

SUMMARY

S.1 INTRODUCTION

This document is a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed Seawall Lot 337 and Pier 48 Mixed-Use Project, known herein as the Mission Rock Project (or proposed project). This chapter of the EIR provides a summary of the proposed project, a summary of the anticipated environmental impacts of the proposed project and the identified mitigation measures, areas of controversy to be resolved, a summary of alternatives to the proposed project, and an identification of the environmentally superior alternative. The project sponsor, Seawall Lot 337 Associates, LLC, proposes to develop residential, commercial, production, active/retail, and parking uses on 11 proposed development blocks on Seawall Lot 337 and rehabilitate and reuse approximately 261,000 gross square feet (gsf) of Pier 48 in downtown San Francisco.

S.2 PROJECT SUMMARY

The Mission Rock Project entails development of a mixed-use, multi-phase project at Seawall Lot 337, rehabilitation and reuse of Pier 48, and construction of approximately 5.4 acres of net new open spaces for a total of approximately 8 acres of open space on the project site. The proposed project would include 2.7 to 2.8 million gsf of mixed uses on 11 proposed development blocks, with building heights ranging from 90 feet (approximately seven stories) to a maximum of 240 feet (approximately 23 stories). The mixed-use development would comprise approximately 1.1 to 1.6 million gsf of residential uses (estimated at 1,000 to 1,600 units, consisting of both market-rate and affordable housing), approximately 972,000 to 1.4 million gsf of commercial uses, and 241,000 to 244,800 gsf of active/retail uses on the lower floors of each block. Additionally, the project would include approximately 1.1 million gsf of aboveground and underground parking (approximately 3,100 parking spaces) and rehabilitation of 242,500 gsf of industrial, restaurant, active/retail, tour, exhibition, and meeting space within Pier 48 for reuse by an industrial use, specifically analyzed as a proposed brewery.

The project site is located in the Mission Bay neighborhood of the city, adjacent to the Mission Bay South Redevelopment Area. The 27-acre project site consists of Assessor's Block 8719/Lot 002, Block 8719/Lot 006, and Block 9900/Lot 048, which includes several areas: the 13.6-acre Seawall Lot 337; the 0.3-acre strip of land on the south side of Seawall Lot 337, referred to as Parcel P20; the 6.0-acre Pier 48; the existing 2.6-acre China Basin Park; and 4.6 acres of streets and access areas within or adjacent to the boundaries of Seawall Lot 337 and Pier 48. Most of the project site is currently paved, with Seawall Lot 337 and portions of Parcel P20 used mainly as a

surface parking lot; the Pier 48 structure is used for indoor parking, storage, and warehouse uses. Seawall Lot 337 and Pier 48 are also used for special events, which are held up to 50 days per year, with a total of approximately 200,000 to 250,000 guests annually.

S.3 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The Planning Department published a Notice of Preparation (NOP) on December 11, 2013, announcing its intent to prepare and distribute an EIR. In June 2014, subsequent to the publication of the NOP, the City's voters approved Proposition B (Voter Approval for Waterfront Development Height Increases), which states that voter approval is required for any height increases on property, such as the project site, within the jurisdiction of the Port of San Francisco. Accordingly, on November 3, 2015, the City voters approved Proposition D (the Mission Rock Affordable Housing, Parks, Jobs, and Historic Preservation Initiative), which amended the height and bulk restrictions for the project site by establishing the Mission Rock Height and Bulk District. Under Proposition D, the proposed heights for buildings on some of the proposed development blocks are lower than originally contemplated in the NOP, and there have been no increases in the height, density or intensity of development for the proposed project since publication of the NOP.

Topics analyzed in the EIR are land use and land use planning, aesthetics, population and housing, cultural resources, transportation and circulation, noise, air quality, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, wind and shadow, public services and recreation, utilities and service systems, biological resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, and hazards/hazardous materials.

This summary provides an overview of the analysis contained in Chapter 4, *Environmental Setting and Impacts*. Impacts are categorized by type of impact, as follows:

- **No Impact.** No adverse changes (or impacts) to the environment are expected.
- **Less than Significant.** An impact that would not involve an adverse physical change to the environment, would 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.** An impact that would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of the identified mitigation measure.
- **Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation.** An adverse physical environmental impact that would exceed the defined significance criteria but could be reduced through compliance with existing local, state, and federal laws and regulations and/or implementation of feasible mitigation measures. The impact cannot be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

- **Significant and Unavoidable.** An adverse physical environmental 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. There are no feasible mitigation measures.

SENATE BILL 743

On September 27, 2013, Governor Brown signed Senate Bill (SB) 743, which became effective on January 1, 2014, and added Section 21099 to the California Public Resources Code. Among other provisions, Public Resources Code Section 21099(d)(1) changed the typical analysis of aesthetics and parking impacts for urban infill projects under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The proposed project meets most of the criteria associated with SB 743 (e.g., it is an infill site located within a transit priority area). SB 743 directs that aesthetic and parking impacts of residential, mixed-use residential, or employment center infill projects located in transit priority areas are not considered significant impacts on the environment under CEQA. However, the project may not fully meet the criteria for being considered a mixed-use project because mixed-use projects typically include residential, commercial, and some industrial uses but not heavy industrial uses. Because the proposed project would include an industrial use (i.e., the proposed industrial use, specifically analyzed as a brewery on Pier 48), it may not fit within the generally accepted classification of a mixed-use residential development. Although the majority of the proposed project would include residential and commercial uses, with the heavy industrial use constituting an estimated 10 percent of the approximately 2.5 million gsf of proposed development, this EIR nevertheless applies a conservative interpretation of SB 743; thus, an analysis of the proposed project's impacts on aesthetics is provided in Section 4.B; an analysis of the project's impacts related to parking is provided in Section 4.E, *Transportation and Circulation*.

SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

All impacts of the proposed project, its alternatives, and the associated mitigation measures and improvement measures identified in this EIR are summarized in Table S.1, page S-11. The impacts are listed in the same order as they appear in the text of Chapter 4, *Environmental Setting and Impacts*, of this EIR. The proposed project would result in the following significant and unavoidable impacts (including impacts that are significant and unavoidable with mitigation):

TRANSPORTATION IMPACTS

- The proposed project would result in an adverse impact by increasing ridership by more than 5 percent on two individual Muni routes that exceed 85 percent capacity utilization under baseline conditions. (Impact TR-4)

- The proposed project would result in an adverse impact related to a substantial increase in transit delays on Third Street between Channel Street and Mission Rock Street. (Impact TR-6)
- The proposed project would have significant impacts on pedestrian safety at the unsignalized intersections of Fourth Street/Mission Rock Street and Fourth Street/Long Bridge Street. (Impact TR-9)
- The proposed project would contribute considerably to a significant cumulative transit impact because it would increase ridership by more than 5 percent on one individual Muni route that would exceed 85 percent capacity utilization. (Impact C-TR-4)
- The proposed project would contribute considerably to significant cumulative impacts related to transit delay. (Impact C-TR-6)
- The proposed project would contribute considerably to significant cumulative pedestrian impacts. (Impact C-TR-7)

