

Figure 4.16-3 Tsunami Run-Up Areas..... 4.16-9

Figure 4.16-4 Sea Level Rise 4.16-10

Figure 4.16-5 Groundwater Basins 4.16-15

Figure 4.17-1 Hazardous Waste Sites and Areas Subject to San Francisco Health Code
Article 22A (the Maher Ordinance)..... 4.17-45

Figure 6-1 Alternative 1, No Project Alternative, Shuttle Routes and Stops (Existing Shuttle
System 2010) 6-15

Figure 6-2 Centralized Growth Alternative..... 6-30

Figure 6-3a Alternative 2, Centralized Growth Alternative, Potential Shuttle Routes 6-37

Figure 6-3b Alternative 2, Centralized Growth Alternative, Potential Shuttle Routes 6-38

Tables

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures 1-6

Table 1-2 Comparison of Proposed Project and Project Alternatives: Impacts 1-62

Table 3-1 Existing AAU Facilities – EIR Baseline (September 2010) 3-8

Table 3-2 Existing Institutional Facilities 3-9

Table 3-3 Existing Residential Facilities 3-10

Table 3-4 Existing Athletic Facilities Information 3-11

Table 3-5 AAU Fall 2010 Fixed Route Shuttle Services..... 3-18

Table 3-6 Summary of Existing and Proposed AAU Facilities 3-22

Table 3-7 San Francisco Population Growth Generated by the Proposed Project 3-25

Table 3-8 Summary of Project Site Daytime Population..... 3-26

Table 3-9 Existing and Recommended AAU Shuttle Stops in or Adjacent to Study Areas and Sites.....3-38

Table 3-10 EIR Program-Level Growth Assumptions, 2011–2020—Study Areas3-40

Table 3-11 Project Sites.....3-77

Table 4-1 Cumulative Projects4-10

Table 4.1-1 AAU Study Areas and Project Sites in Area Plans of the San Francisco General Plan4.1-7

Table 4.1-2 Study Areas and Project Sites in Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure Areas4.1-30

Table 4.1-3 Existing Zoning in Study Areas4.1-41

Table 4.1-4 Project-Level Zoning Districts4.1-42

Table 4.1-5 Special Use Districts in the Study Areas and Project Sites4.1-46

Table 4.1-6 Special Sign Districts in the Study Areas and Project Sites4.1-48

Table 4.4-1 Population Trends 2010–2020.....4.4-2

Table 4.4-2 Household Population and Household Growth 2010–2020.....4.4-3

Table 4.4-3 Employment Trends and Projections, 2000–20204.4-4

Table 4.4-4 Bay Area Commuting Patterns (Workers Commuting to San Francisco in 2000)4.4-6

Table 4.4-5 Historic AAU Growth (2000–2013)4.4-7

Table 4.4-6 Existing Residential Facilities4.4-9

Table 4.4-7 Summary of Existing and Proposed AAU Facilities4.4-15

Table 4.4-8 2020 Proposed AAU Population4.4-16

Table 4.4-9 San Francisco Population Growth and Housing Demand from the Proposed Project.....4.4-18

Table 4.4-10 Maximum Student Population and Employment at Each of the Project Sites4.4-22

Table 4.5-1 Area Plan EIR Historical Resources (Built Environment) Mitigation Measures.....4.5-54

Table 4.5-2 Area Plan EIR Archeological Resources Mitigation Measures4.5-59

Table 4.6-1 Existing Intersection Levels of Service4.6-10

Table 4.6-2 Existing Muni Routes In or Near Study Areas and Project Sites.....4.6-14

Table 4.6-3 Existing Muni Capacity Utilization at Maximum Load Point – PM Peak Period4.6-15

Table 4.6-4 Existing Muni Screenline Capacity Utilization – PM Peak Period.....4.6-20

Table 4.6-5 Existing Regional Transit Screenline Capacity Utilization – PM Peak Period4.6-22

Table 4.6-6 AAU Fall 2010 Fixed-Route Shuttle Services.....4.6-25

Table 4.6-7 AAU Spring 2010 Daily and PM Peak Hour Shuttle Capacity Utilization4.6-27

Table 4.6-8 AAU Fall 2010 On-Demand Shuttle Services4.6-29

Table 4.6-9 AAU Fall 2010 Shuttle Stops.....4.6-30

Table 4.6-10 Existing Pedestrian Crosswalk Level of Service – PM Peak Period.....4.6-33

Table 4.6-11 Existing Bike Routes In or Near Study Areas and Project Sites.....4.6-38

Table 4.6-12 On-Street Parking Supply and Utilization.....4.6-43

Table 4.6-13 Off-Street Parking Supply4.6-45

Table 4.6-14 LOS Definitions for Signalized and Unsignalized Intersections4.6-51

Contents

Table 4.6-15 Summary of AAU Transportation Options and Sub Options4.6-54

Table 4.6-16 Comparison of Land Use by Option and Sub Option.....4.6-55

Table 4.6-17 AAU PM Peak Period Trip Generation Rates4.6-59

Table 4.6-18 AAU Transportation Mode Split4.6-60

Table 4.6-19 AAU Trip Distribution Percentages4.6-60

Table 4.6-20 Comparison of Travel Demand for Options and Sub options (PM Peak-Hour
Person and Vehicle Trips)4.6-61

Table 4.6-21 Total Project Peak Parking Demand.....4.6-65

Table 4.6-22 Freight Delivery Demand4.6-67

Table 4.6-23 Existing plus Project Intersection Levels of Service – AM Peak Period4.6-71

Table 4.6-24 Existing plus Project Intersection Levels of Service – PM Peak Period4.6-71

Table 4.6-25 Muni Downtown Transit Screenlines, Existing and Existing plus Project PM
Peak Hour.....4.6-78

Table 4.6-26 Regional Transit Screenlines, Existing and Existing plus Project.....4.6-79

Table 4.6-27 Pedestrian Delay and LOS, Existing plus Project (PM Peak Hour)4.6-100

Table 4.6-28 Cumulative (2035) and Cumulative plus Project LOS E or LOS F AM and PM
Peak Hour Intersections4.6-131

Table 4.6-29 Cumulative (2035) AM & PM Peak Hour Project Trip Contributions to LOS E
and LOS F Intersections4.6-132

Table 4.6-30 Muni Downtown Transit Screenlines, Cumulative and Cumulative plus
Project: Option 1 – SA-10/SA-11 Sub option (PM Peak Hour Outbound)4.6-138

Table 4.6-31 Regional Transit Screenlines, Cumulative and Cumulative plus Project:
Option 1 – SA-10/SA-11 Sub option (PM Peak Hour Outbound)4.6-139

Table 4.7-1 Representative Environmental Noise Levels4.7-2

Table 4.7-2 WHO Guideline Values for Community Noise in Specific Environments.....4.7-5

Table 4.7-3 Existing Ambient Noise Measurements, in L_{eq} 4.7-15

Table 4.7-4 Modeled Existing Traffic Noise Levels—Roadways within the Most
Congested Study Areas and Project Sites Containing Noise-Sensitive Uses.....4.7-17

Table 4.7-5 Human Response to Different Levels of Groundborne Vibration4.7-18

Table 4.7-6 Federal Transit Administration Impact Criteria for Noise-Sensitive Uses.....4.7-25

Table 4.7-7 Typical Noise Levels from Construction Equipment.....4.7-28

Table 4.7-8 Future Year Study Noise Levels at Most Affected Roadways.....4.7-35

Table 4.8-1 Air Quality Monitoring Data.....4.8-3

Table 4.8-2 Carcinogenic Toxic Air Contaminants – Annual Average Ambient
Concentrations.....4.8-8

Table 4.8-3 Study Areas within Air Pollutant Exposure Zones.....4.8-11

Table 4.8-4 Project Sites within Air Pollutant Exposure Zones4.8-16

Table 4.8-5 Off-Site Receptor Locations for the Project Sites4.8-17

Table 4.8-6 National and California Ambient Air Quality Standards4.8-18

Table 4.8-7 Air Quality Index Statistics for the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin.....4.8-20

Table 4.8-8 Attainment Status for the San Francisco Air Basin4.8-21

Table 4.8-9 Criteria Air Pollutant Significance Thresholds4.8-27

Table 4.8-10 Existing Cancer Risk and $PM_{2.5}$ Concentrations4.8-36

Table 4.8-11 Study Area Renovation Emissions.....4.8-38

Table 4.8-12 Project Site Renovation Emissions4.8-40

Table 4.8-13 Off-Road Equipment Compliance Step-Down Schedule.....4.8-44

Table 4.8-14 Net Change in Study Area Operational Emissions4.8-48

Table 4.8-15 Net Change in Project Site Operational Emissions.....4.8-50

Table 4.8-16 Net Change in Partial Study Area Occupancy Operational Emissions.....4.8-52

Table 4.8-17 Mitigated Net Change in Partial Study Area Occupancy Operational Emissions.....4.8-53

Table 4.8-18 Net Change in Full Occupancy Operational Emissions4.8-54

Table 4.8-19 Cumulative Cancer Risk (per million).....4.8-58

Table 4.8-20 Cumulative PM_{2.5} Concentration (µg/m³)4.8-58

Table 4.9-1 GHG Reductions from the AB 32 Scoping Plan Sectors4.9-4

Table 4.10-1 Seasonal Wind Direction Frequency and Average Speed in Knots, in Percent...4.10-2

Table 4.11-1 Parks and Recreational Facilities in the Vicinity of the 12 Study Areas and Six Project Sites4.11-3

Table 4.11-2 Existing Athletic Facilities Used by AAU4.11-7

Table 4.12-1 Estimated Range of Solid Waste Generation by AAU Study Areas4.12-21

Table 4.12-2 Estimated Solid Waste Generated at the Project Sites.....4.12-23

Table 4.13-1 SFFD Fire Stations Serving the AAU Study Areas and Project Sites4.13-3

Table 4.13-2 San Francisco Fire Department Response Times, 20114.13-4

Table 4.13-3 San Francisco Police Department Response Times, January 2011–December 2011.....4.13-8

Table 4.13-4 Yearly Comparison of Crimes, 2009 to 2010.....4.13-10

Table 4.13-5 San Francisco Public Library Branch Information within AAU Study Areas and near Project Sites.....4.13-12

Table 4.13-6 San Francisco Population Growth Generated by the Proposed Project4.13-19

Table 4.13-7 Summary of Project Site Daytime Population.....4.13-19

Table 4.14-1 Biological Resources in and Adjacent to Study Areas and Project Sites4.14-4

Table 4.15-1 Geologic Units in AAU Study Areas and Project Sites4.15-2

Table 4.15-2 Active and Potentially Active Faults4.15-6

Table 4.16-1 100-Year Flood, Tsunami, and Sea Level Rise Hazards.....4.16-7

Table 4.16-2 Key Water Quality Laws and Regulations4.16-17

Table 4.17-1 Underground Storage Tanks in the Study Areas.....4.17-6

Table 4.17-2 Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites in the Study Areas4.17-8

Table 4.17-3 Hazardous Materials Use at the Project Sites.....4.17-10

Table 6-1 Comparison of Proposed Project and Project Alternatives: Project Characteristics.....6-12

Table 6-2 Comparison of Proposed Project and Project Alternatives: Ability to Meet Project Objectives6-74

Table 6-3 Comparison of Proposed Project and Project Alternatives: Impacts6-75

Abbreviations

<i>Abbreviation</i>	<i>Definition</i>
°C	degrees Celsius
°F	degrees Fahrenheit
AAS	annual available sunlight
AAU	Academy of Art University
AB	Assembly Bill
AC	Alameda-Contra Costa County
AC Transit	Alameda-Contra Costa County Transit
ACM	asbestos-containing material
afy	acre-feet per year
AQI	Air Quality Index
AQTR	Air Quality Technical Report
ARB	[California] Air Resources Board
ARDTP	Archeological Research Design Treatment Plan
ASCE	American Society of Civil Engineers
ASHRAE	American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air Conditioning Engineers
AST	aboveground storage tank
ATCM	Air Toxics Control Measure
BAAQMD	Bay Area Air Quality Management District's
BACT	Best Available Control Technology for Toxics
BART	Bay Area Rapid Transit
Basin Plan	San Francisco Bay Basin Water Quality Control Plan
BCDC	Bay Conservation and Development Commission
Bcf/year	billion cubic feet per year
BLIP	Branch Library Improvement Program
BMP	best management practice
BP	building permit
Btu	British thermal unit
BVHP	Bayview Hunters Point
C&D	construction and demolition
C-2	Community Business District
C-3-G	Downtown—General Commercial
C-3-O(SD)	Downtown Office-Special Development
C-3-R	Downtown—Retail
C-3-S	Downtown Support

Abbreviation	Definition
CAA	Clean Air Act of 1970
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
CAFE	Corporate Average Fuel Economy
Cal/EPA	California Environmental Protection Agency
Cal/OSHA	California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Occupational Safety and Health
CalRecycle	California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery
CAP	Clean Air Plan
CBC	California Building Code
CBSC	California Building Standards Code
CCAA	California Clean Air Act
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CDMG	California Division of Mines and Geology
CDOC	California Department of Conservation
CEC	California Energy Commission
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
CESQG	conditionally exempt small-quantity generator
CFGC	California Fish and Game Code
CGS	California Geological Survey
CH ₄	methane
CHP	California Highway Patrol
CHSC	California Health and Safety Code
CI	compression-ignition [engine] (diesel)
CIP	Capital Improvement Program
CIWMB	California Integrated Waste Management Board
C-M	Heavy Commercial
CMU	Concrete Tilt-Up & Reinforced Masonry
CNDDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
CNEL	community noise equivalent level
CO	carbon monoxide
CO _{2e}	carbon dioxide-equivalent
COA	Certificate of Appropriateness
CPMC	California Pacific Medical Center
CRHR	California Register of Historical Resources
CSD	combined sewer discharge

Abbreviations

<i>Abbreviation</i>	<i>Definition</i>
CSO	Combined Sewer Overflow [control policy]
CU	conditional use
CWA	Clean Water Act of 1977
dB	decibel
dBA	A-weighted decibel scale
DBH	diameter at breast height
DBI	[San Francisco] Department of Building Inspection
DEHP	Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate
DOT	[U.S.] Department of Transportation
DPM	diesel particulate matter
DPW	[San Francisco] Department of Public Works
DR	Discretionary Review
DTSC	[California] Department of Toxic Substances Control
DWR	[California] Department of Water Resources
EB	eastbound
EIR	environmental impact report
EISA	Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007
EN	Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plan Project
EO	Executive Order
EOC	Emergency Operations Center
ERO	Environmental Review Officer
ERP	Emergency Response Plan
ESA	environmental site assessment
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FESA	federal Endangered Species Act
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FHWA-RD-77-108	Federal Highway Administration Highway Noise Prediction Model
FIRM	Flood Insurance Rate Map
FMMP	Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
FWPRP	Fisherman's Wharf Public Realm Plan
FY	fiscal year
GED	gallons per employee-day
GGNRA	Golden Gate National Recreation Area
GGT	Golden Gate Transit
GHG	greenhouse gas

<i>Abbreviation</i>	<i>Definition</i>
GISO	General Industrial Safety Order
gpcd	gallons per capita per day
gpd	gallons per day
gpm	gallons per minute
GWh	gigawatt-hour
HC	hydrocarbon
HCD	California Department of Housing and Community Development
HCM	Highway Capacity Manual
HEPA	high-efficiency particulate air [filter]
HMBP	Hazardous Materials Business Plan
HMUPA	Hazardous Materials Unified Program Agency
HOJ	Hall of Justice
hp	horsepower
HPC	San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission
HRA	health risk assessment
HREC	historical recognized environmental condition
HRER	Historic Resources Evaluation Responses
HUD	[U.S. Department of] Housing and Urban Development
HVAC	heating, ventilation, and air conditioning
I-#	Interstate #
IBC	International Building Code
IEPR	integrated energy policy report
IMP	Institutional Master Plan
IS	initial study
ITE	Institute of Transportation Engineers
kg	kilograms
lb	pound
LBP	lead-based paint
L _{dn}	day-night average noise level
LEED	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design
L _{eq}	equivalent-energy noise level
LID	low-impact design
L _{max}	maximum sound levels during the measurement period
L _{min}	minimum sound levels during the measurement period
L _n	statistical sound levels
LOS	level of service