NOISE IMPACTS

- Construction of the proposed project would generate noise levels in excess of standards or result in substantial temporary increases in ambient noise levels. (Impact NOI-1)
- Operation of the proposed project could result in the exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of the San Francisco Noise Ordinance or a substantial permanent, temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity, above levels existing without the project. (Impact NOI-2)
- Construction of the project would expose persons to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels related to annoyance. (Impact NOI-3)
- Construction activities for the proposed project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonable future projects in the city, would result in a substantial temporary increase in noise or noise levels in excess of the applicable local standards. (Impact C-NOI-1)
- Construction activities associated with project-related development, in combination with other past, present, and reasonable future projects in the city, would expose sensitive receptors to excessive ground-borne vibration related to annoyance. (Impact C-NOI-2)
- Operation of the proposed project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonable future projects in the city, could result in the exposure of persons to noise in excess of the applicable local standards or a substantial permanent ambient noise level increase in the project vicinity. (Impact C-NOI-3)

AIR QUALITY IMPACTS

- Construction of the proposed project would generate fugitive dust and criteria air pollutants, which for criteria air pollutants but not fugitive dust, would 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. (Impact AQ-1)
- During project operations, the proposed project would result in emissions of criteria air pollutants 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. (Impact AQ-2)
- During combined project construction and operations, the proposed project would result in emissions of criteria air pollutants 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. (Impact AQ-3)
- The proposed project's construction and operation, in combination with other past, present, and reasonable future projects, would contribute to cumulative regional air quality impacts. (Impact C-AQ-1)

WIND IMPACTS

- The proposed project would alter wind in a manner that would substantially affect public areas. (Impact WS-1)
- The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would alter wind in a manner that would substantially affect public areas. (Impact C-WS-1)

S.4 AREAS OF KNOWN CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

As noted above, the Planning Department published a NOP on December 11, 2013, to notify the public of its intent to prepare and distribute an EIR for the Mission Rock Project. During the public scoping process and at the public scoping meeting (held on January 13, 2014), the Planning Department received numerous comments from public agencies, organizations, and individuals regarding the scope and content of the EIR, including comments on the design of the proposed project and its environmental effects.

Comments received during the scoping process on the proposed project and its environmental effects are addressed in this EIR. This section lists the areas of controversy and major concerns raised during the scoping period as well as issues to be resolved. These include the following:

- Consistency of the proposed project with the Mission Bay Plan, San Francisco Waterfront Plan, and Mission Bay development guidelines (Chapter 3, *Plans and Policies*).
- Potential impacts along specific viewpoints, the waterfront, and in surrounding areas. The scale of the proposed project, height of the project, and the future use of Parcel P20 (Section 4.B, *Aesthetics*).
- Provision of affordable housing and population density (Section 4.C, *Population and Housing*).
- Potential impacts on submerged cultural resources in the project area (Section 4.D, *Cultural Resources*).
- Increases in traffic and traffic congestion, connections to the city's transportation network, lack of public transportation in the area, pedestrian safety, traffic during game days, fair-share contributions, and impacts of increased traffic on emergency vehicle delay (Section 4.E, *Transportation and Circulation*).
- Potential noise impacts from additional residents (Section 4.F, *Noise*).
- Potential GHG impacts, mitigation measures, and inclusion of a GHG emissions analysis consistent with Assembly Bill 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act (Section 4.H, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*).
- Potential shadow impacts along the waterfront and in China Basin Park and Mission Rock Square (Section 4.I, *Wind and Shadow*).
- Potential loss of green space, and preservation of public lands for public and recreational use (Section 4.J, *Public Services and Recreation*).
- Adequacy of water and sewer systems with the addition of the proposed project and the Water Supply Assessment (Section 4.K, *Utilities and Service Systems*).
- Potential impacts on the marine environment, as well as state- and federally listed species, and pile-driving impacts on fish, birds, and mammals (Section 4.L, *Biological Resources*).

The issues listed above are discussed in this EIR.

S.5 SUMMARY OF VARIANTS

The project sponsor (Seawall Lot 337 Associates, LLC) has requested that this Draft EIR include an environmental analysis of variants to the proposed project. Variants are variations of the proposed project at the same project site, with the same objectives, background, and

development controls, but with a specific variation that may or may not reduce environmental impacts. Therefore, this chapter describes and analyzes the associated environmental impacts for the following four variants to the proposed project:

- Variant 1 – District Energy/Bay-Source Heating and Cooling, which would provide a district-wide heating and cooling system, with hot and cold water piped underground to individual buildings in lieu of chillers and boilers in each building.
- Variant 2 – Entertainment Venue, which would accommodate up to 4,000 patrons and up to 50 events per year in one of the proposed project buildings.
- Variant 3 – Reconfigured Parking, which would relocate 700 parking spaces from the subterranean garage at Mission Rock Square, which would not be constructed under this variant, to the Block D2 garage.
- Variant 4 – Hotel Use, which would provide a hotel with approximately 200,000 gsf in a building that otherwise would have been residential.

S.6 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES

In addition to the proposed project, this Draft EIR analyzes the environmental impacts of three alternatives that were determined to represent a reasonable range of alternatives, as follows:

- **No Project Alternative (Alternative A):** The project site would remain in its current condition, and no new development or redevelopment of existing uses would occur. Seawall Lot 337 would continue to operate as a surface parking lot and an area for pop-up retail; it would not be developed. No physical or operational changes would be made to the existing sheds, aprons, or the valley on Pier 48; seismic upgrades to the pier structure would not be implemented. China Basin Park would remain as a 3.3-acre park, and no other open space would be added to the project site.
- **Reduced Intensity Alternative (Alternative B):** Mission Rock Square and the Mission Rock Square Garage would not be constructed. In their place, a building (Building K) would be constructed in the middle of Seawall Lot 337. The area where Building K would be located under the proposed project would be an extension of China Basin Park under this alternative. The removal of Mission Rock Square would result in a slight decrease in open space (approximately 0.48 acre less than the proposed project), which would be compensated for by provision of an equivalent amount of open space (or more) on rooftops on the buildings on Blocks E and/or K or a combination thereof. Building heights adjacent to China Basin Park would be reduced. In addition, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would not include flexible parcels on Blocks H, I, and J. Instead, Block H would be commercial, while Blocks I and J would be residential. The D1 residential tower would be relocated to the east side of Block D and the D2 garage.

The D2 garage (and its driveways) would be shifted to the west. Active retail use would be maintained on the Block D frontage on Third Street. All proposed changes to Pier 48 would remain the same. In total, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in 240,000 to 340,000 gsf less at Seawall Lot 337 compared with the proposed project. This alternative was selected because of its potential to reduce construction-related noise, air quality, shadow, and transportation impacts.

- **No Change to Pier 48 Alternative (Alternative C):** No rehabilitation or reuse would occur on Pier 48; Pier 48 would remain in its existing condition, except that the Pier 48 aprons would continue to be designated for public access and open space, consistent with the proposed project plan. Development on the remaining portions of the project site, including Seawall Lot 337, Parcel P20, China Basin Park, Channel Wharf, and Terry A. Francois Boulevard, would occur as proposed under the proposed project. This alternative was selected because of its potential to reduce traffic, loading, and pedestrian/bicycle conflicts as well as noise and biological impacts (no in-water construction or pile driving). Eliminating the reuse and rehabilitation of Pier 48 could avoid or reduce various impacts without changing the proposal for Seawall Lot 337.

Section 21002 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires lead agencies to adopt feasible mitigation measures or feasible environmentally superior alternatives in order to substantially lessen or avoid otherwise significant adverse environmental effects, unless specific social or other conditions make such mitigation measures or alternatives infeasible. CEQA also requires that an environmentally superior alternative be identified among the alternatives analyzed. In general, the environmentally superior alternative is the project that avoids or substantially lessens some or all of the significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6). Table S-2, page S-65, compares the significant impacts of the proposed project, the No Project Alternative, the Reduced Intensity Alternative, and the No Change to Pier 48 Alternative. The table compares the significance of impacts in two ways. One, for each impact studied, it identifies the level of impact for the project and each alternative (e.g., no impact, less-than-significant impact, less-than-significant impact with mitigation, significant and unavoidable impact, or significant and unavoidable impact with mitigation). Two, for each alternative, it indicates whether the degree of impact would be equal to, less than, or greater than that of the project impact. In some cases, although both the project and alternative would result in the same level of impact, the degree of impact with the alternative might be less than or greater than that of the project.

S.7 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

The EIR is required to identify the environmentally superior alternative (i.e., the alternative that has the fewest significant environmental impacts) from among the other alternatives evaluated. The proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to

transportation, noise, air quality, and wind. On the basis of comparing the extent to which the alternatives reduce or avoid the significant impacts of the proposed project, the No Project Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative because it would result in no impacts on resources. However, if the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, then the EIR must also specify which of the other alternatives (including the proposed project) would be environmentally superior.

Both the Reduced Intensity Alternative and the No Change to Pier 48 Alternative would result in less overall gross square footage of development compared to the proposed project. Under the Reduced Intensity Alternative, in addition to less development, building heights would decrease at some locations, and the underground Mission Rock Square Garage would not be constructed. Building K would be moved from next to China Basin Park to the Mission Rock Square site. Because some building heights would decrease and the location of the tower on Block D would be shifted, the significant and unavoidable wind impacts would be reduced slightly, but impacts would remain significant and unavoidable, even with mitigation. In addition, reducing the total square footage of development and eliminating the underground parking garage would slightly decrease overall impacts related to land use, aesthetics, population/housing, cultural resources, transportation, GHG emissions, shadow, public services, utilities, geology, hydrology and water quality, and hazards and hazardous materials. Although these impacts would be lower in degree under this alternative, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would not decrease any significant and unavoidable impacts or reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level that would otherwise require mitigation.

The No Change to Pier 48 Alternative would not develop Pier 48, which would result in a slight reduction in impacts related to land use, aesthetics, population/housing, cultural resources, transportation, air quality, GHG emissions, public services, utilities, geology, hydrology and water quality, and hazards and hazardous materials. However, this alternative would reduce all of the impacts on fish and marine mammal species from pile driving at Pier 48 during the seismic upgrades. The proposed project would require mitigation measures related to biological resources to reduce project and cumulative impacts to less-than-significant levels. However, because no in-water pile driving would be required under the No Change to Pier 48 Alternative, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures would be needed.

Overall, the No Change to Pier 48 Alternative is considered the environmentally superior alternative because it would reduce the severity of adverse environmental effects across a broad range of environmental resources, eliminate impacts on fish and marine mammal species related to pile driving at Pier 48, and not result in any new significant environmental impacts.

S.8 SUMMARY TABLES

Table S-1, on the following page, includes the impacts and mitigation measures identified in the EIR for the proposed project; Table S-2, page S-65, includes a comparison of the significant impacts of the proposed project to the impacts of the alternatives. It also determines if the sponsor's objectives would be met by the proposed project and the alternatives.

The information in the tables is organized to correspond with environmental issues discussed in Chapter 4 of the EIR. Table S-1, on the following page, is arranged in four columns: 1) impacts, 2) level of significance prior to mitigation measures (if applicable), 3) mitigation and improvement measures (if applicable), and 4) level of significance after mitigation (if applicable). For a complete description of potential impacts and recommended mitigation measures, please refer to the topical sections in Chapter 4 of the EIR. This EIR also identifies improvement measures where applicable. Improvement measures are not required to reduce, avoid, or eliminate adverse physical changes. Instead, they are identified as ways to further reduce the magnitude of less-than-significant impacts. They may be adopted by decision-makers as conditions of project approval.

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF PROPOSED PROJECT

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Land Use and Land Use Planning			
Impact LU-1. The proposed project would not physically divide an established community.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact LU-2. The proposed project would not conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact C-LU-1. The proposed project, in combination with other development within the city, would not physically divide an established community.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact C-LU-2. The proposed project, in combination with other development within the city, would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.	LTS	None required.	NA
Aesthetics			
Impact AE-1. The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact AE-2. The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact AE-3. The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.	LTS	None required.	NA

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Impact AE-4. The proposed project would not create a substantial adverse effect on light and glare.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact C-AE-1. The proposed project, in combination with other foreseeable development in the surrounding area, would not have a significant cumulative impact on visual character or the quality of scenic vistas or public view corridors and would not cumulatively contribute to new sources of light, glare, or shadows.	LTS	None required.	NA
Population and Housing			
Impact PH-1. The proposed project would not result in substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact C-PH-1. The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not induce substantial population growth either directly or indirectly or create substantial demand for additional housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing.	LTS	None required.	NA
Cultural Resources			
Impact CP-1. The proposed project, including rehabilitation and reuse of the existing historic Pier 48 structures, in accordance with applicable Secretary of the Interior’s Rehabilitation Standards, as well as new construction on Seawall Lot 337, would not have a substantial adverse effect on a historical or potential historical resource.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact CP-2. The proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource.	S	M-CP-2: Archeological Testing. Based on a reasonable presumption that archeological resources may be present within the project site, the following measures shall be undertaken to avoid any potentially significant adverse effect from the proposed project on buried or submerged historical resources. The project sponsor shall retain the services of an archeological consultant from the rotational Qualified Archeological Consultants List (QACL) maintained by the Planning Department archeologist. The project sponsor shall contact the Planning Department archeologist to obtain the names and contact information for the	LTS