Abbreviations

<i>Abbreviation</i>	<i>Definition</i>
LQG	large-quantity generator
LRDP	Long Range Development Plan
LTS	less than significant
LUFT	leaking underground fuel tank [site]
M-1	Light Industrial
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918
MERV	Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value
mg/kg	milligrams per kilogram
mg/L	milligrams per liter
mg/m ³	milligrams per cubic meter
mgd	million gallons per day
MLD	most likely descendant
MLP	maximum load point
MMT	million metric tonnes
MOB	medical office building
mph	miles per hour
MPO	metropolitan planning organization
MQG	minimal-quantity generator
MRZ	mineral resource zone
MSDS	material safety data sheet
msl	mean sea level
MT	metric tonnes
MTBE	methyl tertiary-butyl ether
MUG	Mixed Use General
Muni	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
MUO	Mixed Use Office
MUTCD	[California] Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices
MW	megawatt
Mw	maximum moment earthquake magnitude
MWh	megawatt-hours
N ₂ O	nitrous oxide
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NB	northbound
NC-2	Small-Scale Neighborhood Commercial
NC-3	Moderate-Scale Neighborhood Commercial

<i>Abbreviation</i>	<i>Definition</i>
NCT	SoMa Neighborhood Commercial Transit
NCT-3	Neighborhood Commercial Transit–Moderate Scale
NEHRP	National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NESHAP	National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants
NFPA	National Fire Protection Association
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act of 1966
NI	no impact
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NMHC	nonmethane hydrocarbons
NO ₂	nitrogen dioxide
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NOI	notice of intent
NOP	notice of preparation
NO _x	nitrogen oxide
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NPS	National Park Service
NPWPCP	North Point Water Pollution Control Plant
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NSR	[federal] New Source Review [program]
O ₃	Ozone
OHP	Office of Historic Preservation
OSHA	[U.S.] Occupational Safety and Health Administration
P	Public Use
PAH	polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbon
PAR	Preliminary Archeological Review
PASS	Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Study
Pb	lead
PCB	polychlorinated biphenyl
PDR-2, IPZ	Production, Distribution, and Repair, Industrial Protection Zone
PG&E	Pacific Gas & Electric Company
PLZ	passenger loading zone
PM ₁₀	coarse respirable particulate matter
PM _{2.5}	fine respirable particulate matter
PML	probable maximum loss
ppb	parts per billion

Abbreviations

<i>Abbreviation</i>	<i>Definition</i>
pph	persons per household
ppm	parts per million
PRC	Public Resources Code
PRD	permit registration document
Proposed Project	Academy of Art University (AAU) Project
PS	potentially significant
PS-1	Project Site 1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery)
PS-2	Project Site 2, 700 Montgomery Street
PS-3	Project Site 3, 625 Polk Street
PS-4	Project Site 4, 150 Hayes Street
PS-5	Project Site 5, 121 Wisconsin Street
PS-6	Project Site 6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue
PV	photovoltaic
RC-3	Residential-Commercial Combined Medium Density
RC-4	Residential-Commercial Combined High Density
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RDF	rehabilitation and detention facility
REC	recognized environmental condition
RED	Residential Enclave District
RES	renewable electricity standard
RFS	renewable fuel standard
RH DTR	Rincon Hill Downtown Residential Mixed Use
RH-2	Residential House, Two Family
RH-3	Residential Houses, Three Family
RHNA	Regional Housing Needs Allocation
RM-3	Mixed (Apartments and Houses), Medium Density
RM-4	Mixed (Apartments and Houses), High Density
ROG	reactive organic gas
ROSE	Recreation & Open Space Element
RPP	Residential Parking Permit
RPS	renewable portfolio standard
RP-SB Project Area	Rincon Point-South Beach Redevelopment Project Area
RSD	Residential/Service Mixed-Use
SA-1	Study Area 1, Lombard Street/Divisadero Street
SA-2	Study Area 2, Lombard Street/Van Ness Avenue
SA-3	Study Area 3, Mid Van Ness Avenue

Abbreviation	Definition
SA-4	Study Area 4, Sutter Street/Mason Street
SA-5	Study Area 5, Mid Market Street
SA-6	Study Area 6, Fourth Street/Howard Street
SA-7	Study Area 7, Rincon Hill East
SA-8	Study Area 8, Third Street/Bryant Street
SA-9	Study Area 9, Second Street/Brannan Street
SA-10	Study Area 10, Fifth Street/Brannan Street
SA-11	Study Area 11, Sixth Street/Folsom Street
SA-12	Study Area 12, Ninth Street/Folsom Street
SamTrans	San Mateo County Transit District
SB	Senate Bill
SB	southbound
SB DTR	South Beach Downtown Residential
SCS	sustainable communities strategy
SDWA	[federal] Safe Drinking Water Act
SEL	sound exposure level (also known as the single noise event level)
sf	square feet
SFBC	San Francisco Building Code
SFBRWQCB	San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board
SFDPH	San Francisco Department of Public Health
SFDPH-LOP	San Francisco Department of Public Health-Local Oversight Program
SFFD	San Francisco Fire Department
SFGBO	San Francisco Green Building Ordinance
SFHA	Special Flood Hazard Area
SFHC	San Francisco Health Code
SFMTA	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
SFO	San Francisco International Airport
SFPD	San Francisco Police Department
SFPL	San Francisco Public Library
SFPUC	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
SFRA	San Francisco Redevelopment Agency
SFRPD	San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department
SFUUSD	San Francisco Unified School District
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
SIF	Supplemental Information Form
SIP	State Implementation Plan

Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Definition
SLI	Service/Light Industrial
SLIC	spills, leaks, incidents, and cleanup [site]
SLR	Service/Light Industrial/Residential
SMARA	Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975
SMP	site mitigation plan
SNRAMP	Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan
SO ₂	sulfur dioxide
SOI	Secretary of the Interior
SoMa	South of Market
SPCCP	Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure Plan
SQG	small-quantity generator
SR-#	State Route #
SRO	single-residential occupancy
SS	Sustainable Sites
SSIP	Sewer System Improvement Program
SSO	Service/Secondary Office
SSP	Service/Secondary Office
SU	significant and unavoidable
SUD	Special Use District
SVE	soil vapor extraction
SVWTP	Sunol Valley Water Treatment Plant
SWPCP	Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant
SWPPP	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TAC	toxic air contaminant
TASC	Transportation Advisory Staff Committee
TDM	transportation demand management
TIC	tenancy in common
TIDF	Transit Impact Development Fee
TIS	transportation impact study
TMASF	Transportation Management Association of San Francisco
TMDL	total maximum daily load
TOG	total organic gases
TPH-d	total petroleum hydrocarbons-diesel
U.S. 101	United States Highway 101
UMB	unreinforced masonry building

<i>Abbreviation</i>	<i>Definition</i>
UMU	Urban Mixed Use
URM	Un-reinforced Masonry
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USC	U.S. Code
USEPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
USPS	U.S. Postal Service
UST	underground storage tank
UWMP	urban water management plan
V/C	volume-to-capacity ratio
VdB	vibration decibels
VDECS	Verified Diesel Emission Control Strategy
VMT	vehicle miles traveled
VOC	volatile organic compound
WB	westbound
WHO	World Health Organization
WPD	Water Permits Division
WSA	water supply assessment
WSIP	Water Supply Improvement Program
WUM	[retail] water use model
µg/m ³	micrograms per cubic meter

Abbreviations

[THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

CHAPTER 1 Summary

This document is a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the proposed Academy of Art University (AAU) Project (Proposed Project). This chapter provides a brief summary of the Proposed Project, potential impacts and mitigation measures, project alternatives, and identification of the environmentally superior alternative. Areas of known controversy and issues to be resolved are provided in Chapter 5, Other CEQA Considerations.

1.1 PROJECT SYNOPSIS

AAU, located within the City and County of San Francisco (City), is a private postsecondary academic institution that occupies buildings throughout the City (predominantly in the northeast quadrant) for its existing art programs. AAU plans on expanding its facilities and programs to accommodate a projected on-site student enrollment of approximately 17,282 students by 2020,¹ resulting in a total increase of approximately 6,100 students (or five percent a year) as compared to a 2010 on-site student enrollment of 11,182. In addition, AAU also anticipates an increase of 1,220 faculty and staff, beyond the 2,291 faculty and staff that were employed by AAU in 2010, resulting in 3,511 faculty and staff by 2020. In order to accommodate AAU's increased enrollment, AAU plans on expanding its existing facilities and shuttle service.

The Proposed Project consists of four general components: program-level growth, project-level growth, legalization of prior unauthorized changes, and shuttle expansion. These components are explained below:

1. **Program-level growth** consists of approximately 110,000 net square feet (sf) of additional residential uses (to house approximately 400 students, equivalent to about 220 rooms) and 669,670 sf of additional institutional space in 12 geographic areas (study areas) that AAU and the Planning Department have identified where AAU could occupy buildings. However, beyond the project sites listed below, no specific buildings have been identified at this stage in the planning process for these geographic areas. The 12 study areas are further described in Section 3.4.3, Study Areas (Program-Level Analysis), p. 3-39, and generally include the following areas: Study Area 1 (SA-1), Lombard Street/Divisadero Street; SA-2, Lombard Street/Van Ness Avenue; SA-3, Mid Van Ness Avenue; SA-4, Sutter Street/Mason Street; SA-5, Mid Market Street; SA-6, Fourth Street/Howard Street; SA-7, Rincon Hill East; SA-8, Third Street/Bryant Street; SA-9, Second Street/Brannan Street; SA-10, Fifth Street/Brannan Street; SA-11, Sixth Street/Folsom Street; and SA-12, Ninth Street/Folsom Street.

¹ This does not include AAU's online student population. In 2010, the average ratio of on-line to on-site students was approximately 0.6 to one. Assuming this ratio remains the same, future AAU growth would include approximately 3,660 on-line students. Because on-line students do not use AAU facilities, the increase in on-line student is not considered in this environmental analysis.

2. **Project-level growth** consists of six additional buildings that have been occupied, identified, or otherwise changed by AAU since publication of the September 2010 Notice of Preparation (NOP) for this environmental impact report (EIR), but for which one or more City approvals have not yet been issued. These six project sites include 393,537 sf of institutional uses and 17,533 sf of recreational uses. The six project sites are further described in Section 3.4.4, Project Sites (Project-Level Analysis), p. 3-77, and include the following addresses: Project Site 1 (PS-1), 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery); PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street; PS-3, 625 Polk Street; PS-4, 150 Hayes Street; PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street; and PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue.
3. **Legalization Approvals.** The legalization of pre-NOP changes addresses the fact that AAU was operating at 34 locations at the time of the September 2010 NOP, but that at most of these locations, AAU had not obtained the required City permits to change the use and/or appearance of the buildings, including required conditional use authorizations, building permits, or other permits. AAU now seeks to obtain the necessary approvals (“Legalization Approvals”). The City will rely on this EIR when considering the Legalization Approvals. For a complete list of pending Legalization Approvals, see Table 3-2, Existing Institutional Facilities, p. 3-9, and Table 3-3, Existing Residential Facilities, p. 3-10, and Section 3.6, Intended Uses of the EIR, p. 3-148.²

It should be noted that California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires an analysis of a proposed project’s changes to the environment as it existed at the time environmental review began, even if that existing condition resulted from unpermitted or otherwise unlawful activity. This means that the EIR’s analysis of the impacts of the legalization of AAU’s pre-NOP changes, like the EIR’s analysis of the other three elements of the Proposed Project (program-level growth, project-level growth and shuttle expansion), is measured against the existing conditions at the time of the NOP. But because AAU had already changed the use and/or appearance of the buildings that need Legalization Approvals prior to the NOP, and no further change is proposed, there is no impact resulting from the legalization of the pre-NOP changes as compared to the baseline. The Legalization Approvals would result in the full legalization of 28 of AAU’s 34 existing sites, which total 1,550,459 sf of institutional, residential, and recreational uses.³

4. The **shuttle expansion** consists of an extension of AAU’s shuttle service, under its Shuttle Bus Service Policy, to four of the project sites and potential extension to the 12 study areas in which program-level growth is anticipated.

Combining the project-level and program-level growth, the Proposed Project would add about 110,000 sf of residential uses, 1,063,207 sf of institutional uses, and 17,533 sf of recreational uses, none of which includes new construction. The Legalization Approvals would result in the full

² Of the 34 existing sites, six do not require discretionary review, and five require only historic review for signage and/or exterior lighting and no other discretionary approvals.

³ The City is evaluating the effects of the potential issuance of the Legalization Approvals in an Existing Sites Technical Memorandum, which will be used by the City in determining whether or under what conditions those approvals could be granted.

legalization of 28 of AAU's 34 existing sites, which total 1,550,459 sf of institutional, residential, and recreational uses. In total, the Proposed Project would result in 2,741,199 sf of AAU institutional, residential, and recreational uses.

1.2 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES

The Planning Department published a Notice of Preparation (NOP) on September 29, 2010, announcing its intent to prepare and distribute an EIR (the NOP is presented in Appendix A to this EIR). Nineteen topics are analyzed in the EIR, as listed in Section 2.4.2, Public Review of the Draft EIR, of Chapter 2, Introduction.

All impacts of the proposed project and associated mitigation measures identified in this EIR are summarized in Table 1-1, Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures, p. 1-6. These impacts are listed in the same order as they appear in the text of Chapter 4, Environmental Setting and Impacts. For the topics evaluated in the EIR, the levels of significance of impacts are identified as:

- **No Impact** – No adverse changes (or impacts) to the environment are expected.
- **Less than Significant** – Impact that does not exceed the defined significance criteria or would be eliminated or reduced to a less-than-significant level through compliance with existing local, state, and federal laws and regulations.
- **Less than Significant with Mitigation** – Impact that is reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of the identified mitigation measures.
- **Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation** – Impact that exceeds the defined significance criteria and can be reduced through compliance with existing local, state, and federal laws and regulations and/or implementation of all feasible mitigation measures, but cannot be reduced to a less-than-significant level.
- **Significant and Unavoidable** – Impact that exceeds the defined significance criteria and cannot be eliminated or reduced to a less-than-significant level through compliance with existing local, state, and federal laws and regulations and for which there are no feasible mitigation measures.

Where applicable, Table 1-1, Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures, p. 1-6, identifies project revisions or conditions, expressed as mitigation measures, which would reduce the identified impact(s) to less-than-significant levels. The impact's level of significance after implementation of the required mitigation measure is provided in the column labeled "Level of Significance After Mitigation." Where called for, improvement measures are also identified in Chapter 4 to reduce the effects of impacts that would be less than significant. Improvement measures would not be required by CEQA, but are recommended for consideration as conditions of approval by decision-makers as part of individual project approvals.

This summary table is presented for the reader as an overview of project impacts, mitigation measures, and improvement measures. Refer to the relevant environmental topic sections in Chapter 4, Environmental Setting and Impacts, for a thorough discussion and analysis of the impacts of the proposed project, and the mitigation measures identified to address those impacts.