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>next three archeological consultants on the QACL. The archeological consultant shall undertake an archeological testing program as specified herein. In addition, the consultant shall be available to conduct an archeological monitoring and/or data recovery program if required pursuant to this measure. The archeological consultant’s work shall be conducted in accordance with this measure at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer (ERO). All plans and reports prepared by the consultant, as specified herein, shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Archeological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction of the project for up to a maximum of 4 weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of construction can be extended beyond 4 weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce to a less-than-significant level of potential effects on a significant archeological resource, as defined in CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15064.5 (a) and (c).</p> <p><i>Consultation with Descendant Communities:</i> On discovery of an archeological site¹ associated with descendant Native Americans, the overseas Chinese, or other potentially interested descendant group, an appropriate representative² of the descendant group and the ERO shall be contacted. The representative of the descendant group shall be given the opportunity to monitor archeological field investigations of the site and offer recommendations to the ERO regarding appropriate archeological treatment of the site, recovered data from the site, and, if applicable, interpretative treatment of the associated archeological site. A copy of the final archeological resources report shall be provided to the representative of the descendant group.</p> <p><i>Archeological Testing Program.</i> The archeological consultant shall prepare and submit to the ERO for review and approval an archeological testing plan (ATP). The archeological testing program shall be conducted in accordance with the approved ATP. The ATP shall identify the property types of the expected archeological resource(s) that could be adversely affected by the proposed project, the testing method to be used, and the locations recommended for</p>	

¹ The term “archeological site” is intended here to include any archeological deposit, feature, burial, or evidence of burial.

² An “appropriate representative” of the descendant group is here defined to mean, in the case of Native Americans, any individual listed in the current Native American contact list for the City and County of San Francisco maintained by the NAHC or, in the case of overseas Chinese, the Chinese Historical Society of America. An appropriate representative of other descendant groups should be determined in consultation with the department archeologist.

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>testing. The purpose of the archeological testing program will be to determine, to the extent possible, the presence or absence of archeological resources and identify and evaluate whether any archeological resource encountered on the site constitutes a historical resource under CEQA.</p> <p>At the completion of the archeological testing program, the archeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings to the ERO. If, based on the archeological testing program, the archeological consultant finds that significant archeological resources may be present, the ERO, in consultation with the archeological consultant, shall determine if additional measures are warranted. Additional measures that may be undertaken include additional archeological testing, archeological monitoring, and/or an archeological data recovery program. No archeological data recovery shall be undertaken without the prior approval of the ERO or the Planning Department archeologist. If the ERO determines that a significant archeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the proposed project, at the discretion of the project sponsor:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. The proposed project shall be redesigned so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archeological resource, or B. A data recovery program shall be implemented, unless the ERO determines that the archeological resource is of greater interpretive than research significance and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible. <p><i>Archeological Monitoring Program.</i> If the ERO, in consultation with the archeological consultant, determines that an archeological monitoring program shall be implemented, the archeological monitoring program shall include the following provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the archeological monitoring program reasonably prior to any project-related soil-disturbing activities commencing. The ERO, in consultation with the archeological consultant, shall determine what project activities shall be archeologically monitored. In most cases, any soil-disturbing activities, such as demolition, foundation removal, excavation, grading, utility installation, foundation work, pile driving (foundation, shoring, etc.), site remediation, etc., shall require archeological monitoring because of the risk these activities pose to potential archeological resources and their depositional context; • The archeological consultant shall advise all project contractors to be on the alert for evidence of the presence of the expected resource(s), know how to identify evidence of the expected resource(s), and know the appropriate protocol in the event of apparent discovery of an archeological resource; 	

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The archeological monitor(s) shall be present on the project site according to the schedule agreed upon by the archeological consultant and the ERO until the ERO has, in consultation with project archeological consultant, determined that project construction activities could have no effects on significant archeological deposits; • The archeological monitor shall record and be authorized to collect soil samples and artifactual/ecofactual material as warranted for analysis; • If an intact archeological deposit is encountered, all soil-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit shall cease. The archeological monitor shall be empowered to temporarily redirect demolition/excavation/pile-driving/construction activities and equipment until the deposit is evaluated. If, in the case of pile-driving activity (foundation, shoring, etc.), the archeological monitor has cause to believe that the pile-driving activity may affect an archeological resource, the pile-driving activity shall be terminated until an appropriate evaluation of the resource has been made in consultation with the ERO. The archeological consultant shall immediately notify the ERO of the encountered archeological deposit. The archeological consultant shall make a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archeological deposit and present the findings of this assessment to the ERO. <p>Whether or not significant archeological resources are encountered, the archeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings of the monitoring program to the ERO.</p> <p><i>Archeological Data Recovery Program.</i> The archeological data recovery program shall be conducted in accordance with an archeological data recovery plan (ADRP). The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the ADRP prior to preparation of a draft ADRP. The archeological consultant shall submit a draft ADRP to the ERO. The ADRP shall identify how the proposed data recovery program will preserve the significant information the archeological resource is expected to contain. That is, the ADRP will identify what scientific/historical research questions are applicable to the expected resource, what data classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions. Data recovery, in general, should be limited to the portions of the historical property that could be adversely affected by the proposed project. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be applied to any portions of the archeological resources if nondestructive methods are practical.</p>	

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Field Methods and Procedures.</i> Descriptions of proposed field strategies, procedures, and operations. • <i>Cataloging and Laboratory Analysis.</i> Description of selected cataloging system and artifact analysis procedures. • <i>Discard and Deaccession Policy.</i> Description of and rationale for field and post-field discard and deaccession policies. • <i>Interpretive Program.</i> Consideration of an onsite/offsite public interpretive program during the course of the archeological data recovery program. • <i>Security Measures.</i> Recommended security measures to protect the archeological resource from vandalism, looting, and nonintentionally damaging activities. • <i>Final Report.</i> Description of proposed report format and distribution of results. • <i>Curation.</i> Description of the procedures and recommendations for the curation of any recovered data having potential research value, identification of appropriate curation facilities, and a summary of the accession policies of the curation facilities. <p><i>Final Archeological Resources Report.</i> The archeological consultant shall submit a Draft Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archeological resource and describes the archeological and historical research methods employed in the archeological testing/monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the final report.</p> <p>Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one copy, the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC, and the Environmental Planning division of the Planning Department shall receive one bound, one unbound, and one unlocked, searchable PDF copy on CD of the FARR, along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest in or high interpretive value of the resource, the ERO may require a final report content, format, and distribution different from that presented above.</p>	

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>Impact CP-3. The proposed project could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>M-CP-3: Treatment of Human Remains or Unassociated Funerary Objects. The treatment of human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soil-disturbing activity shall comply with applicable state and federal laws. This shall include immediate notification of the coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and, in the event of the coroner’s determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (PRC Section 5097.98). The archeological consultant, project sponsor, ERO, and MLD shall have up to but not beyond 6 days after the discovery to make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects with appropriate dignity (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5(d)). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects. Nothing in existing state regulations or in this mitigation measure compels the project sponsor and the ERO to accept recommendations of an MLD. The archeological consultant shall retain possession of any Native American human remains and associated or unassociated burial objects until completion of any scientific analyses of the human remains or objects, as specified in the treatment agreement, if such an agreement has been made or, otherwise, as determined by the archeological consultant and the ERO.</p>	<p>LTS</p>
<p>Impact CP-4. The proposed project could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>M-CP-4: Tribal Cultural Resources Interpretive Program. If the ERO determines that a significant archeological resource is present, and if in consultation with the affiliated Native American tribal representatives, the ERO determines that the resource constitutes a tribal cultural resource (TCR) and that the resource could be adversely affected by the proposed project, the proposed project shall be redesigned so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant tribal cultural resource, if feasible.</p> <p>If the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) determines that preservation-in-place of the tribal cultural resource (TCR) pursuant to Mitigation Measure M-CP-2, Archeological Testing, is both feasible and effective, then the archeological consultant shall prepare an archeological resource preservation plan (ARPP). Implementation of the approved ARPP by the archeological consultant shall be required when feasible.</p> <p>If the Environmental Review Officer (ERO), in consultation with the affiliated Native American tribal representatives and the Project Sponsor, determines that preservation-in-place of the tribal cultural resources is not a sufficient or feasible</p>	<p>LTS</p>

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		option, the project sponsor shall implement an interpretive program of the TCR in consultation with affiliated tribal representatives. An interpretive plan produced in consultation with the ERO and affiliated tribal representatives, at a minimum, and approved by the ERO would be required to guide the interpretive program. The plan shall identify, as appropriate, proposed locations for installations or displays, the proposed content and materials of those displays or installation, the producers or artists of the displays or installation, and a long-term maintenance program. The interpretive program may include artist installations, preferably by local Native American artists, oral histories with local Native Americans, artifacts displays and interpretation, and educational panels or other informational displays.	
Impact C-CP-1. The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects in the city, could result in a significant cumulative impact on historic resources. However, the proposed project’s contribution would not be cumulatively considerable.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact C-CP-2. The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects in the city, could result in a significant cumulative impact on archeological resources, tribal cultural resources, and human remains. However, the project’s contribution would be less than cumulatively considerable.	S	Implement M-CP-2: Archeological Testing, M-CP-3: Treatment of Human Remains or Unassociated Funerary Objects, and M-CP-4: Tribal Cultural Resources Interpretive Program.	LTS
Transportation and Circulation			
Impact TR-1. Construction of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts on the transportation and circulation network.	LTS	I-TR-1: Construction Management Plan. <u>Traffic Control Plan for Construction</u> – To reduce potential conflicts between construction activities and pedestrians, bicyclists, transit and autos during construction activities, the project sponsor should require construction contractor(s) to prepare a traffic control plan for major phases of construction (e.g. demolition and grading, construction, or renovation of individual buildings). The project sponsor and their construction contractor(s) should meet with relevant City agencies to coordinate feasible measures to reduce traffic congestion, including temporary transit stop relocations and other measures to reduce potential traffic and transit disruption and pedestrian circulation effects during major phases of construction. This includes coordinating project construction activities with nearby	NA

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>City construction projects, such as the Third Street Rehabilitation Project. For any work within the public right-of-way, the contractor would be required to comply with the San Francisco’s Regulations for Working in San Francisco Streets, which establishes rules and permit requirements so that construction activities can be conducted safely and with the least possible interference with pedestrians, bicyclists, transit, and vehicular traffic. Additionally, restrict truck movements and deliveries to the maximum feasible extent during peak hours (generally 7:00 to 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 to 6:00 p.m., or other times, as determined by SFMTA and the TASC). In the event that the construction timeframes of the major phases and other development projects adjacent to the project site overlap, the project sponsor should coordinate with City agencies through the TASC and the adjacent developers to minimize the severity of any disruption to adjacent land uses and transportation facilities from overlapping construction transportation impacts. The project sponsor, in conjunction with the adjacent developer(s), should propose a construction traffic control plan that includes measures to reduce potential construction traffic conflicts, such as coordinated material drop-offs, collective worker parking and transit to job site and other measures.</p> <p><u>Reduce Single-Occupant Vehicle Mode Share for Construction Workers</u> – To minimize parking demand and vehicle trips associated with construction workers, the project sponsor should require the construction contractor to include in the Traffic Control Plan for Construction methods to encourage walking, bicycling, carpooling, and transit access to the project construction sites by construction workers in the coordinated plan.</p> <p><u>Project Construction Updates for Adjacent Residents and Businesses</u> – To minimize construction impacts on access for nearby residences, institutions, and businesses, the project sponsor should provide nearby residences and adjacent businesses with regularly updated information regarding construction, including construction activities, peak construction vehicle activities (e.g., concrete pours), travel lane closures, and lane closures via a newsletter and/or website.</p>	
Impact TR-2. The proposed project would not cause substantial additional VMT nor substantially induce automobile travel.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact TR-3. The proposed project would result in queues that would create traffic hazards.	S	M-TR-3: Parking Garage and Intersection Queue Impacts. The easternmost driveway on Long Bridge Street (i.e., closest to Bridgeview Street) shall be restricted to right-in, right-out access during all times. Restricted access could be accomplished by placing signage as well as delineators of a sufficient length in the middle of Long Bridge Street to block left-turn access to the driveway.	LTS

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>Impact TR-4. The proposed project would result in an adverse impact by increasing ridership by more than 5 percent on two individual Muni routes that exceed 85 percent capacity utilization under baseline conditions.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>M-TR-4.1: Provide Fair-Share Contribution to Improve 10 Townsend Line Capacity. Upon completion and occupancy of Phase 1 of the proposed project and upon completion and occupancy of each subsequent phase as defined in the Development Agreement the project sponsor shall obtain from SFMTA the current ridership on the 10 Townsend and conduct an assessment of the capacity utilization at the screenline’s Maximum Load Point (MLP) for weekday AM and PM peak hour conditions. If the capacity utilization exceeds 85 percent, a fair share contribution payment shall be made to SFMTA by the project sponsor, calculated as further provided in a Transit Mitigation Agreement described below, and attached to or incorporated into the Development Agreement. Such payment shall be adjusted, as appropriate, to the extent, if any, that the proposed project reflects either the High Residential Assumption or High Commercial Assumption based upon all phases of the proposed project that have been completed up to such date. Accordingly, the fair share contributions by phase may differ by scenario because the number of transit riders varies due to different mixes of land use. If the capacity utilization based on SFMTA’s ridership data is less than 85 percent, then the project sponsor’s fair share payment for that phase shall be \$0 and the process will repeat at the next subsequent phase. Each subsequent fair share calculation shall take account of amounts paid for prior phases, to ensure that payments are not duplicative for the same transit rider impacts. The project sponsor shall enter into a Transit Mitigation Agreement with the SFMTA pursuant to which the project sponsor will make a fair share contribution to the cost of providing additional bus service or otherwise improving service on the 10 Townsend. The fair share contribution as documented in the Transportation Impact Study for the proposed project shall not exceed the following amounts, in total across all phases: a. \$991,230 for High Commercial Assumption b. \$782,706 for High Residential Assumption SFMTA will determine whether adding bus(es) or other measures are more desirable to increase capacity along the route and will use the funds provided by the project sponsor to implement the most desirable measure, which may include but is not limited to the following measures: 1. Convert to using higher-capacity vehicles on the 10 Townsend route. In this case, the project sponsors fair share contribution may be utilized to convert the route to articulated buses. Some bus stops along the route may not currently be configured to accommodate the longer articulated buses. Some bus zones could be extended by removing one or more parking spaces at locations where appropriate space is available.</p>	<p>SUM</p>