There are several measures required by law that would serve to avoid potential significant impacts; they are summarized here for informational purposes. These measures include, but are not limited to, prohibition on the use of mirrored glass on the building to reduce glare, as per City Planning Commission Resolution 9212; limitation of construction-related noise levels, pursuant to the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (San Francisco Police Code Article 29, 1972); compliance with *Planning Code* Section 139, Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings; compliance with San Francisco Building Code Section 3424, Work Practices for Lead-Based Paint on Pre-1979 Buildings and Steel Structures; San Francisco Health Code Articles 21 and 22; and observance of state and federal Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) safety requirements related to handling and disposal of other hazardous materials, such as asbestos. Because compliance with existing law would obviate any potential impacts related to the above issues, neither significant impacts nor mitigation measures are identified in connection with these issues.

Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

The analysis in this EIR indicates that the Proposed Project would create a demand for housing that is significant and unavoidable. No feasible mitigation is available.

- Impact PH-2.1 identifies a significant and unavoidable impact from housing demand as a result of population growth in the study areas. Alternative 4, Reduced Institutional Growth Alternative, was identified and has been assessed to reduce this significant and unavoidable impact of the Proposed Project.

The analysis in this EIR indicates that the Proposed Project would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to the following significant cumulative impact in the year 2035. This impact can be mitigated, but not necessarily to a less-than-significant level, and therefore is deemed significant and unavoidable:

- Impact C-TR-2.1a/2.2a/2.3a identifies a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact from a substantial increase in local transit demand that could not be accommodated by adjacent Muni transit capacity at the Kearny/Stockton and Geary corridors under 2035 Cumulative plus Project conditions. AAU shall be required to make a fair share contribution to mitigate the cumulative transit demand impact related to AAU growth in transit ridership on the Kearny/Stockton corridor of the Northeast screenline and on the Geary corridor of the Northwest screenline to SFMTA. For all institutional use, AAU shall pay a fee in the amount of the applicable Transit Impact Development Fee (TIDF), found in *Planning Code* Section 411.3(e) for “Cultural/Institution/Education, Post-Secondary School” as that fee is indexed annually, or any successor fee that supersedes this fee. The fee will be based on the total square footage of use in the EIR for each Project Site and for the proposed square

footage of use when a Project in one of the Study Areas is proposed. None of the credits permitted by Sections 411 et seq., or any successor fee ordinance, shall apply. Any payment or proportional payment is due prior to the issuance of a building permit for the Project or portion of the Project. The City shall account for the expenditure of funds to support additional transit in the affected corridors. The payment of the fee in this mitigation measure shall satisfy the AAU's obligations under the TIDF for all projects where the mitigation measure applies. For residential uses, any proposed AAU student housing proposal shall be subject to future transit impact fees if adopted. The City has conducted a nexus analysis, including on residential development, to support a future Transportation Sustainability Fee. The City anticipates that the Board of Supervisors may adopt a new impact fee or fees to offset the impact of residential use on San Francisco's transportation network. AAU student housing or other residential projects shall be subject to any future residential transit impact fees that are established prior to the project receiving a final project approval including a building permit or first certificate of occupancy, whichever occurs later. The Planning Department or the Planning Commission shall make payment of any future residential transit impact fee a condition of approval of all AAU student housing or residential project consistent with future legislation.

AAU may apply to the ERO to reduce, adjust, or modify this fee prior to a project approval based on substantial evidence supporting the absence of any reasonable relationship between the impact of the AAU use on cumulative transit demand and the amount of fee charged.

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
SECTION 4.2, LAND USE AND LAND USE PLANNING			
Impact LU-1.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would not physically divide an established community. (No Impact)	NI	None required.	NI
Impact LU-1.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not physically divide an established community. (No Impact)	NI	—	NI
<u>Levels of Significance</u>			
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
Impact LU-1.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not physically divide an established community. (No Impact)	NI	None required.	NI
Impact LU-2.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would not have a substantial adverse impact on the existing character of the vicinity. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact LU-2.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not have a substantial adverse impact on the existing character of the vicinity. (Less than Significant)	LTS	—	LTS
<u>Levels of Significance</u>			
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: Less than Significant ■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: Less than Significant 	LTS	None required.	LTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: Less than Significant 	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact LU-2.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not have a substantial adverse impact on the existing character of the vicinity. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact LU-3.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact LU-3.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. (Less than Significant)	LTS	—	LTS
<u>Levels of Significance</u>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): Less than Significant ■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: Less than Significant ■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: Less than Significant ■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: Less than Significant ■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: Less than Significant ■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: Less than Significant 	LTS	None required.	LTS
	LTS	None required.	LTS
	LTS	None required.	LTS
	LTS	None required.	LTS
	LTS	None required.	LTS
	LTS	None required.	LTS
	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact LU-3.3, Occupancy and renovation in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
Impact C-LU-1, Implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a cumulative impact on land use. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
SECTION 4.3, AESTHETICS			
Impact AE-1.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would not substantially affect scenic vistas or visual resources visible from publicly accessible areas in the study areas. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact AE-1.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not substantially affect scenic vistas and visual resources visible from publicly accessible areas at the project sites. (Less than Significant)	LTS	—	LTS
<u>Levels of Significance</u>			
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact AE-1.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not substantially affect scenic vistas and visual resources visible from publicly accessible areas in the study areas and at the project sites. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact AE-2.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would not substantially affect the existing visual character or quality of the sites and their surroundings. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
Impact AE-2.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the sites and their surroundings. (Less than Significant) <u>Levels of Significance</u>	LTS	—	LTS
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact AE-2.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact AE-3.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area or which would substantially impact other people or properties. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact AE-3.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area or which would substantially impact other people or properties. (Less than Significant) <u>Levels of Significance</u>	LTS	—	LTS
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact AE-3.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area or which would substantially impact other people or properties. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact C-AE-1, The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant aesthetic impact. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS

SECTION 4.4, POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT

Impact PH-1.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would not induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, by establishing substantial new employment opportunities that attract employees to an area or through extension of roads or other infrastructure). (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact PH-1.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, by establishing substantial new employment opportunities that attract employees to an area or through extension of roads or other infrastructure). (Less than Significant)	LTS	—	LTS
<u>Levels of Significance</u>			
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures

NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
Impact PH-1.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, by establishing substantial new employment opportunities that attract employees to an area or through extension of roads or other infrastructure). (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact PH-2.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would displace substantial numbers of people, or existing housing units, or create demand for additional housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, or displace a substantial number of businesses or employees. (Significant and Unavoidable)	SU	No feasible mitigation is available.	SU
Impact PH-2.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing units or create demand for additional housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, or displace a substantial number of businesses or employees. (Less than Significant)	LTS	—	LTS
<u>Levels of Significance</u>			
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
Impact PH-2.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would displace substantial numbers of people, or existing housing units or create demand for additional housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, or displace a substantial number of businesses or employees. (Significant and Unavoidable)	SU	No feasible mitigation is available.	SU

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
Impact C-PH-1, The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a cumulative impact on population and housing. (Significant and Unavoidable)	SU	No feasible mitigation is available.	SU
SECTION 4.5, CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
Impact CP-1.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical architectural resources. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact CP-1.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical architectural resource. (Less than Significant)	LTS	—	LTS
<u>Levels of Significance</u>			
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
Impact CP-1.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical architectural resource. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact CP-2.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resources pursuant to Section 15064.5. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)	PS	Mitigation Measure M-CP-2.1 – Project-Specific Preliminary Archaeological Assessment. This archeological mitigation measure shall apply to any project involving any soils-disturbing or soils-improving activities including excavation, utilities installation, grading, soils remediation, compaction/chemical grouting to a depth of two feet below ground surface (bgs) or greater within the following study areas: SA-2, Lombard Street/Van Ness Avenue, SA-5, Mid Market Street; SA-6, Fourth Street/Howard Street; SA-7, Rincon Hill East; SA-8, Third Street/Bryant Street; SA-9, Second Street/Brannan Street; and SA-12,	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures

NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
		<p>Ninth Street/Folsom Street; to a depth of four feet bgs or greater and located within properties within the remaining study areas (SA-1, Lombard Street/Divisadero Street; SA-3, Mid Van Ness Avenue; SA-4, Sutter Street/Mason Street; SA-10, Fifth Street/Brannan Street; and SA-11, Sixth Street/Folsom Street); or to the thresholds identified in the Area Plan EIR Archeological Mitigation Zones outlined in Table 4.5-2, Area Plan EIR Archeological Resources Mitigation Measures, p. 4.5-59, for projects covered by those Zones.</p> <p>Projects to which this mitigation measure applies shall be subject to Preliminary Archeology Review (PAR) by the San Francisco Planning Department archeologist, or a Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Study (PASS) may be required in consultation with the San Francisco Planning Department archeologist. The PASS shall be prepared by an archeological consultant from the pool of qualified archeological consultants maintained by the Planning Department archeologist. The PASS shall contain the following:</p> <p>Determine the historical uses of the project site based on any previous archeological documentation and Sanborn maps.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Determine types of archeological resources/properties that may have been located at the project site and whether the archeological resources/property types would potentially be eligible for listing on the California Register. ■ Determine if 19th- or 20th-century soils-disturbing activities may have adversely affected the identified potential archeological resources. ■ Assess potential project effects in relation to the depth of any identified potential archeological resource. ■ Provide a conclusion that assesses whether any California Register-eligible archeological resources could be adversely affected by the Proposed Project and recommends appropriate further action. ■ Based on the PAR or PASS, the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) shall determine if an Archeological Research Design Treatment Plan (ARDTP) shall be required to more definitively identify the potential for California Register-eligible archeological resources to be present at the project site and determine the appropriate action necessary to reduce the potential effect of the 	

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
		project on archeological resources to a less-than-significant level. The scope of the ARDTP shall be determined in consultation with the ERO and consistent with the standards for archeological documentation established by the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) for purposes of compliance with CEQA (OHP Preservation Planning Bulletin No. 5). If the PAR or PASS adequately identifies the potential for California Register-eligible archeological resources to be present at the project site, the ERO shall determine the appropriate action necessary to reduce the potential effect of the project on archeological resources to a less-than-significant level. Actions may include an archeological testing program, archeological monitoring program, archeological data recovery program, accidental discovery measures/worker training, final reporting, curation, consultation with descendant communities, and interpretation undertaken in consultation with the Planning Department archeologist by an archeological consultant from the pool of qualified archeological consultants maintained by the Planning Department archeologist.	
Impact CP-2.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resources pursuant to Section 15064.5. (No Impact)	NI	—	NI
<u>Levels of Significance</u>			
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
Impact CP-2.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resources pursuant to Section 15064.5. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)	PS	Implement Mitigation Measure M-CP-2.1, Project-Specific Preliminary Archaeological Assessment, p. 4.5-78.	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
Impact CP-3.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact CP-3.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature. (No Impact)	NI	—	NI
<u>Levels of Significance</u>			
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
Impact CP-3.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact CP-4.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, could disturb human remains including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)	PS	Implement Mitigation Measure M-CP-2.1, Project-Specific Preliminary Archaeological Assessment, p. 4.5-78.	LTS
Impact CP-4.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites would not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. (No Impact)	NI	—	NI
<u>Levels of Significance</u>			
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
Impact CP-4.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)	PS	Implement Mitigation Measure M-CP-2.1, Project-Specific Preliminary Archaeological Assessment, p. 4.5-78.	LTS
Impact C-CP-1, The Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative historical, archeological, or paleontological resources impact, or to a significant cumulative disturbance of human remains. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
SECTION 4.6, TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION			
Impact TR-1.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would not result in a substantial adverse impact at any of the study intersections during the peak hours, or cause major traffic hazards. (Less than Significant)	LTS	No mitigation required. Improvement Measure I-TR-1 – Implement Transportation Demand Management Strategies to Reduce Single-Occupancy Vehicle Trips. AAU shall implement a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program that seeks to minimize the number of single-occupancy vehicle trips (SOV) generated by the Proposed Project for the lifetime of the project. The TDM Program targets a reduction in SOV trips by encouraging persons to select other modes of transportation, including walking, bicycling, transit, car-share, carpooling, and/or other modes. 1. Identify TDM Coordinator: The project sponsor should identify a TDM coordinator for all of the project sites. The TDM Coordinator is responsible for the implementation and ongoing operation of all other TDM measures described below. The TDM Coordinator could be a brokered service through an existing transportation management association (e.g., the Transportation Management Association of San Francisco, TMA SF), or the TDM Coordinator could be an existing staff member (e.g., property manager); the TDM Coordinator does not have to work full-time at the project site. However, the TDM Coordinator should be the single point of contact for all transportation-related questions from Project occupants and City staff. The TDM Coordinator should provide TDM training to other Project staff about the transportation amenities and options	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures

NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
		<p>available at the project sites and nearby.</p> <p>2. Provide Transportation and Trip Planning Information to Building Occupants:</p> <p>a. Move-in packet: Provide a transportation insert for the move-in packet that includes information on transit service (local and regional, schedules and fares), information on where transit passes could be purchased, information on the 511 Regional Rideshare Program and nearby bike and car share programs, and information on where to find additional web-based alternative transportation materials (e.g., NextMuni phone app). This move-in packet should be continuously updated as local transportation options change, and the packet should be provided to each new building occupant or, in the case of the Project Sites, to all current building occupants prior to building permit issuance. Provide Muni maps, San Francisco Bicycle and Pedestrian maps upon request.</p> <p>b. New-hire packet: Provide a transportation insert in the new-hire packet that includes information on transit service (local and regional, schedules and fares), information on where transit passes could be purchased, information on the 511 Regional Rideshare Program and nearby bike and car share programs, and information on where to find additional web-based alternative transportation materials (e.g., NextMuni phone app). This new-hire packet should be continuously updated as local transportation options change, and the packet should be provided to each new building occupant. Provide Muni maps, San Francisco Bicycle and Pedestrian maps upon request.</p>	
<p>Impact TR-1.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not result in a substantial adverse impact at any of the study intersections during the peak hours, or cause major traffic hazards. (Less than Significant)</p>	<p>LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation required.</p> <p>Implement Improvement Measure I-TR-1 – Implement Transportation Demand Management Strategies to Reduce Single-Occupancy Vehicle Trips, p. 4.6-154.</p>	<p>LTS</p>

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
Impact TR-1.3, The Proposed Project, including growth within the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not result in a substantial adverse impact at any of the 67 study intersections during the peak hours, or cause major traffic hazards. (Less than Significant)	LTS	No mitigation required. Implement Improvement Measure I-TR-1 – Implement Transportation Demand Management Strategies to Reduce Single-Occupancy Vehicle Trips, p. 4.6-154.	LTS
Impact TR-2.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would not result in a substantial increase in local or regional transit demand that could not be accommodated by local or regional transit capacity; nor would it affect transit operating conditions such that adverse impacts to local or regional transit service could occur. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact TR-2.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not result in a substantial increase in local or regional transit demand that could not be accommodated by local or regional transit capacity; nor would it affect transit operating conditions such that adverse impacts to local or regional transit service could occur. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact TR-2.3, The Proposed Project, including growth within the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not result in a substantial increase in local or regional transit demand that could not be accommodated by local or regional transit capacity; nor would it affect transit operating conditions such that adverse impacts to local or regional transit service could occur. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact TR-3.1, The Proposed Project, including growth within the 12 study areas, would result in a substantial increase in shuttle demand that could not be accommodated by planned shuttle capacity so as to avoid an impact to the City's transit or transportation system; but would not cause substantial conflicts with traffic, public transit, pedestrian, bicycles, or commercial loading. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)	PS	Mitigation Measure M-TR-3.1 – Shuttle Demand, Service Monitoring, and Capacity Utilization Performance Standard. AAU shall develop, implement, and provide to the City a shuttle management plan to address meeting the peak hour shuttle demand needs of its growth. The shuttle management plan shall address the monitoring, analysis, and potential correction such that unmet shuttle demand would not impact the City's transit and transportation system. Analysis of shuttle bus demand and capacity utilization shall occur at least on an annual basis, or as needed to address shuttle demand. Specifically, analysis and adjustments shall be made on any AAU shuttle routes to reduce shuttle peak hour capacity utilization when the performance standard of 100 percent capacity utilization is regularly observed to be exceeded on any of the AAU shuttle routes. Additionally, the shuttle management plan shall address how shuttle demand at the six project sites will be provided. As additional project sites are added the shuttle	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures

NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
		<p>management plan would be adjusted to reflect up-to-date shuttle routes, stops and services, as well as a capacity utilization analysis, as needed to, indicate that the proposed demand for shuttle services could be met and avoid potential mode shifts to other travel modes. AAU shall report annually to the City on capacity utilization and alter its schedules and/or capacity, as necessary to avoid regular exceedances of the capacity utilization standard.</p> <p>Improvement Measure I-TR-2 – AAU Shuttle Activities Monitoring. As a standard condition of approval, the project sponsor, AAU shall develop and monitor a shuttle bus operation program or group of policies, such as the AAU Shuttle Bus Policy, to ensure shuttle activities do not on a recurring basis substantially impede or interfere with traffic, adjacent land use, transit, pedestrians, commercial or passenger loading, and bicycles on the public right-of-way. Such a program shall at a minimum include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ A dedicated contact person(s) for the shuttle bus operation program ■ AAU will document changes to routes and make the documentation available to the City and to the public promptly on the AAU website ■ Inclusion of policies or procedures and necessary driver education and penalties to insure that shuttles avoid neighborhood residential streets where feasible ■ Inclusion of polices or procedures and necessary driver education and penalties to insure shuttles do not idle at stops when vehicles are not actively loading and unloading ■ In the event that a white shuttle bus zone cannot be located or approved in front of an AAU building or an existing stop cannot accommodate additional shuttle traffic, AAU shall analyze and propose an alternate location (white zone, nearby property driveway or garage, etc.) to accommodate the AAU peak hour shuttle trips without affecting adjacent vehicle travel lanes ■ Reporting and documentation procedures to address transportation-related complaints related to shuttle activity ■ Policies requiring the management of the shuttle program to be consistent with SFMTA shuttle policies, including no use of Muni or 	

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
		<p>regional stops without approval of the affected transit agency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Policies to regularly monitor and adjust (as needed) the AAU shuttle service provided, such that underutilized routes can be adjusted or removed as needed, and heavily used route service can be adjusted to add larger shuttles, provide more frequent service, or other adjustments that result in similar increased capacity <p>If the Planning Director or SFMTA Director, or his or her designee, have reason to believe that a shuttle activity is creating a recurring conflict (traffic, transit, pedestrian, bicycle, or loading) or safety concern on public property, the Planning Department or SFMTA shall notify AAU in writing. If warranted, the Department(s) may also require AAU to hire a qualified transportation consultant to evaluate the conditions at the site. The consultant shall evaluate the conditions for no less than seven days. The scope of data collection shall be coordinated and reviewed with the Planning Department and/or SFMTA prior to collection. The consultant shall prepare a report summarizing the observations and conditions, and the contribution of the shuttle activity to the concern. The consultant shall provide the Department a recommendation for resolution. If the Department determines that a recurring conflict or safety concern related to shuttle activities exists and could be improved upon, AAU shall have 90 days from the date of the written determination to resolve the matter as recommended or present an alternative solution.</p>	
Impact TR-3.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would result in a substantial increase in shuttle demand that could not be accommodated by planned shuttle capacity so as to avoid an impact to the City's transit or transportation system; but would not cause substantial conflicts with traffic, public transit, pedestrian, bicycles, or commercial loading. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)	PS	Implement Mitigation Measure M-TR-3.1 – Shuttle Demand, Service Monitoring, and Capacity Utilization Performance Standard, p. 4.6-89. Implement Improvement Measure I-TR-2 – AAU Shuttle Activities Monitoring, p. 4.6-155.	LTS
Impact TR-3.3, The Proposed Project, including growth within the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would result in a substantial increase in shuttle demand that could not be accommodated by planned shuttle capacity so as to avoid an impact to the City's transit or transportation system; but would not cause substantial conflicts with traffic, public transit, pedestrian, bicycles, or commercial loading. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)	PS	Implement Mitigation Measure M-TR-3.1 – Shuttle Demand, Service Monitoring and Capacity Utilization Performance Standard, p. 4.6-89. Implement Improvement Measure I-TR-2 – AAU Shuttle Activities Monitoring, p. 4.6-155.	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
Impact TR-4.1, The Proposed Project, including growth within the 12 study areas, would not result in substantial overcrowding on public sidewalks or otherwise interfere with pedestrian accessibility, or create potentially hazardous conditions for pedestrians. (Less than Significant)	LTS	No mitigation required. Implement Improvement Measure I-TR-2 – AAU Shuttle Activities Monitoring, p. 4.6-155.	LTS
Impact TR-4.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not result in substantial overcrowding on public sidewalks or otherwise interfere with pedestrian accessibility, or create potentially hazardous conditions for pedestrians. (Less than Significant)	LTS	No mitigation required. Improvement Measure I-TR-3 – Improvement of Pedestrian Conditions at PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue. To improve pedestrian conditions at the 2225 Jerrold Avenue building entry, AAU would create a clear pedestrian walkway between the proposed AAU shuttle stop and adjacent parking lot to the building entrance, which may require AAU to stop utilizing up to two of the six existing loading docks east of the parking lot. Additionally, and as part of the abandonment of these loading dock area, AAU shall remove or reduce in size the curb cuts along Jerrold Avenue, improving pedestrian conditions along Jerrold Avenue.	LTS
Impact TR-4.3, The Proposed Project, including growth within the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not result in substantial overcrowding on public sidewalks or otherwise interfere with pedestrian accessibility, or create potentially hazardous conditions for pedestrians. (Less than Significant)	LTS	Implement Improvement Measure I-TR-3 – Improvement of Pedestrian Conditions at PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue, p. 4.6-156.	LTS
Impact TR-5.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would not result in potentially hazardous conditions for bicyclists, nor otherwise substantially interfere with bicycle accessibility to the site and adjoining areas. (Less than Significant)	LTS	No mitigation required. Improvement Measure I-TR-4 – Improvement of Bicycle Parking Conditions at AAU Facilities. To improve bicycle parking and conditions for bicyclists at the six project sites and future project sites, AAU shall add on- or off-street (or some combination thereof) bicycle parking facilities at project sites. Although additional bicycle parking may not be required under the <i>Planning Code</i> , AAU shall strive to reach the bicycle parking levels consistent with <i>Planning Code</i> for such use categories as for student housing, offices, and postsecondary educational institutions, or consistent with other college campuses for similar types of use (such as classrooms, public areas/showrooms/event facilities, administrative office, student housing, and other student services).	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
Impact TR-5.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not result in potentially hazardous conditions for bicyclists, nor otherwise substantially interfere with bicycle accessibility to the site and adjoining areas. (Less than Significant)	LTS	No mitigation required. Implement Improvement Measure I-TR-4 – Improvement of Bicycle Parking Conditions at AAU Facilities, p. 4.6-156.	LTS
Impact TR-5.3, The Proposed Project, including growth within the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not result in potentially hazardous conditions for bicyclists, nor otherwise substantially interfere with bicycle accessibility to the site and adjoining areas. (Less than Significant)	LTS	No mitigation required. Implement Improvement Measure I-TR-4 – Improvement of Bicycle Parking Conditions at AAU Facilities, p. 4.6-156.	LTS
Impact TR-6.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would not substantially increase loading demand and would, therefore, have a less-than-significant commercial loading impact. (Less than Significant)	LTS	No mitigation required. Improvement Measure I-TR-5 – AAU Monitoring of Commercial Loading Activities. AAU would further improve conditions in study areas with high existing commercial loading demand, such as SA-5 and SA-7, where AAU would monitor and efficiently manage their commercial loading activities over time and as needed, adjusting times of deliveries or applying for additional on-street commercial loading spaces from SFMTA. Since AAU has a centralized delivery system, commercial deliveries could be combined and managed to occur when higher amounts of on-street commercial loading spaces are available. This would improve potential AAU commercial loading activities in the study areas.	LTS
Impact TR-6.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not substantially increase loading demand and would, therefore, have a less-than-significant commercial loading impact. (Less than Significant)	LTS	No mitigation required. Implement Improvement Measures I-TR-3 – Improvement of Pedestrian Conditions at PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue, p. 4.6-156, and I-TR-5 – AAU Monitoring of Commercial Loading Activities, p. 4.6-156.	LTS
Impact TR-6.3, The Proposed Project, including growth within the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not substantially increase loading demand and would, therefore, have a less-than-significant commercial loading impact. (Less than Significant)	LTS	No mitigation required. Implement Improvement Measure I-TR-5 – AAU Monitoring of Commercial Loading Activities, p. 4.6-156.	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures

NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
Impact TR-7.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would not substantially increase parking demand nor would it cause unsafe or delayed conditions for other transportation activities. (Less than Significant)	LTS	No mitigation required. Implement Improvement Measures I-TR-1 – Implement Transportation Demand Management Strategies to Reduce Single-Occupancy Vehicle Trips, p. 4.6-154, and I-TR-5 – AAU Monitoring of Commercial Loading Activities, p. 4.6-156.	LTS
Impact TR-7.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not substantially increase parking demand nor would it cause unsafe or delayed conditions for other transportation activities. (Less than Significant)	LTS	No mitigation required. Implement Improvement Measures I-TR-1 – Implement Transportation Demand Management Strategies to Reduce Single-Occupancy Vehicle Trips, p. 4.6-154, and I-TR-3 – Improvement of Pedestrian Conditions at PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue, p. 4.6-156.	LTS
Impact TR-7.3, The Proposed Project, including growth within the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not substantially increase parking demand nor would it cause unsafe or delayed conditions for other transportation activities. (Less than Significant)	LTS	No mitigation required. Implement Improvement Measure I-TR-1 – Implement Transportation Demand Management Strategies to Reduce Single-Occupancy Vehicle Trips, p. 4.6-154.	LTS
Impact TR-8, The Proposed Project, including growth within the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not result in inadequate emergency access. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
Impact TR-9, The Proposed Project, including growth within the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not result in construction-related transportation impacts because of their temporary and limited duration. (Less than Significant)	LTS	<p>No mitigation required.</p> <p>Improvement Measure I-TR-6 – Construction Truck Deliveries during Off-Peak Periods. Any construction traffic occurring between 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 a.m. or between 3:30 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. would coincide with peak hour traffic and could temporarily impede traffic and transit flow. Limiting truck movements to the hours between 9:00 a.m. and 3:30 p.m. (or other times, if approved by SFMTA) would improve general traffic flow on adjacent streets during the AM and PM peak periods.</p> <p>Improvement Measure I-TR-7 – Additions to the Construction Management Plan. In addition to items required in the Construction Management Plan, AAU shall include the following additional items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Carpool and Transit Access for Construction Workers – As an improvement to minimize parking demand and vehicle trips associated with construction workers, the construction contractor shall include methods to encourage carpooling and transit use to the project site by construction workers in the Construction Management Plan contracts. ■ Project Construction Updates – As an improvement to reduce construction-related disruption on nearby businesses and neighborhoods, the project sponsor shall provide regularly-updated information (typically in the form of website, news articles, on-site posting, etc.) regarding project construction and schedule, as well as contact information for specific construction inquiries or concerns. 	LTS
Impact C-TR-1.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity of the study areas, would not result in a substantial adverse impact at any of the study intersections, or cause major traffic hazards. (Less than Significant)	LTS	<p>No mitigation required.</p> <p>Implement Improvement Measure I-TR-1 – Implement Transportation Demand Management Strategies to Reduce Single-Occupancy Vehicle Trips, p. 4.6-154.</p>	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
Impact C-TR-1.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity of the project sites, would not result in a substantial adverse impact at any of the study intersections, or cause major traffic hazards. (Less than Significant)	LTS	No mitigation required. Implement Improvement Measure I-TR-1 – Implement Transportation Demand Management Strategies to Reduce Single-Occupancy Vehicle Trips, p. 4.6-154.	LTS
Impact C-TR-1.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity of the study areas and project sites, would not result in a substantial adverse impact at any of the study intersections, or cause major traffic hazards. (Less than Significant)	LTS	No mitigation required. Implement Improvement Measure I-TR-1 – Implement Transportation Demand Management Strategies to Reduce Single-Occupancy Vehicle Trips, p. 4.6-154.	LTS
Impact C-TR-2.1a, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity of the study areas, could result in a substantial increase in local transit demand that could not be accommodated by adjacent Muni transit capacity at the Kearny/Stockton and Geary corridors under 2035 Cumulative plus Project conditions. (Significant and Unavoidable)	SU	Mitigation Measure C-M-TR-2.1a – AAU Fair Share Contribution to Cumulative Transit Impact. AAU shall be required to make a fair share contribution to mitigate the cumulative transit demand impact related to AAU growth in transit ridership on the Kearny/Stockton corridor of the Northeast screenline and on the Geary corridor of the Northwest screenline to SFMTA. For all institutional use, AAU shall pay a fee in the amount of the applicable Transit Impact Development Fee (TIDF), found in <i>Planning Code</i> Section 411.3(e) for “Cultural/Institution/Education, Post-Secondary School” as that fee is indexed annually, or any successor fee that supersedes this fee. The fee will be based on the total square footage of use in the EIR for each Project Site and for the proposed square footage of use when a Project in one of the Study Areas is proposed. None of the credits permitted by Section 411 et seq., or any successor fee ordinance, shall apply. Any payment or proportional payment is due prior to the issuance of a building permit for the Project or portion of the Project. The City shall account for the expenditure of funds to support additional transit in the affected corridors. The payment of the fee in this mitigation measure shall satisfy the AAU’s obligations under the TIDF for all projects where the mitigation measure applies. For residential uses, any proposed AAU student housing proposal shall be subject to future transit impact fees if adopted. The City has conducted a nexus analysis, including on residential development, to support a future Transportation Sustainability Fee. The City anticipates that the Board of Supervisors may adopt a new impact fee or fees to	SU

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
		offset the impact of residential use on San Francisco's transportation network. AAU student housing or other residential projects shall be subject to any future residential transit impact fees that are established prior to the project receiving a final project approval including a building permit or first certificate of occupancy, whichever occurs later. The Planning Department or the Planning Commission shall make payment of any future residential transit impact fee a condition of approval of all AAU student housing or residential project consistent with future legislation. AAU may apply to the ERO to reduce, adjust, or modify this fee prior to a project approval based on substantial evidence supporting the absence of any reasonable relationship between the impact of the AAU use on cumulative transit demand and the amount of fee charged.	
Impact C-TR-2.1b, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity of the study areas, would not result in a substantial increase in regional transit demand that could not be accommodated by regional transit capacity under 2035 Cumulative plus Project conditions. (Less than Significant)	LTS	Implement Mitigation Measure C-M-TR-2.1a – AAU Fair Share Contribution to Cumulative Transit Impact, p. 4.6-140.	LTS
Impact C-TR-2.2a, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity of the project sites, could result in a substantial increase in local transit demand that could not be accommodated by adjacent Muni transit capacity at the Kearny/Stockton corridor and Geary corridor under 2035 Cumulative plus Project conditions. (Significant and Unavoidable)	SU	Implement Mitigation Measure C-M-TR-2.1a – AAU Fair Share Contribution to Cumulative Transit Impact, p. 4.6-140.	SU
Impact C-TR-2.2b, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity of the project sites, would not result in a substantial increase in regional transit demand that could not be accommodated by regional transit capacity under 2035 Cumulative plus Project conditions. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
Impact C-TR-2.3a, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity of the study areas and project sites, could result in a substantial increase in local transit demand that could not be accommodated by adjacent Muni transit capacity at the Kearny/Stockton corridor and Geary Corridor under 2035 Cumulative plus Project conditions. (Significant and Unavoidable)	SU	Implement Mitigation Measure C-M-TR-2.1a – AAU Fair Share Contribution to Cumulative Transit Impact, p. 4.6-140.	SU
Impact C-TR-2.3b, The Proposed Project would not result in a substantial increase in regional transit demand that could not be accommodated by regional transit capacity under 2035 Cumulative plus Project conditions. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required	LTS
Impact C-TR-3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity of the study areas and project sites, would have less-than-significant with mitigation cumulative AAU shuttle impact. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)	PS	Implement Mitigation Measure M-TR-3.1 – Shuttle Demand, Service Monitoring, and Capacity Utilization Performance Standard, p. 4.6-89. Implement Improvement Measures I-TR-2 – AAU Shuttle Activities Monitoring, p. 4.6-155, I-TR-4 – Improvement of Bicycle Parking Conditions at AAU Facilities, p. 4.6-156, I-TR-5 – Monitoring of Commercial Loading Activities, p. 4.6-156, I-TR-6 – Construction Truck Deliveries during Off-Peak Periods, p. 4.6-156, and I-TR-7 – Additions to the Construction Management Plan, p. 4.6-156.	LTS