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>2. Instead of adding more buses to a congested route, increase travel speeds along the route which would allow for buses to move faster thus increasing efficiency and reliability. In this case, the project sponsor’s fair share contribution may be used to fund a study to identify appropriate and feasible improvements and/or implement a portion of the improvements that would increase travel speeds enough to increase capacity along the bus route. Such improvements could include transit only lanes, transit signal priority, and transit boarding improvements.</p> <p>3. Increase capacity along the corridor by adding a new Muni service route in this area. If this option is selected, the project sponsor’s fair share contribution may fund the purchase of the new vehicles</p> <p>M-TR-4.2: Provide Fair-Share Contribution to Improve 30 Stockton Line Capacity Proposed Project. Upon completion and occupancy of Phase 1 of the proposed project and upon completion and occupancy of each subsequent phase as defined in the Development Agreement, the project sponsor shall obtain from SFMTA the current ridership on the 30 Stockton and conduct an assessment of the capacity utilization at the Maximum Load Point (MLP) on the route between the proposed project and Market Street for weekday PM peak hour conditions.</p> <p>If the capacity utilization exceeds 85 percent, a fair share contribution payment shall be made by the project sponsor, calculated as further provided in Transit Mitigation Agreement described below, and attached to or incorporated into the Development Agreement. Such payment shall be adjusted, as appropriate, to the extent, if any, that the proposed project reflects either the High Commercial Assumption or the High Residential Assumption, the latter of which does not require any fair share contribution. The fair share contributions differ by scenario because the number of transit riders varies due to different mixes of land use. If the capacity utilization based on SFMTA’s ridership data is less than 85 percent, then the project sponsor’s fair share payment for that phase shall be \$0 and the process will repeat at the next subsequent phase. Each subsequent fair share calculation shall take account of amounts paid for prior phases, to ensure that payments are not duplicative for the same transit rider impacts.</p> <p>The project applicant shall enter into a Transit Mitigation Agreement with the SFMTA pursuant to which the project applicant will make a fair share contribution to the cost of providing additional bus service or otherwise improving service on the 30 Stockton. The fair share contribution as documented in the Transportation Impact Study for the proposed project shall not exceed the following amounts, in total across all phases:</p>	

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		a) \$417,691 for High Commercial Assumption b) \$0 for High Residential Assumption SFMTA will determine whether adding bus(es) or other measures are more desirable to increase capacity along the route and will use the funds provided by the project sponsor to implement the most desirable measure, which may include but is not limited to the following measures: 1. Convert to using higher-capacity vehicles on the 30 Stockton route. In this case, the project sponsors fair share contribution may be utilized to convert the route to articulated buses. Some bus stops along the route may not currently be configured to accommodate the longer articulated buses. Some bus zones could be extended by removing one or more parking spaces at locations where appropriate space is available. 2. Instead of adding more buses to a congested route, increase travel speeds along the route which would allow for buses to move faster thus increasing efficiency and reliability. In this case, the project sponsor’s fair share contribution may be used to fund a study to identify appropriate and feasible improvements and/or implement a portion of the improvements that would increase travel speeds enough to increase capacity along the bus route. Such improvements could include transit only lanes, transit signal priority, and transit boarding improvements. 3. Increase capacity along the corridor by adding a new Muni service route in this area. If this option is selected, the project sponsor’s fair share contribution may fund the purchase of the new vehicles.	
Impact TR-5. The proposed project would not cause significant impacts on regional transit routes.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact TR-6. The project would result in an adverse impact related to a substantial increase in transit delays on Third Street between Channel Street and Mission Rock Street.	S	M-TR-6: Parking Garage and Intersection Queue Impacts on Transit Delay A. The westernmost driveway on Mission Rock Street (i.e., closest to Third Street) shall be restricted to right-in, right-out access and closed during large AT&T Park events. Restricted access could be accomplished by placing signage as well as delineators of a sufficient length between the westbound through and left-turn lanes on Mission Rock Street to block left-turn access to the driveway. B. A “keep clear” zone shall be provided in front of the easternmost driveway on Mission Rock Street (i.e., closest to Bridgeview Street) to prevent westbound queues at the Third Street/Mission Rock traffic signal from blocking inbound access to the driveway.	SUM

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>C. The southbound left-turn lane at the Third Street/Mission Rock Street intersection shall be restriped to extend the length of the left-turn lane to 350 feet. Advance traffic signal detection equipment shall be installed at the end of the newly striped left-turn pocket to detect when queues fill up the left-turn pocket and extend north to the end of the pocket near the Third Street/Channel Street intersection, allowing additional green time to be allocated to the southbound left-turn movement at the Third Street/Mission Rock Street traffic signal.</p> <p>D. Wayfinding signs including Static and Variable Message Signs will be installed to provide directions to the parking garages and to provide traffic alerts, messages, and alternate driving routes for drivers traveling to the Block D2 aboveground garage, to destinations in the vicinity, or through the area. Four High Visibility Static Signs will be installed, three on the approaches to the Third Street/Mission Rock Street intersections (for southbound, eastbound and northbound directions) and one for northbound drivers on Terry A. Francois Boulevard, south of Mission Rock Street. One permanent Variable Message Sign shall be installed for southbound drivers on Third Street, between King Street and Berry Street.</p> <p>E. The project sponsor shall enter into an Event Mitigation Agreement with the SFMTA that provides for Parking Control Officers (PCOs) to manage traffic within the project site adjacent to the proposed project’s parking garages and on Exposition Street (between Third Street and the Shared Public Way) during all AT&T Park events and on-site events with 15,000 or more attendees.</p> <p>F. The site’s TDM coordinator shall be a member of the Mission Bay Ballpark Transportation Coordination Committee and provide notification prior to the start of any on-site event that would overlap with an event at AT&T Park or the Warriors arena.</p> <p>G. Traffic destined for the proposed project’s parking garages will be monitored by the owner/operator during all AT&T Park events and on-site events with 15,000 or more attendees, and periodically during weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours, to ensure that garage access queues do not affect operations of the T Third transit line. Action will be taken by the Mission Rock Transportation Coordinator, onsite transportation staff, parking garage management staff, event staff, and/or PCOs assigned to event traffic management to implement real-time traffic management strategies (i.e., alternative traffic routing, temporal parking pricing, enhanced garage driveway controls, etc.) to reduce vehicle garage access queues so they do not affect operations of the T Third line.</p>	

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>H. If the SFMTA Director, or his or her designee, receives information that a recurring queue that could affect the operation of the T Third line is imminent or present, SFMTA shall notify the property owner in writing. Upon request, the owner/operator shall hire a qualified transportation consultant to evaluate the conditions at the site for no less than 7 days. The consultant shall prepare a monitoring report to be submitted to SFMTA for review. If SFMTA determines that a recurring queue does exist, the facility owner/operator shall have 45 days from the date of the written determination to abate the excessive recurring queue. Approaches to queue abatement could include but are not limited to: changing parking access and revenue collection system (PARCS) technology to process vehicles more rapidly, adjusting the layout of the garage’s ground floor to accommodate more queuing vehicles within the garage, implementing peak-period surge pricing to encourage garage access and egress outside of times with recurrent excessive queues; installing additional variable message signage further upstream from the site to direct drivers to garage access routes away from affected intersections; and/or closing, limiting or controlling Mission Rock Street access from Third Street during times with excessive recurrent queuing and redirecting garage-bound traffic to Terry A. Francois Boulevard.</p>	
<p>Impact TR-7. The proposed project would have a substantial adverse effect on pedestrian travel by creating potentially hazardous conditions for pedestrians adjacent to the Block D2 parking structure.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>Implement Mitigation Measure M-TR-3 and M-TR-6. I-TR-7: Garage Access – Pedestrian Design Features. During the final design process for the parking facilities and the pedestrian realm of adjacent streets, improvements should be designed for the safe interface of vehicles and pedestrians at parking facility driveways. This design shall include adequate sight distance, signing, striping, warning devices, and lighting.</p>	<p>LTS</p>
<p>Impact TR-8. Existing pedestrian facilities on the Third Street Bridge, the Fourth Street Bridge, and the Fourth Street/King Street intersection are sized adequately to accommodate pedestrian traffic generated by the proposed project.</p>	<p>LTS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>Impact TR-9. The proposed project would have significant impacts on pedestrian safety at the unsignalized intersections of Fourth Street/Mission Rock Street and Fourth Street/Long Bridge Street.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>M-TR-9: Install Traffic Signals and Related Intersection Improvements at Unsignalized Intersections on Fourth Street at Mission Rock Street and Long Bridge Street. Prior to issuance of approval of the third building site permit, but in no event later than the site permit for the Block D2 parking garage, the project sponsor shall provide funding to SFMTA, for a maximum amount of \$1 million for SFMTA to design and construct (1) a traffic signal at the intersection of Fourth Street/Long Bridge Street and (2) a traffic signal at the intersection of Fourth Street/Mission Rock Street. These improvements should be constructed by SFMTA prior to opening of the Block D2 parking garage.</p>	<p>SUM</p>

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>Impact TR-10. The proposed project would create potentially hazardous conditions for bicyclists and would interfere with bicycle accessibility to the project site or adjoining areas.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>Implement Mitigation Measures M-TR-3 and M-TR-6. M-TR-10: Bicycle-Truck Interface at Pier 48. The project shall construct a highly visible crossing treatment across the driveway as well as bollards and detectable warning pavers that satisfy ADA requirements at the Pier 48 driveway’s beginning and end locations along the Blue Greenway path to warn cyclists and pedestrians of the upcoming driveway crossing. The project shall provide a traffic control staff at the junction of the Blue Greenway and the driveway to the Pier 48 valley during deliveries to manage bicycle and truck traffic. A flagger shall be provided to manage bicycle and pedestrian travel along the Blue Greenway at the Pier 48 valley driveway whenever trucks back into Pier 48. I-TR-10: Garage Access – Bicycle-Vehicle Design Features. During the final design process for Long Bridge Street, adequate sight distance should be provided through a combination of signing, striping, and lighting improvements, which should be designed for the safe interface of vehicles and cyclists at the two Block D2 parking facility driveways.</p>	<p>LTS</p>
<p>Impact TR-11. The proposed project’s loading demand during the peak loading hour would not be adequately accommodated by the proposed onsite/off-street loading supply or in proposed on-street loading zones, which may create hazardous conditions or significant delays for transit, bicycles, or pedestrians.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>M-TR-11.1: Commercial Loading Supply – Monitor Loading Activity and Implement Additional Loading Management Strategies as Needed. After completion (of the first phase of the proposed project and prior to approval of each subsequent phase, the project sponsor shall conduct a study of utilization of commercial loading spaces. The methodology for the study shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department prior to completion. If the result of the study indicates that fewer than 15 percent of the commercial loading spaces are available during the peak loading period, the project sponsor shall implement additional loading management strategies and/or provide additional or expanded off-street loading supply sufficient to meet the loading demand in subsequent phases of the project in either the garages or in off-street parking in individual buildings, consistent with the proposed project’s design intent. Additional loading strategies could include (but are not limited to): expanding efforts to coordinate with parcel delivery companies to schedule deliveries to the site during hours outside the peak hour of loading, installing parcel lock boxes that allow parcel delivery personnel unsupervised access to enable off-hour deliveries, coordinating delivery services across buildings to enable the delivery of several buildings’ packages to a single location, and/or encouraging deliveries to the retail and restaurant components of the projects to happen during early morning or late evening hours. The project sponsor may also address a shortfall by reserving parking spaces for smaller delivery vehicles such as autos or vans, which comprise approximately two-thirds of the vehicle types for freight</p>	<p>LTS</p>

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>delivery service, on the ground floor of the Block D2 garage during peak or appropriate business hours for small-vehicle deliveries and, in connection therewith, providing hand trucks, bicycles, or electric wheeled carts for distribution of packages to buildings throughout the site.</p> <p>If plans for individual buildings include a driveway to off-street loading or parking (maximum 10 off-street spaces) along a frontage that has a designated on-street loading zone, an equivalent amount or level of off-street loading space shall be provided to effectively replace the lost on-street loading area.</p> <p>M-TR-11.2: Coordinate Deliveries and Tenant Moving Activities. The project’s transportation coordinator and in-building concierges shall coordinate with building tenants and delivery services to minimize deliveries and moving activities during peak periods, and endeavor to spread deliveries across the full day and moving activities to time periods after regular working hours, thereby reducing activity during the peak hour for loading.</p> <p>Although many deliveries cannot be limited to specific hours, the transportation coordinator and in-building concierges shall work with tenants to find opportunities to consolidate deliveries and reduce the need for peak-period deliveries, wherever possible.</p>	
<p>Impact TR-12. The proposed project could result in significant impacts on emergency access to the project site or adjacent locations.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>M-TR-12: Coordinate Final Design of the “keep clear” zone on Mission Rock Street (in front of the Public Safety Building) with Police and Fire Departments. Prior to finalizing the design and dimensions of the “keep clear” zone on Mission Rock Street in front of the police and fire truck access point (in front of the Public Safety Building), the project sponsor shall coordinate this design with the Police and Fire Departments.</p> <p>I-TR-12: Strategies to Enhance Transportation Conditions During Large Events. The project’s Transportation Coordinator should participate as a member of the Mission Bay Ballpark Transportation Coordination Committee and provide at least 1-month notification prior to the start of any large event that would overlap with an event at AT&T Park.</p>	<p>LTS</p>
<p>Impact TR-13. The proposed project would not result in a substantial parking deficit that would create hazardous conditions or significant delays affecting transit, bicycles, or pedestrians, and particular characteristics of the proposed project would not render the use of other modes infeasible.</p>	<p>LTS</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>NA</p>