SECTION 4.7, NOISE

Impact NO-1.1, The Proposed Project construction activities associated with growth in the 12 study areas would not expose persons to temporary increases in noise levels substantially in excess of ambient levels. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact NO-1.2, The Proposed Project construction activities associated with growth at the six project sites would not expose persons to temporary increases in noise levels substantially in excess of ambient levels. (Less than Significant)	LTS	—	LTS
<u>Levels of Significance</u>			
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: Less than Significant ■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: Less than Significant ■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: Less than Significant 	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact NO-1.3, The Proposed Project construction activities associated with growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites would not expose persons to temporary increases in noise levels substantially in excess of ambient levels. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact NO-2.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas could expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the San Francisco General Plan or Noise Ordinance (Police Code Article 29) or result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure M-NO-2.1a – Interior Noise Levels for Residential Uses. For new development including conversion of non-noise-sensitive to noise-sensitive uses located along streets with noise levels above 60 dBA (L_{dn}), where such development is not already subject to the California Noise Insulation Standards in California Code of Regulations Title 24, the project sponsor of future individual developments within the study areas shall conduct a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements. Such analysis shall be conducted by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering. Noise-insulation features identified and recommended by the analysis shall be included in the design, as specified in the <i>San Francisco General Plan Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Community Noise</i> to reduce potential interior noise levels to the maximum extent feasible. Additional noise attenuation features may need to be incorporated into the building design where noise levels exceed 70 dBA (L_{dn}) to ensure that acceptable interior noise levels can be achieved.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure M-NO-2.1b – Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses. To reduce potential conflicts between existing noise-generating uses and new sensitive receptors, for new residential development and development that includes other noise-sensitive uses (primarily, residences, and also including schools and child care, religious, and convalescent facilities and the like), the San Francisco Planning Department shall require the preparation of an analysis that includes, at a minimum, a site survey to identify potential noise-generating uses within 900 feet of, and that have a direct line-of-sight to, the project site, and including at least one 24-hour noise measurement (with average and maximum noise level readings taken so as to be able to accurately</p>	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures

NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
		<p>describe maximum levels reached during nighttime hours) prior to the first project approval action. The analysis shall be prepared by persons qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering and shall demonstrate with reasonable certainty that Title 24 standards, where applicable, can be met, and that there are no particular circumstances about the individual project site that appear to warrant heightened concern about noise levels in the vicinity. Should the Planning Department conclude that such concerns be present, the Planning Department may require the completion of a detailed noise assessment by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering prior to the first project approval action, in order to demonstrate that acceptable interior noise levels consistent with those in the Title 24 standards can be attained.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure M-NO-2.1c – Siting of Noise-Generating Equipment. If AAU proposes, as part of a change of use new (as opposed to replacement) mechanical equipment or ventilation units that would be expected, to increase ambient to noise levels by 5 dBA or more, either short-term, at nighttime, or as 24-hour average, in the proposed Project site vicinity, the San Francisco Planning Department shall require the preparation of an analysis that includes, at a minimum, a site survey to identify potential noise-sensitive uses (primarily, residences, and also including schools and child care, religious, and convalescent facilities and the like) within 900 feet of, and that have a direct line-of-sight to, the project site, and at least one 24-hour noise measurement (with average and maximum noise level readings taken so as to be able to accurately describe maximum levels reached during nighttime hours), prior to the first project approval action. The analysis shall be conducted prior to issuance of a building permit. The analysis shall be prepared by persons qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering and shall demonstrate with reasonable certainty that the proposed equipment would not cause a conflict with the use compatibility requirements in the <i>San Francisco General Plan</i> and would not violate Noise Ordinance Section 2909. If necessary to meet these standards, the proposed equipment shall be replaced with quieter equipment, deleted entirely, or mitigated through implementation of site-specific noise reduction features or strategies.</p>	

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
Impact NO-2.2, The Proposed Project, including the uses at the six project sites, would not expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the San Francisco General Plan or Noise Ordinance (Police Code Article 29) or result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels, (Less than Significant) <u>Levels of Significance</u>	LTS	—	LTS
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact NO-2.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, could expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the San Francisco General Plan or Noise Ordinance (Police Code Article 29) or result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)	PS	Implement Mitigation Measures M-NO-2.1a – Interior Noise Levels for Residential Uses, p. 4.7-36, M-NO-2.1b – Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses, p. 4.7-37, and M-NO-2.1c – Siting of Noise-Generating Equipment, p. 4.7-38.	LTS
Impact NO-3.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would not create excessive groundborne vibration levels in existing residential neighborhoods adjacent to the study areas. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact NO-3.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not create excessive groundborne vibration levels in existing residential neighborhoods adjacent to the project sites. (Less than Significant) <u>Levels of Significance</u>	LTS	—	LTS
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact NO-3.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not create excessive groundborne vibration levels in existing residential neighborhoods adjacent to the study areas or project sites. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact C-NO-1, The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a cumulative impact associated with noise and vibration. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)	PS	Implement of Mitigation Measures M-NO-2.1a – Interior Noise Levels for Residential Uses, p. 4.7-36, and M-NO-2.1b – Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses, p. 4.7-37.	LTS
SECTION 4.8, AIR QUALITY			
Impact AQ-1.1, Construction in the 12 study areas, could generate fugitive dust and criteria air pollutants during renovation activities, but would not violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact AQ-1.2, Construction at the six project sites would generate fugitive dust and criteria air pollutants during renovation activities, but would not violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact AQ-1.3, Construction of the Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would generate fugitive dust and criteria air pollutants during renovation activities, but would not violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact AQ-2.1, Construction in the 12 study areas could generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter that would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)	PS	Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2.1 – Construction Emissions Minimization within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone. This mitigation measure is applicable to renovation activities occurring within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone and where off-road diesel powered equipment	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
		<p>is required and would operate for more than 20 total hours over the duration of construction at any one site.</p> <p>A. <i>Construction Emissions Minimization Plan.</i> Prior to issuance of a construction permit, the project sponsor shall submit a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan (Plan) to the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) for review and approval by an Environmental Planning Air Quality Specialist. The Plan shall detail project compliance with the following requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All off-road equipment greater than 25 hp and operating for more than 20 total hours over the entire duration of construction activities shall meet the following requirements: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Where access to alternative sources of power is available, portable diesel engines shall be prohibited. b) All off-road equipment shall have: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Engines that meet or exceed either U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) or California Air Resources Board (ARB) Tier 2 off-road emission standards, and ii. Engines that are retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy (VDECS). c) Exceptions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Exceptions to A(1)(a) may be granted if the project sponsor has submitted information providing evidence to the satisfaction of the ERO that an alternative source of power is limited or infeasible at the project site and that the requirements of this exception provision apply. Under this circumstance, the sponsor shall submit documentation of compliance with A(1)(b) for on-site power generation. ii. Exceptions to A(1)(b)(ii) may be granted if the project sponsor has submitted information providing evidence to the satisfaction of the ERO that a particular piece of off-road equipment with an ARB Level 3 VDECS is (1) technically not feasible, (2) would not produce 	

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures

NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>															
		<p>desired emissions reductions due to expected operating modes, (3) installing the control device would create a safety hazard or impaired visibility for the operator, or (4) there is a compelling emergency need to use off-road equipment that are not retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 VDECS and the sponsor has submitted documentation to the ERO that the requirements of this exception provision apply. If granted an exception to A(1)(b)(ii), the project sponsor must comply with the requirements of A(1)(c)(iii).</p> <p>iii. If an exception is granted pursuant to A(1)(c)(ii), the project sponsor shall provide the next cleanest piece of off-road equipment as provided by the step down schedules in Table 4.8-13, Off-Road Equipment Compliance Step-Down Schedule.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1108 834 1782 1097"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" data-bbox="1108 834 1782 906">Table 4.8-11 Off-Road Equipment Compliance Step-Down Schedule</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="1108 906 1255 959"><i>Compliance Alternative</i></th> <th data-bbox="1255 906 1444 959"><i>Engine Emission Standard</i></th> <th data-bbox="1444 906 1782 959"><i>Emissions Control</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1108 959 1255 1003">1</td> <td data-bbox="1255 959 1444 1003">Tier 2</td> <td data-bbox="1444 959 1782 1003">ARB Level 2 VDECS</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1108 1003 1255 1047">2</td> <td data-bbox="1255 1003 1444 1047">Tier 2</td> <td data-bbox="1444 1003 1782 1047">ARB Level 1 VDECS</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1108 1047 1255 1097">3</td> <td data-bbox="1255 1047 1444 1097">Tier 2</td> <td data-bbox="1444 1047 1782 1097">Alternative Fuel*</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="1108 1097 1782 1268">How to use the table: If the requirements of (A)(1)(b) cannot be met, then the project sponsor would need to meet Compliance Alternative 1. Should the project sponsor not be able to supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 1, then Compliance Alternative 2 would need to be met. Should the project sponsor not be able to supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 2, then Compliance Alternative 3 would need to be met.</p> <p data-bbox="1108 1268 1782 1300">* Alternative fuels are not a VDECS.</p> <p data-bbox="1108 1300 1782 1421">2. The project sponsor shall require the idling time for off-road and on-road equipment be limited to no more than two minutes, except as provided in exceptions to the applicable state</p>	Table 4.8-11 Off-Road Equipment Compliance Step-Down Schedule			<i>Compliance Alternative</i>	<i>Engine Emission Standard</i>	<i>Emissions Control</i>	1	Tier 2	ARB Level 2 VDECS	2	Tier 2	ARB Level 1 VDECS	3	Tier 2	Alternative Fuel*	
Table 4.8-11 Off-Road Equipment Compliance Step-Down Schedule																		
<i>Compliance Alternative</i>	<i>Engine Emission Standard</i>	<i>Emissions Control</i>																
1	Tier 2	ARB Level 2 VDECS																
2	Tier 2	ARB Level 1 VDECS																
3	Tier 2	Alternative Fuel*																

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
		<p>regulations regarding idling for off-road and on-road equipment. Legible and visible signs shall be posted in multiple languages (English, Spanish, Chinese) in designated queuing areas and at the construction site to remind operators of the two minute idling limit.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The project sponsor shall require that construction operators properly maintain and tune equipment in accordance with manufacturer specifications. 4. The Plan shall include estimates of the construction timeline by phase with a description of each piece of off-road equipment required for every construction phase. Off-road equipment descriptions and information may include, but is not limited to: equipment type, equipment manufacturer, equipment identification number, engine model year, engine certification (Tier rating), horsepower, engine serial number, and expected fuel usage and hours of operation. For VDECS installed: technology type, serial number, make, model, manufacturer, ARB verification number level, and installation date and hour meter reading on installation date. For off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall indicate the type of alternative fuel being used. 5. The Plan shall be kept on-site and available for review by any persons requesting it and a legible sign shall be posted at the perimeter of the construction site indicating to the public the basic requirements of the Plan and a way to request a copy of the Plan. The project sponsor shall provide copies of Plan to members of the public as requested. <p>B. <i>Reporting.</i> Monthly reports shall be submitted to the ERO indicating the construction phase and off-road equipment information used during each phase including the information required in A(4). In addition, for off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall include the actual amount of alternative fuel used.</p> <p>Within six months of the completion of construction activities, the project sponsor shall submit to the ERO a final report summarizing construction activities. The final report shall indicate the start and</p>	

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures

NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
		<p>end dates and duration of each construction phase. For each phase, the report shall include detailed information required in A(4). In addition, for off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall include the actual amount of alternative fuel used.</p> <p>C. <i>Certification Statement and On-Site Requirements.</i> Prior to the commencement of construction activities, the project sponsor must certify (1) compliance with the Plan and (2) all applicable requirements of the Plan have been incorporated into contract specifications.</p>	
<p>Impact AQ-2.2, Construction at the six project sites, would generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, but would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)</p> <p><u>Levels of Significance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): Less than Significant with Mitigation ■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: Less than Significant ■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: Less than Significant with Mitigation ■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: Less than Significant with Mitigation ■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: Less than Significant ■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: Less than Significant 	<p>PS</p> <p>PS</p> <p>LTS</p> <p>PS</p> <p>PS</p> <p>LTS</p> <p>LTS</p>	<p>—</p> <p>Implement Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2.1 – Construction Emissions Minimization within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, p. 4.8-42.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>Implement Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2.1 – Construction Emissions Minimization within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, p. 4.8-42.</p> <p>Implement Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2.1 – Construction Emissions Minimization within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, p. 4.8-42.</p> <p>None required</p> <p>None required</p>	<p>LTS</p> <p>LTS</p> <p>LTS</p> <p>LTS</p> <p>LTS</p> <p>LTS</p>
<p>Impact AQ-2.3, Construction of the Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, that would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>Implement Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2.1 – Construction Emissions Minimization within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, p. 4.8-42.</p>	<p>LTS</p>

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
Impact AQ-3.1, Operation in the 12 study areas could result in emissions of criteria air pollutants but not at levels that would violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact AQ-3.2, Operation of the six project sites, would result in emissions of criteria air pollutants, but not at levels that would violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact AQ-3.3, Operation of the Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would result in emissions of criteria air pollutants, but not at levels that would violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)	PS	Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3.3 – Maximum Daily Construction Activities. Construction activities shall be limited to the renovation (including architectural coating) of a maximum of 100,000 square feet of building space at a time.	LTS
Impact AQ-4.1, Operation of the 12 study areas could generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, and could expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4.1a – Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Generators. All new (i.e., not replacement) diesel generators shall have engines that (1) meet Tier 4 Final or Tier 4 Interim emission standards, or (2) meet Tier 2 emission standards and are equipped with a California Air Resources Board (ARB) Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy (VDECS).</p> <p>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4.1b – Best Available Control Technology for Boilers. All new (i.e., not replacement) boilers shall be natural gas operated. If infeasible, all boilers shall be equipped with Best Available Control Technologies, such as fuel gas filters, or baghouse or electrostatic precipitators. BACTs shall be approved by BAAQMD through the permitting process.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4.1c – Air Filtration Measures within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone. <i>Air Filtration and Ventilation Requirements for Sensitive Land Uses.</i> Prior to receipt of a building permit for a change of use to a sensitive land use, the project sponsor shall submit an enhanced ventilation plan for the proposed building(s). The enhanced ventilation plan shall be prepared and signed by, or</p>	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures

NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
		<p>under the supervision of, a licensed mechanical engineer or other individual authorized by the California Business And Professions Code Sections 6700-6799. The enhanced ventilation plan shall show that the building ventilation system will be capable of achieving protection from particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) equivalent to that associated with a Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV) 13 filtration, as defined by American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) standard 52.2. The enhanced ventilation plan shall explain in detail how the project will meets the MERV-13 performance standard identified in this measure.</p> <p><i>Maintenance Plan.</i> Prior to receipt of a building permit for a change of use to a sensitive land use, the project sponsor shall present a plan that ensures ongoing maintenance for the ventilation and filtration systems.</p> <p><i>Disclosure to Renters.</i> The project sponsor shall also ensure the disclosure to buyers (and renters) that the building is located in an area with existing sources of air pollution and as such, the building includes an air filtration and ventilation system designed to remove 80 percent of outdoor particulate matter and shall inform occupants of the proper use of the installed air filtration system.</p>	
<p>Impact AQ-4.2, Operation at the six project sites would not generate new emissions of toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, and therefore would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations. (No Impact)</p>	<p>NI</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>NI</p>
<p>Impact AQ-4.3, Operation of the Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, could generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, and could expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>Implement Mitigation Measures M-AQ-4.1a – Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Generators, p. 4.8-56; M-AQ-4.1b – Best Available Control Technology for Boilers, p. 4.8-56; and M-AQ-4.1c – Air Filtration Measures within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, p. 4.8-59.</p>	<p>LTS</p>
<p>Impact AQ-5.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would not conflict with, or obstruct implementation of, the 2010 Clean Air Plan. (Less than Significant)</p>	<p>LTS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>LTS</p>

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
Impact AQ-5.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not conflict with, or obstruct implementation of, the 2010 Clean Air Plan. (Less than Significant) <u>Levels of Significance</u>	LTS	—	LTS
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact AQ-5.3, The Proposed Project, including growth within the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not conflict with, or obstruct implementation of, the 2010 Clean Air Plan. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact AQ-6.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact AQ-6.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. (Less than Significant) <u>Levels of Significance</u>	LTS	—	LTS
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures

NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
Impact AQ-6.3, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact C-AQ-1, The Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would result in a considerable contribution to a cumulative regional criteria air pollutant impact. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)	PS	Implement Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3.3 – Maximum Daily Construction Activities, p. 4.8-54.	LTS
Impact C-AQ-2, The Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would contribute considerably to cumulative health risk impacts. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)	PS	Implement Mitigation Measures M-AQ-2.1 – Construction Emissions Minimization within Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, p. 4.8-42; M-AQ-4.1a – Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Generators, p. 4.8-56; M-AQ-4.1b – Best Available Control Technology for Boilers, p. 4.8-56; and M-AQ-4.1c – Air Filtration Measures Within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, p. 4.8-59.	LTS

SECTION 4.9, GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Impact C-GG-1.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the study areas, would generate greenhouse gas emissions, but not at levels that would result in a cumulatively considerably impact on the environment or conflict with any policy, plan, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact C-GG-1.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would generate greenhouse gas emissions, but not at levels that would result in a cumulatively considerably impact on the environment or conflict with any policy, plan, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. (Less than Significant)	LTS	—	LTS
<u>Levels of Significance</u>			
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact C-GG-1.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the study areas and at the six project sites, would generate greenhouse gas emissions, but not at levels that would result in a cumulatively considerably impact on the environment or conflict with any policy, plan, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
SECTION 4.10, WIND AND SHADOW			
Impact WS-1.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would not alter wind in a manner that could substantially affect public areas. (No Impact)	NI	None required.	NI
Impact WS-1.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not alter wind in a manner that could substantially affect public areas. (No Impact)	NI	—	NI
<u>Levels of Significance</u>			
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
Impact WS-1.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not alter wind in a manner that could substantially affect public areas. (No Impact)	NI	None required.	NI
Impact WS-2.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would not create new shadow in a manner that could substantially affect outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas. (No Impact)	NI	None required.	NI

NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
Impact WS-2.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not create new shadow in a manner that could substantially affect outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas. (No Impact)	NI	—	NI
<u>Levels of Significance</u>			
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
Impact WS-2.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not create new shadow in a manner that could substantially affect outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas. (No Impact)	NI	None required.	NI

SECTION 4.11, RECREATION

Impact RE-1.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would not increase the use of or physically degrade existing recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of those facilities would occur or be accelerated, or require construction or expansion of recreational facilities in a way that would adversely affect the environment. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact RE-1.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not increase the use of or physically degrade existing recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of those facilities would occur or be accelerated, or require construction or expansion of recreational facilities in a way that would adversely affect the environment. (Less than Significant)	LTS	—	LTS
<u>Levels of Significance</u>			
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: Less than Significant ■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: Less than Significant ■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: No Impact 	LTS LTS NI	None required. None required. None required.	LTS LTS NI
Impact RE-1.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not increase the use of or physically degrade existing recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of those facilities would occur or be accelerated, or require construction or expansion of recreational facilities in a way that would adversely affect the environment. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact C-RE-1, The Proposed Project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact related to the provision of recreational facilities. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
SECTION 4.12, UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS			
Impact UT-1.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would not require or result in the construction of substantial new water treatment facilities, and the City would have sufficient water supply available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, and would not require new or expanded water supply resources or entitlements. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact UT-1.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites would not require or result in the construction of substantial new water treatment facilities, and the City would have sufficient water supply available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, and would not require new or expanded water supply resources or entitlements. (Less than Significant)	LTS	—	LTS
<u>Levels of Significance</u>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): Less than Significant ■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: Less than Significant ■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: Less than Significant ■ PS-4, 121 Wisconsin Street: Less than Significant 	LTS LTS LTS LTS	None required. None required. None required. None required.	LTS LTS LTS LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures

NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ PS-5, 150 Hayes Street: Less than Significant ■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: Less than Significant 	LTS	None required.	LTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: Less than Significant 	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact UT-1.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not require or result in the construction of substantial new water treatment facilities, and the City would have sufficient water supply available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, and would not require new or expanded water supply resources or entitlements. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact UT-2.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would not require or result in the expansion or construction of new wastewater treatment or stormwater facilities, exceed capacity of the wastewater treatment provider when combined with other commitments, or exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact UT-2.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not require or result in the expansion or construction of new wastewater treatment or stormwater facilities, exceed capacity of the wastewater treatment provider when combined with other commitments, or exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. (Less than Significant)	LTS	—	LTS
<u>Levels of Significance</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): Less than Significant ■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: Less than Significant ■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: Less than Significant ■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: Less than Significant ■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: Less than Significant ■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: Less than Significant 	LTS	None required.	LTS
	LTS	None required.	LTS
	LTS	None required.	LTS
	LTS	None required.	LTS
	LTS	None required.	LTS
	LTS	None required.	LTS
	LTS	None required.	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
Impact UT-2.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not require or result in the expansion or construction of new wastewater treatment or stormwater facilities, exceed capacity of the wastewater treatment provider when combined with other commitments, or exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact UT-3.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs and would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact UT-3.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs and would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. (Less than Significant)	LTS	—	LTS
<u>Levels of Significance</u>			
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact UT-3.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs and would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact C-UT-1, The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact on utilities. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
SECTION 4.13, PUBLIC SERVICES			
Impact PS-1.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered fire or police protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire and police protection. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact PS-1.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered fire and police protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire and police protection. (Less than Significant)	LTS	—	LTS
<u>Levels of Significance</u>			
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact PS-1.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered fire and police protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire and police protection. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
Impact PS-2.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered school facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives for schools. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact PS-2.2, The Proposed Project, including the growth at the six project sites, would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered school facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives for schools. (No Impact)	NI	—	NI
<u>Levels of Significance</u>			
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
Impact PS-2.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered school facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives for schools. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact PS-3.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered library facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives for libraries. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
Impact PS-3.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered library facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives for libraries. (Less than Significant) <u>Levels of Significance</u>	LTS	—	LTS
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact PS-3.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered library facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives for libraries. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact C-PS-1, The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact on public services. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
SECTION 4.14, BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
Impact BI-1.1, The Proposed Project, including the growth in 12 study areas, would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
Impact BI-1.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (Less than Significant) <u>Levels of Significance</u>	LTS	—	LTS
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact BI-1.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact BI-2.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
Impact BI-2.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. (Less than Significant) <u>Levels of Significance</u>	LTS	—	LTS
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact BI-2.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact C-BI-1, Implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, could make a considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact on biological resources. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
SECTION 4.15, GEOLOGY AND SOILS			
Impact GE-1.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in 12 study areas, would not expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic groundshaking and seismic-related ground failure such as liquefaction. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
Impact GE-1.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic groundshaking and seismic-related ground failure such as liquefaction. (Less than Significant) <u>Levels of Significance</u>	LTS	—	LTS
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact GE-1.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic groundshaking and seismic-related ground failure such as liquefaction. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact GE-2.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would not be located on geologic or soil units that are unstable, or that could become unstable as a result of the Proposed Project. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact GE-2.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not be located on geologic or soil units that are unstable, or that could become unstable as a result of the Proposed Project. (Less than Significant) <u>Levels of Significance</u>	LTS	—	LTS
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth (The Cannery): Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures

NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact GE-2.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not be located on geologic or soil units that are unstable, or that could become unstable as a result of the Proposed Project. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact GE-3.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would not be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, and, therefore, would not create substantial risks to life or property. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact GE-3.2, The Proposed Project, including the use of the six project sites, would not be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, and, therefore, would not create substantial risks to life or property. (Less than Significant)	LTS	—	LTS
<u>Levels of Significance</u>			
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact GE-3.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and growth at the six project sites, would not be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, and, therefore, would not create substantial risks to life or property. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact C-GE-1, The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a cumulative impact on geology and soils. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
SECTION 4.16, HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY			
Impact HY-1.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact HY-1.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. (Less than Significant)	LTS	—	LTS
<u>Levels of Significance</u>			
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact HY-1.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact HY-2.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in 12 study areas, would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on site or off site, or create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm sewer systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures

NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
Impact HY-2.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on site or off site, or create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm sewer systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. (Less than Significant)	LTS	—	LTS
<u>Levels of Significance</u>			
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact HY-2.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on site or off site, or create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm sewer systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact HY-3.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other authoritative flood hazard delineation map, or place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows. (No Impact)	NI	None required.	NI

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
Impact HY-3.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other authoritative flood hazard delineation map, or place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows. (No Impact) <u>Levels of Significance</u>	NI	—	NI
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
Impact HY-3.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other authoritative flood hazard delineation map, or place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact HY-4.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in 12 study areas would not expose people or structures to inundation by tsunamis. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact HY-4.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites would not expose people or structures to inundation by tsunamis. (Less than Significant) <u>Levels of Significance</u>	LTS	—	LTS
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI
Impact HY-4.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not expose people or structures to inundation by tsunami. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact C-HY-1, The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a cumulative impact on hydrology and water quality. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
SECTION 4.17, HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS			
Impact HZ-1.1, The Proposed Project, including the growth in the 12 study areas, would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact HZ-1.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. (Less than Significant)	LTS	—	LTS
<u>Levels of Significance</u>			
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact HZ-1.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
Impact HZ-2.1, The Proposed Project, including the growth in the 12 study areas, could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous building materials into the environment, including within 0.25 mile of a school. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)	PS	Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2.1 – Testing and Removal of Hazardous Building Materials. AAU shall ensure that for any existing building where tenant improvements are planned, the building is surveyed for hazardous building materials including PCB-containing electrical equipment, fluorescent light ballasts containing PCBs or DEHP, and fluorescent light tubes containing mercury vapors. The results of testing shall be provided to DBI. The materials not meeting regulatory standards shall be removed and properly disposed of prior to the start of tenant improvements for buildings in the study areas. Old light ballasts that are removed during renovation shall be evaluated for the presence of PCBs. In the case where the presence of PCBs in the light ballast cannot be verified, the light ballast shall be assumed to contain PCBs and handled and disposed of as such, according to applicable laws and regulations. Any other hazardous building materials identified either before or during demolition or renovation shall be abated according to federal, state, and local laws and regulations.	LTS
Impact HZ-2.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous building materials into the environment, including within 0.25 mile of a school. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)	PS	—	LTS
<u>Levels of Significance</u>			
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): Less than Significant with Mitigation	PS	Implement Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2.1 – Testing and Removal of Hazardous Building Materials, p. 4.17-39.	LTS
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: Less than Significant with Mitigation	PS	Implement Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2.1 – Testing and Removal of Hazardous Building Materials, p. 4.17-39.	LTS
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: Less than Significant with Mitigation	PS	Implement Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2.1 – Testing and Removal of Hazardous Building Materials, p. 4.17-39.	LTS
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: Less than Significant with Mitigation	PS	Implement Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2.1 – Testing and Removal of Hazardous Building Materials, p. 4.17-39.	LTS
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: No Impact	NI	None required.	NI

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures

NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: Less than Significant with Mitigation 	PS	Implement Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2.1 – Testing and Removal of Hazardous Building Materials, p. 4.17-39.	LTS
Impact HZ-2.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in 12 study areas and at the six project sites, could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous building materials into the environment, including within 0.25 mile of a school. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)	PS	Implement Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2.1 – Testing and Removal of Hazardous Building Materials, p. 4.17-39.	LTS
Impact HZ-3.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would not expose the public or the environment to unacceptable levels of known or newly discovered hazardous materials as a result of a site being located on a hazardous materials list site. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact HZ-3.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not expose the public or the environment to unacceptable levels of known or newly discovered hazardous materials as a result of a site being located on a hazardous materials list site. (Less than Significant)	LTS	—	LTS
<u>Levels of Significance</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): Less than Significant ■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: Less than Significant ■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: Less than Significant ■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: Less than Significant ■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: Less than Significant ■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: Less than Significant 	LTS	None required.	LTS
	LTS	None required.	LTS
	LTS	None required.	LTS
	LTS	None required.	LTS
	LTS	None required.	LTS
	LTS	None required.	LTS
	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact HZ-3.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not expose the public or the environment to unacceptable levels of known or newly discovered hazardous materials as a result of a site being located on a hazardous materials list site. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures			
NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable			
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
Impact HZ-4.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact HZ-4.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. (Less than Significant)	LTS	—	LTS
<u>Levels of Significance</u>			
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact HZ-4.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact C-HZ-1, The Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative hazard and hazardous materials impacts. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)	PS	Implement Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2.1 - Testing and Removal of Hazardous Building Materials, p. 4.17-33.	LTS
SECTION 4.18, MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES			
Impact ME-1.1, The Proposed Project, including growth in 12 study areas, would not encourage activities that result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use these in a wasteful manner. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures

NI = no impact; LTS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; SU = significant and unavoidable

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure/Improvement Measure</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
Impact ME-1.2, The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites would not encourage activities that result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use these in a wasteful manner. (Less than Significant)	LTS	—	LTS
<u>Levels of Significance</u>			
■ PS-1, 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery): Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-3, 625 Polk Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-4, 150 Hayes Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
■ PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue: Less than Significant	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact ME-1.3, The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not encourage activities that result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use these in a wasteful manner. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS
Impact C-ME-1, The Proposed Project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to wasteful use of energy. (Less than Significant)	LTS	None required.	LTS

SECTION 4.19, AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

None of the components of the Proposed Project would have any impact on agricultural or forest resources.

1.3 ALTERNATIVES

The alternatives evaluated in further detail include the No Project Alternative, Centralized Growth Alternative, and the Reduced Growth Alternative. The Reduced Project Alternative addresses the Proposed Project's significant and unavoidable contribution to a cumulative impact related to increased transit load. The Reduced Institutional Growth Alternative would address the Proposed Project's significant and unavoidable housing demand impacts. As discussed above, the less-than-significant-with-mitigation impacts identified for the Proposed Project that are related to affecting archaeological resources, or human remains, construction being located within an Air Pollution Exposure Zone, use of generators or boilers, and exposure to noise would apply to all the alternatives.

This EIR evaluates the following alternatives to the Proposed Project:

- Alternative 1, No Project Alternative
- Alternative 2, Centralized Growth Alternative
- Alternative 3, Reduced Project Alternative
- Alternative 4, Reduced Institutional Growth Alternative

The comparative summary of the environmental impacts anticipated under each alternative with the environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Project indicates that Alternative 3, Reduced Growth Alternative, would be considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative. Overall, Alternative 3 would reduce the impacts of the Proposed Project, including the significant and unavoidable impacts associated with housing demand and shuttle demand affecting local transit, because it would reduce AAU growth. Alternative 3 would not reduce the significant and unavoidable impact on the Geary corridor or housing demand to a less-than-significant level. However, this alternative would fail to meet or would significantly fall short of four of the basic project objectives: to offer on-site residential housing for new full-time students who desire to live in AAU housing; to consolidate administrative and classroom functions for each academic discipline in the same buildings so that students and faculty do not have to travel from building to building unnecessarily; to manage facilities in a flexible manner to ensure availability of space to meet changing needs of academic programs; or to enable long-range programs and service planning to meet the needs of the community and provide increased employment opportunities. Although Alternative 4 Reduced Institutional Growth would also reduce the impacts of the Proposed Project, it would not provide as much reduced growth as would Alternative 3 as it maintains the program-level growth amount of residential growth.

Table 1-2, Comparison of Proposed Project and Project Alternatives: Impacts, p. 1-62, provides a comparison of significant impacts of the Proposed Project and the Alternatives.

1.4 AREAS OF KNOWN CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

This Draft EIR/EIS assesses the impact of AAU's occupation and use of existing buildings in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites. It also evaluates the public's concerns raised during the scoping period. Issues raised during the scoping period included the following:

- Traffic, noise, and pollution from shuttle buses
- Expansion of the shuttle bus service
- Displacement of housing
- Alternatives
- Graffiti
- General tidiness of public spaces
- Pedestrian activity in and around existing AAU sites
- Impacts to historic resources

NI = No impact; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation					
	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Centralized Growth Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: Reduced Growth</i>	<i>Alternative 4: Reduced Institutional Growth</i>
Description	This includes 110,000 sf of institutional residential, 669,670 sf of institutional nonresidential and 17,533 sf of institutional recreation in 12 study areas and 393,537 sf of institutional nonresidential at six project sites	Vacation of three project sites and 164-399 rooms of existing residential, and no AAU growth in study areas	Project growth in five study areas along major transit corridors and six project sites	Approximately 33% reduction in Project growth (335,000 sf institutional, 55,000 sf residential, and 17,533 sf recreational in 12 study areas and 393,537 sf at six project sites)	Approximately 28% reduction in Project growth (335,000 sf institutional, 110,000 sf residential, and 17,533 sf recreational in 12 study areas and 393,537 sf at six project sites)
Ability to Meet Project Sponsor's Objectives	Meets all of the project sponsor's objectives	Meets or partially meets three of ten of the project sponsor's objectives	Meet eight of ten of the project sponsor's objectives	Meets or partially meets seven of ten of the project sponsor's objectives	Meets or partially meets eight of ten of the project sponsor's objectives

SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

Population, Housing, and Employment

Housing	Impact PH-2.1 The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would displace substantial numbers of people, or existing housing units, or create demand for additional housing elsewhere, or displace a substantial number of businesses or employees. (SU)	Substantially less than proposed project. (LTS)	Similar to proposed project. (SU)	Substantially less than proposed project. (SU)	Substantially less than proposed project. (SU)
---------	--	---	-----------------------------------	--	--

Transportation and Circulation

Transit	Impact C-TR-2.3a The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity of the study areas and project sites, would result in a substantial increase in local transit demand that could not be accommodated by adjacent Muni transit capacity at the Kearny/Stockton and Geary corridors under 2035 Cumulative plus Project conditions. (SU)	No impact. (NI)	Similar to proposed project. (SU)	Substantially less than proposed project. (SU)	Substantially less than proposed project. (SU)
---------	---	-----------------	-----------------------------------	--	--

Table 1-2 Comparison of Proposed Project and Project Alternatives: Impacts

NI = No impact; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Centralized Growth Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: Reduced Growth</i>	<i>Alternative 4: Reduced Institutional Growth</i>
--	-------------------------	--	--	--	--

LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS WITH MITIGATION MEASURES

Cultural and Paleontological Resources

Archaeological Resources	<p>Impact CP-2.1 identifies a potentially significant impact to archaeological resources pursuant to Section 15064.5 in the study areas that would be less than significant with preparation of a Project-Specific Preliminary Archaeological Assessment which shall determine if an Archeological Research Design Treatment Plan (ARDTP) shall be required. This archeological mitigation measure shall apply to any project involving any soils disturbing or soils-improving activities including excavation, utilities installation, grading, soils remediation, compaction/chemical grouting to a depth of two feet or greater within the following study areas: This archeological mitigation measure shall apply to any project involving any soils-disturbing or soils-improving activities including excavation, utilities installation, grading, soils remediation, compaction/chemical grouting to a depth of two feet or greater within the following study areas: SA-2, Lombard Street/Van Ness Avenue, SA-5, Mid Market Street; SA-6, Fourth Street/Howard Street; SA-7, Rincon Hill East; SA-8, Third Street/Bryant Street; SA-9, Second Street/Brannan Street; and SA-12, Ninth Street/Folsom Street; and to a depth of four feet bgs or greater and located within properties within the remaining study areas (SA-1, Lombard Street/Divisadero Street; SA-3, Mid Van Ness Avenue; SA-4, Sutter Street/Mason Street; SA-10, Fifth Street/Brannan Street; and SA-11, Sixth Street/Folsom Street). Unless no or lesser thresholds are identified in the Area Plan EIR Archeological Mitigation Zones outlined in Table 4.5-2, Area Plan EIR Archeological Resources Mitigation Measures, for projects covered by those Zones, then the no or lesser depth of soil disturbance would be used. Projects to which this mitigation measure applies shall be subject to Preliminary Archeology Review (PAR) by the San Francisco Planning Department</p>	No impact. (NI)	Similar to proposed project. (SM)	Similar to proposed project. (SM)	Similar to proposed project. (SM)
--------------------------	---	-----------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Table 1-2 Comparison of Proposed Project and Project Alternatives: Impacts					
NI = No impact; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation					
	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: No Project Alternative	Alternative 2: Centralized Growth Alternative	Alternative 3: Reduced Growth	Alternative 4: Reduced Institutional Growth
	archeologist, or a Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Study (PASS) may be required in consultation with the San Francisco Planning Department archeologist. Based on the PAR or PASS, the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) shall determine if an Archeological Research Design Treatment Plan (ARDTP) shall be required to more definitively identify the potential for California Register-eligible archeological resources to be present at the project site and determine the appropriate action necessary to reduce the potential effect of the project on archeological resources to a less-than-significant level. (SM)				
Human Remains	Impact CP-4.1 identifies a potentially significant impact associated with disturbing any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, in each of the study areas that would be less than significant with preparation of a Project-Specific Preliminary Archaeological Assessment) which shall determine if an Archeological Research Design Treatment Plan (ARDTP) shall be required. (SM)	No impact. (NI)	Similar to proposed project. (SM)	Similar to proposed project. (SM)	Similar to proposed project. (SM)
Air Quality					
Toxic Air Contaminants	Impact AQ-2.3 identifies a potentially significant impact associated with generation of toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, during operation of an AAU site in each of the study areas within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone that would be less than significant with Air Filtration Measures within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone (preparation of a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan, Reporting, and Certification Statement and On-Site Requirements). (SM)	No impact. (NI)	Similar to proposed project. (SM)	Similar to proposed project. (SM)	Similar to proposed project. (SM)
Criteria Air Pollutants	Impact AQ-3.3 identifies a potentially significant impact associated with generation of criteria air pollutants, from renovation activities of an AAU site in the study areas and at the project sites, that would be less than significant by limiting maximum daily construction activities. (SM)	No impact. (NI)	Similar to proposed project. (SM)	Similar to proposed project. (SM)	Similar to proposed project. (SM)

Table 1-2 Comparison of Proposed Project and Project Alternatives: Impacts

NI = No impact; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Centralized Growth Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: Reduced Growth</i>	<i>Alternative 4: Reduced Institutional Growth</i>
Toxic Air Contaminants	Impact AQ-4.1 identifies a potentially significant impact associated with generation of toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, from use of generators and boilers during operation of an AAU site in each of the study areas, and within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone that would be less than significant with implementation of Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Generators, Best Available Control Technology for Boilers, and/or Air Filtration Measures within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone. (SM)	No impact. (NI)	Similar to proposed project. (SM)	Similar to proposed project. (SM)	Similar to proposed project. (SM)
Hazardous Building Materials	Impact HZ-2.3 identifies a potentially significant impact associated with releasing hazardous building materials to the environment that would be less than significant with implementation of Testing and Removal of Hazardous Building Materials. (SM)	No impact. (NI)	Similar to proposed project. (SM)	Similar to proposed project. (SM)	Similar to proposed project. (SM)

[THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

CHAPTER 2 Introduction

2.1 OVERVIEW

Academy of Art University (AAU), located within the City and County of San Francisco (City), is a private postsecondary academic institution that occupies buildings throughout the City (predominantly in the northeast quadrant) for its existing art programs. AAU plans on expanding its facilities and programs to accommodate a projected on-site student enrollment of approximately 17,282 students by 2020,⁴ resulting in a total increase of approximately 6,100 students (or five percent a year) as compared to a 2010 on-site student enrollment of 11,182. In addition, AAU also anticipates an increase of 1,220 faculty and staff, beyond the 2,291 faculty and staff that were employed by AAU in 2010, resulting in 3,511 faculty and staff by 2020. In order to accommodate AAU's increased enrollment, AAU plans on expanding its existing facilities and shuttle service.

The Proposed Project consists of four general components: program-level growth, project-level growth, legalization of prior unauthorized changes, and shuttle expansion. These components are explained below:

1. **Program-level growth** consists of approximately 110,000 net square feet (sf) of additional residential uses (to house approximately 400 students, equivalent to about 220 rooms) and 669,670 sf of additional institutional space in 12 geographic areas (study areas) that AAU and the Planning Department have identified where AAU could occupy buildings. However, beyond the project sites listed below, no specific buildings have been identified at this stage in the planning process for these geographic areas. The 12 study areas are further described in Section 3.4.3, Study Areas (Program-Level Analysis), p. 3-39, and generally include the following areas: Study Area 1 (SA-1), Lombard Street/Divisadero Street; SA-2, Lombard Street/Van Ness Avenue; SA-3, Mid Van Ness Avenue; SA-4, Sutter Street/Mason Street; SA-5, Mid Market Street; SA-6, Fourth Street/Howard Street; SA-7, Rincon Hill East; SA-8, Third Street/Bryant Street; SA-9, Second Street/Brannan Street; SA-10, Fifth Street/Brannan Street; SA-11, Sixth Street/Folsom Street; and SA-12, Ninth Street/Folsom Street.
2. **Project-level growth** consists of six additional buildings that have been occupied, identified, or otherwise changed by AAU since publication of the September 2010 Notice of Preparation (NOP) for this environmental impact report (EIR), but for which one or more City approvals have not yet been issued. These six project sites include 393,537 sf of institutional uses and 17,533 sf of recreational uses. The six project sites are further described in Section 3.4.4, Project Sites (Project-Level Analysis), p. 3-77, and include the following addresses: Project Site 1 (PS-1), 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery); PS-2, 700 Montgomery Street; PS-3, 625

⁴ This does not include AAU's online student population. In 2010, the average ratio of on-line to on-site students was approximately 0.6 to one. Assuming this ratio remains the same, future AAU growth would include approximately 3,660 on-line students. Because on-line students do not use AAU facilities, the increase in on-line student is not considered in this environmental analysis.

Polk Street; PS-4, 150 Hayes Street; PS-5, 121 Wisconsin Street; and PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue.

3. **Legalization Approvals.** The legalization of pre-NOP changes addresses the fact that AAU was operating at 34 locations at the time of the September 2010 NOP, but that at most of these locations, AAU had not obtained the required City permits to change the use and/or appearance of the buildings, including required conditional use authorizations, building permits, or other permits. AAU now seeks to obtain the necessary approvals (“Legalization Approvals”). The City will rely on this EIR when considering the Legalization Approvals. For a complete list of pending Legalization Approvals, see Table 3-2, Existing Institutional Facilities, p. 3-9, and Table 3-3, Existing Residential Facilities, p. 3-10, and Section 3.6, Intended Uses of the EIR, p. 3-148.⁵

It should be noted that California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires an analysis of a proposed project’s changes to the environment as it existed at the time environmental review began, even if that existing condition resulted from unpermitted or otherwise unlawful activity. This means that the EIR’s analysis of the impacts of the legalization of AAU’s pre-NOP changes, like the EIR’s analysis of the other three elements of the Proposed Project (program-level growth, project-level growth and shuttle expansion), is measured against the existing conditions at the time of the NOP. But because AAU had already changed the use and/or appearance of the buildings that need Legalization Approvals prior to the NOP, and no further change is proposed, there is no impact resulting from the legalization of the pre-NOP changes as compared to the baseline. The Legalization Approvals would result in the full legalization of 28 of AAU’s 34 existing sites, which total 1,550,459 sf of institutional, residential, and recreational uses.⁶

4. The **shuttle expansion** consists of an extension of AAU’s shuttle service, under its Shuttle Bus Service Policy, to four of the project sites and potential extension to the 12 study areas in which program-level growth is anticipated.

Combining the project-level and program-level growth, the Proposed Project would add about 110,000 sf of residential uses, 1,063,207 sf of institutional uses, and 17,533 sf of recreational uses, none of which includes new construction. The Legalization Approvals would result in the full legalization of 28 of AAU’s 34 existing sites, which total 1,550,459 sf of institutional, residential, and recreational uses. In total, the Proposed Project would result in 2,741,199 sf of AAU institutional, residential, and recreational uses.

AAU growth through occupation and operation of buildings within the 12 study areas and at the six specific sites continues AAU’s practice of having growth occur through the occupation and change in use of existing buildings in the City. Therefore, this EIR analyzes the changes in use and

⁵ Of the 34 existing sites, six do not require discretionary review, and five require only historic review for signage and/or exterior lighting and no other discretionary approvals.

⁶ The City is evaluating the effects of the potential issuance of the Legalization Approvals in an Existing Sites Technical Memorandum, which will be used by the City in determining whether or under what conditions those approvals could be granted.

occupation of existing buildings and does not analyze development (i.e., construction) of new facilities. Because no specific buildings have been identified at this stage in the planning process for the 12 study areas, this EIR provides a program-level analysis of future AAU growth within these areas. The six specific locations that have been occupied since publication of the NOP (the project sites) will be evaluated in this EIR on a project-level basis. These components together with the proposed expansion of AAU's shuttle service and Legalization Approvals constitute the Proposed Project.

This chapter describes the purpose of the EIR, summarizes the environmental review process under CEQA, and outlines the contents of the EIR.

2.2 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The San Francisco Planning Department, serving as Lead Agency for administering the environmental review on behalf of the City, determined that preparation of an EIR was needed to evaluate potentially significant effects that could result from implementation of the Proposed Project.

In accordance with Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21002.1, the purpose of this EIR is to identify the significant environmental impacts of the Proposed Project, to identify alternatives to the Proposed Project, and to indicate the manner in which those significant effects could be mitigated or avoided. As defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15382, a "significant effect on the environment" is:

... a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. An economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. A social or economic change related to a physical change may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant.

CEQA requires that before a discretionary decision can be made to approve a project that may cause a significant effect on the environment, an EIR must be prepared. The EIR is a public information document for use by governmental agencies and the public to identify and evaluate potential environmental impacts of a project, to identify mitigation measures to lessen or eliminate significant adverse impacts, and to examine feasible alternatives to the project. The City must consider the information in this EIR and make certain findings with respect to each significant effect that is identified. The information contained in this EIR, along with other information available through the public review processes, will be reviewed and considered by the decision-makers prior to a decision to approve, disapprove, or modify the Proposed Project, or to adopt an alternative to the Proposed Project.

As provided in both CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, public agencies are charged with the duty to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental effects, where feasible, for projects subject to

CEQA (refer to PRC Section 21004, CEQA Guidelines Sections 15002(a)(3) and 15021(a)(2)). If the Lead Agency approves a project that will result in the occurrence of significant adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated to less-than-significant levels, the agency must state the reasons for its action in writing, demonstrate that its action is based on the EIR or other information in the record, and adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations. In discharging this duty, the public agency has an obligation to balance a variety of public objectives, taking into account economic, environmental, and social issues. The EIR informs public agency decision-makers and the general public of the significant environmental effects and the ways in which those impacts can be reduced, either through the imposition of mitigation measures or through the implementation of alternatives to the project. In a practical sense, EIRs function as a technique for fact-finding, allowing an applicant (e.g., AAU), the public, and interested or involved agencies an opportunity to collectively review and evaluate baseline conditions and project impacts through a process of full disclosure. Additionally, the EIR provides the primary source of environmental information for the lead agency to consider when exercising any permitting authority or approval power directly related to implementation of the project.

In terms of standards of adequacy, an EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision-makers with information that enables them to make an informed decision that takes into account environmental consequences. An evaluation of the environmental effects of a project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is reviewed in light of what is reasonably feasible. Disagreement among experts does not make an EIR inadequate, but the EIR should summarize the main points of disagreement among the experts. The courts have looked not for perfection but for adequacy, completeness, and a good faith effort at full disclosure, as described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15151.

2.3 TYPE OF EIR

This EIR evaluates the Proposed Project's environmental effects at both a program level and project level of analysis, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168 and 15161, respectively. The impact analysis is tailored to the level of detail provided for the individual Proposed Project components. For components with site-specific details, the impact analysis and associated mitigation measures are presented in detail. For Proposed Project components for which site-specific details are not available, the impacts are analyzed in this EIR using available information and more general mitigation measures are provided. As specified for the program-level components in this EIR, future project-specific CEQA review may be required when site-specific approvals are proposed.

This EIR provides a program-level analysis of AAU's future growth within 12 study areas; a project-level review of growth at six specific locations that have been occupied, identified, or otherwise changed by AAU since establishment of the baseline from publication of the NOP in September 2010; legalization of prior unauthorized changes of use at AAU's existing sites, and analysis of an extension of AAU's shuttle service. These four components comprise the Proposed Project.

2.3.1 Program-Level Analysis

The future growth of AAU within 12 geographic areas of the City and County of San Francisco is analyzed at a program level. CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(a) states that a program EIR may be prepared for a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project and are related either (1) geographically; (2) as logical parts in the chain of contemplated actions; (3) in connection with issuance of rules, regulations, plans, or other general criteria to govern the conduct of a continuing program; or (4) as individual activities carried out under the same authorizing statutory or regulatory authority and having generally similar environmental effects that can be mitigated in similar ways. CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(b) further indicates that use of a program EIR can provide the following advantages:

1. Provide an occasion for a more exhaustive consideration of effects and alternatives than would be practical in an EIR on an individual action
2. Ensure consideration of cumulative impacts that might be slighted in a case-by-case analysis
3. Avoid duplicative reconsideration of basic policy considerations
4. Allow the Lead Agency to consider broad policy alternatives and program-wide mitigation measures at an early time when the agency has greater flexibility to deal with basic problems or cumulative impacts
5. Allow reduction in paperwork

Program-level analysis is provided for AAU's growth within the 12 identified study areas. This includes an additional 669,670 sf of institutional uses and 110,000 sf of residential uses. AAU's shuttle service would be expanded to serve new campus locations. Information regarding the location and amount of future growth envisioned is provided in EIR Chapter 3, Project Description.

With respect to specific development projects that may be proposed in the future as part of future AAU growth, but are not yet known, CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(c) states that subsequent activities should be examined in light of the program EIR to determine whether additional environmental documentation must be prepared. If a later activity would have effects that were not examined in the program EIR, subsequent environmental documentation must be prepared, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 through 15164. Any subsequent environmental documents may rely on certain information contained in the program EIR, but would also focus on project- and site-specific impacts. CEQA findings would be required for any subsequent projects tiering from the program EIR.

2.3.2 Project-Level Analysis

This EIR includes project-level analysis of six distinct project sites and evaluates the environmental effects of AAU's change of use of those sites at a project level of detail, examining all phases of the projects, including change of use, tenant improvements, and operation, as well as the direct,

indirect, and cumulative impacts that might result. These six project sites include 393,537 sf of institutional uses and 17,533 sf of recreational uses and expansion of shuttle service to four of the sites. The 393,537 sf of institutional uses at the six project sites is in addition to the proposed program growth discussed above. Information regarding the locations and amounts of growth anticipated for the six project sites is provided in EIR Chapter 3, Project Description. As described in Chapter 3, these six locations are being evaluated at a project level in this EIR because they have not yet received permits from the City and they were occupied, identified, and/or otherwise changed by AAU after publication of the September 2010 NOP, and because uses at each of these sites are known.

At 34 locations, prior to issuance of the September 2010 Notice of Preparation, AAU had not obtained the required City permits to change the use and/or appearance of the buildings, including required conditional use authorizations, building permits, or other permits. AAU now seeks to obtain the necessary approvals (“Legalization Approvals”). The City will rely on this EIR when considering the Legalization Approvals. For a complete list of pending Legalization Approvals, see Section 3.6.1, Proposed Project Approvals, in Chapter 3, Project Description. It should be noted that CEQA requires an analysis of a proposed project’s changes to the environment as it existed at the time environmental review began, even if that existing condition resulted from unpermitted or otherwise unlawful activity. This means that the EIR’s analysis of the impacts of the legalization of AAU’s pre-NOP changes, like the EIR’s analysis of the other three elements of the Proposed Project (program-level growth, project-level growth and shuttle expansion), is measured against the existing conditions at the time of the NOP. The City is evaluating these effects of the potential issuance of the Legalization Approvals in an Existing Sites Technical Memorandum, which will be used by the City in determining whether or under what conditions those approvals could be granted.

2.4 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

The EIR process provides an opportunity for the public to review and comment on the project’s potential environmental effects and to further inform the environmental analysis. As a first step in complying with the procedural requirements of CEQA, the NOP process was used to determine whether any aspect of the project, either individually or cumulatively, may cause a significant effect on the environment.

2.4.1 Notice of Preparation and Summary of Comments

On September 29, 2010, the San Francisco Planning Department published a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an Environmental Impact Report and Notice of Public Scoping meeting for the project. The NOP was distributed for a 30-day review period to responsible or trustee agencies in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15082, and to other organizations, companies, and/or individuals that the City believed have an interest in the project. The purpose of the public review period was to

solicit comments on the scope and content of the environmental analysis contained in the Draft EIR. In addition, in order to solicit further comments on the scope and content of the environmental analysis to be included in the EIR, the City held a scoping meeting on October 26, 2010. A summary of the comments received on the NOP are contained in Appendix A, Notice of Preparation, Revised NOP, and Summary of NOP Comments.

In response to the NOP, the City received 53 public scoping meeting comments, comment letters, and emails. Not all of the issues raised in the response to the NOP are germane to analysis under CEQA. Where they are, these issues are addressed in the EIR. Some of the opinions, requests, proposals, and concerns offered are presented by several authors, and some are presented by a single author. The contents of these comment letters generally related to the following topics:

- Traffic, noise, and air pollution from shuttle buses
- Expansion of the shuttle bus service
- Displacement of housing
- Alternatives
- Graffiti
- General tidiness of public spaces
- Pedestrian activity in and around existing AAU sites
- Impacts to historic resources

Subsequent to publication of the NOP, several events occurred:

- AAU occupied in part 2801 Leavenworth Street (also known as The Cannery) and 700 Montgomery Street
- AAU occupied the entire building space at 150 Hayes Street and 625 Polk Street (the former California Culinary Academy)
- One existing AAU location at 121 Wisconsin Street was determined to have been omitted from AAU's existing properties listed in the NOP
- AAU proposed recreational uses at 2225 Jerrold Avenue that were not an existing use at the time of the NOP

Each of these project sites still needs at least one approval from the City; because the uses at each of these sites are known (since AAU has occupied them or has developed plans for them), these sites are being evaluated at a project level of detail (CEQA Guidelines Section 15146(a)). AAU's 2011 IMP identified the need for approximately 110,000 sf of residential uses to house about 400 students; 625,000 sf of institutional space; and 100,000 sf of recreational and other common area space for its future growth plan. The projections for future growth included in the IMP formed the basis for the establishment of Proposed Project analyzed in this EIR. As described above, since publication of the NOP, AAU has occupied four additional buildings; one site occupied by AAU prior to 2010 had inadvertently been omitted from the NOP; and one building occupied by AAU proposed with

additional uses. These six project sites provide an additional 393,537 sf of institutional uses and 17,533 sf of recreational uses beyond the program-level growth.

As of September 2010, AAU occupied property in 34 locations throughout the City, including 1,550,459 sf of institutional,⁷ residential, and recreational uses. The uses at AAU's existing 34 sites would not change with implementation of the Proposed Project. The existing institutional, residential, and recreational uses would continue with the same student, faculty, and staffing levels as existed at the time of publication of the NOP in September 2010. There could be some variability in the programming of classroom facilities, but there would be no change in land uses (i.e., from residential to institutional or vice versa). Therefore, the 34 existing sites are considered part of the baseline conditions, against which project-related impacts are compared (CEQA Guidelines Section 15125).

2.4.2 Public Review of the Draft EIR

In accordance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 31, and the NOP, this EIR reviews the potential environmental effects of implementation of the Proposed Project, including all program-level and project-specific elements. Specifically, Section 4.1 through Section 4.19 of EIR Chapter 4, Environmental Setting and Impacts, contains an environmental analysis of the following topics:

- Plans and Policies (Section 4.1)
- Land Use (Section 4.2)
- Aesthetics (Section 4.3)
- Population, Housing, and Employment (Section 4.4)
- Cultural and Paleontological Resources (Section 4.5)
- Transportation and Circulation (Section 4.6)
- Noise (Section 4.7)
- Air Quality (Section 4.8)
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Section 4.9)
- Wind and Shadow (Section 4.10)
- Recreation (Section 4.11)
- Utilities and Service Systems (Section 4.12)
- Public Services (Section 4.13)
- Biological Resources (Section 4.14)
- Geology and Soils (Section 4.15)
- Hydrology and Water Quality (Section 4.16)

⁷ The *San Francisco Planning Code* primarily describes AAU uses as postsecondary academic institution. Post secondary educational institution are defined by the *Planning Code* as an academic, professional, business or fine arts education facility. Such institution may include employee or student dormitories and other housing operated by and affiliated with the institution. Such institution shall not have industrial arts as its primary course of study. The postsecondary academic institutional uses for AAU include offices, classrooms, labs/studios, and other related uses.

- Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Section 4.17)
- Mineral and Energy Resources (Section 4.18)
- Agricultural and Forest Resources (Section 4.19)

The Draft EIR is available for public review and comment on the Planning Department's Negative Declarations and EIRs web page (<http://tinyurl.com/sfceqadocs>). CDs and paper copies are also available at the Planning Information Center (PIC) counter on the first floor of 1660 Mission Street, San Francisco. Referenced materials are available for review by appointment at the Planning Department's office on the fourth floor of 1650 Mission Street (call 415.575.9028). Documents referenced in this EIR are available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in case File No. 2012.1398E.

This Draft EIR is being circulated to local, state, and federal agencies, as necessary, and to interested organizations and individuals that may wish to review and comment on the document. CEQA Guidelines Sections 15086(c) and 15096(d) call for responsible agencies or other public agencies to provide comment on those project activities within an agency's area of expertise or project activities that are required to be carried out or approved by the agency; the agency should support those comments with either oral or written documentation.

Publication of the Draft EIR marks the beginning of a 62-day public review period, during which time the San Francisco Planning Department will accept comments on the Draft EIR. The public review period for the AAU Project is from February 25, 2015, through April 27, 2015. Additionally, the Planning Commission will hold public hearings on this Draft EIR. The Planning Commission hearing will be April 16, 2015, in Room 400 of City Hall, Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, beginning at 12:00 p.m. or later (call 415.558.6422 the week of the hearing for a recorded message giving a more-specific time).

Readers are invited to submit written comments on the Draft EIR. Written comments should be submitted to the San Francisco Planning Department to the attention of Sarah B. Jones, Environmental Review Officer, at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103, or email to Sarah.B.Jones@sfgov.org, during the specified public review and comment period, and written and oral comments may be presented at public hearings concerning the Proposed Project.

2.4.3 Final EIR (Responses to Comments Document) and Final EIR Certification

Following the close of the public review and comment period, the City will prepare and publish a document titled "Response to Comments," which will contain a summary of all written and recorded oral comments on this Draft EIR and written responses to those comments, along with copies of the letters received, a transcript of the public hearings, and any necessary revisions to the EIR. This Draft EIR and the Comments and Responses document will constitute the Final EIR. The Planning Commission, in an advertised public meeting(s), will consider the documents and then, if

found adequate, certify the Final EIR as completed in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines.

2.5 REPORT ORGANIZATION

This EIR is organized into the following chapters:

- **Chapter 1: Summary**—This chapter provides an abbreviated discussion of the project; a summary of the impacts that would result from its implementation; the mitigation measures recommended to reduce or avoid significant impacts; a discussion of alternatives to the project.
- **Chapter 2: Introduction**—This chapter discusses the purpose of the EIR; the type of EIR that has been prepared; the environmental review process; the comments that have been received since publication of the NOP; a statement of where copies of the Draft EIR and documents referenced in the Draft EIR can be obtained; instructions on how to comment on the Draft EIR; and an overview of the organization of the EIR.
- **Chapter 3: Project Description**—This chapter provides background information related to AAU's existing uses; a discussion of project objectives, project location, and project characteristics; and intended uses of the EIR.
- **Chapter 4: Environmental Analysis**—Following an introduction to the analysis (Section 4.0), each environmental topic in this chapter (Section 4.1 through Section 4.19) describes existing conditions (setting); lists regulatory requirements, presents significance thresholds; analyzes environmental impacts; and presents mitigation and/or improvement measures.
- **Chapter 5: Other CEQA Considerations**—This chapter presents growth-inducing impacts; significant unavoidable impacts; significant irreversible impacts; and areas of known controversy and issues to be resolved.
- **Chapter 6: Alternatives**—This chapter provides an evaluation of alternatives to the project, including alternatives considered but rejected, the No Project alternative, and an identification of the environmentally superior alternative.
- **Chapter 7: Report Preparers**—This chapter identifies all staff, agencies, and consultants who prepared the EIR; and the project sponsor team.
- **Appendix A**—This appendix includes the NOP, the Revised NOP, and a summary of comments on the NOP for the project.
- **Appendix B**—This appendix includes the AAU Shuttle Bus Policy.