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Impact C-TR-1. Construction of the proposed project would occur over an approximately 6-year time frame and may overlap with construction of other projects in the vicinity.	LTS	Implement Improvement Measure I-TR-1, Construction Management Plan.	NA
Impact C-TR-2. The proposed project's incremental effects on VMT would not be significant when viewed in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact C-TR-3. The proposed project would not contribute to a major traffic hazards.	S	Implement Mitigation Measure M-TR-3.	LTS
Impact C-TR-4. The proposed project would contribute considerably to a significant cumulative transit impact because it would increase ridership by more than 5 percent on one individual Muni route that would exceed 85 percent capacity utilization.	S	<p>M-C-TR-4: Provide Fair-Share Contribution to Improve 10 Townsend Line Capacity Proposed Project. Upon completion and occupancy of Phase 1 and upon completion and occupancy of each subsequent phase of the proposed project as defined in the Disposition and Development Agreement, the project sponsor shall fund a transit capacity study to be reviewed and approved by the SFMTA. The project sponsor shall obtain from SFMTA the current ridership on the 10 Townsend and conduct an assessment of the capacity utilization at the screenline's Maximum Load Point (MLP) for weekday AM and PM peak hour conditions.</p> <p>If the capacity utilization exceeds 85 percent, a fair share payment shall be made to SFMTA by the project sponsor, calculated as further provided in a Transit Mitigation Agreement. Such payment shall be calculated in light of the project's progress towards one or the other of the development scenario (i.e. High Commercial or High Residential) as reflected by all phases of the project that have been completed up to such date. The fair share contributions by phase differ by scenario because the number of transit riders varies due to different mixes of land use.</p> <p>If the capacity utilization based on SFMTA's ridership data is less than 85 percent, then the project sponsor's fair share payment for that phase shall be \$0 and the process will repeat at the next subsequent phase. Each subsequent fair share calculation shall take account of amounts paid for prior phases, to ensure that payments are not duplicative for the same transit rider impacts.</p> <p>The project sponsor shall enter into a Transit Mitigation Agreement with the SFMTA under which the agreement shall provide for the project sponsor to make a fair share contribution to the cost of providing additional bus service or improving service on the 10 Townsend by paying a fee. The fair share contribution as documented in the Transportation Impact Study from the proposed project shall not exceed the following amounts, in total across all phases:</p> <p>a. \$391,179 for High Commercial</p>	SUM

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		b. \$324,595 for High Residential SFMTA may determine that other measures to increase capacity along the route would be more desirable than adding buses and may use the funds provided by the project sponsor to implement these other measures, which include but are not limited to the following measures: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Convert to using higher-capacity vehicles on the 10 Townsend route. In this case, the project sponsor’s fair share contribution may be utilized to convert the route to articulated buses. Some bus stops along the route may not currently be configured to accommodate the longer articulated buses. Some bus zones could be extended by removing one or more parking spaces at locations where appropriate space is available. 2. Instead of adding more buses to a congested route, it would be more desirable to increase travel speeds along the route which would allow for buses to move faster thus increasing efficiency and reliability. In this case, the project sponsor’s fair share contribution may be used to fund a study to identify appropriate and feasible improvements and/or implement a portion of the improvements that would increase travel speeds enough to increase capacity along the bus route. Such improvements could include transit only lanes, transit signal priority, and transit boarding improvements. 3. Another option to increase capacity along the corridor is to add a new Muni service route in this area. If this option is selected, the project sponsor’s fair share contribution may fund the purchase of the new vehicles 	
Impact C-TR-5. The proposed project would not contribute considerably to significant cumulative impacts on regional transit routes.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact C-TR-6. The proposed project would contribute considerably to significant cumulative impacts related to transit delay.	S	Implement Mitigation Measure M-TR-6.	SUM
Impact C-TR-7. The proposed project would contribute considerably to significant cumulative pedestrian impacts.	S	Implement Mitigation Measure M-TR-9.	SUM
Impact C-TR-8. The proposed project would not contribute considerably to a significant cumulative bicycle impact.	S	Implement Mitigation Measure M-TR-10.	LTS
Impact C-TR-9. The proposed project could contribute to a significant cumulative loading	S	Implement Mitigation Measure M-TR-11.1 and M-TR-11.2.	LTS

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
impact.			
Impact C-TR-10. The proposed project would not contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact on emergency vehicle access.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact C-TR-11. The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would not result in cumulative parking impacts.	LTS	None required.	NA
Noise			
Impact NOI-1. Construction of the proposed project would generate noise levels in excess of standards or result in substantial temporary increases in ambient noise levels.	S	<p>M-NOI-1: Prepare and Implement a Construction Noise Control Plan to Reduce Construction Noise at Noise-Sensitive Land Uses. The project sponsor shall develop a noise control plan that requires the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction contractors shall specify noise-reducing construction practices that will be employed to reduce construction noise from construction activities. The measures specified by the project sponsor shall be reviewed and approved by the City prior to the issuance of building permits. Measures that can be used to limit noise include, but are not limited to, those listed below. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Locate construction equipment as far as feasible from noise-sensitive uses. ○ Require that all construction equipment powered by gasoline or diesel engines have sound control devices that are at least as effective as those originally provided by the manufacturer and that all equipment be operated and maintained to minimize noise generation. ○ Idling of inactive construction equipment for prolonged periods shall be prohibited (i.e., more than 5 minutes). ○ Prohibit gasoline or diesel engines from having unmuffled exhaust systems. ○ Use noise-reducing enclosures around noise-generating equipment that has the potential to disturb nearby land uses. ○ Ensure that equipment and trucks used for project construction utilize the best available noise control techniques (e.g., improved mufflers, equipment redesign, intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures, acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds) wherever feasible. ○ Monitor the effectiveness of noise attenuation measures by taking noise measurements. A plan for noise monitoring shall be provided to the City for review prior to the commencement of each construction phase. 	SUM

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact tools (e.g., jack hammers, pavement breakers, rock drills) used for project construction shall be “quiet” gasoline-powered compressors or electrically powered compressors, and electric rather than gasoline- or diesel-powered engines shall be used to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools. However, where the use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust shall be used; this muffler can lower noise levels from the exhaust by up to about 10 dBA. External jackets on the tools themselves shall be used; which could achieve a reduction of 5 dBA. Quieter equipment shall be used when feasible, such as drills rather than impact equipment. • Construction contractors shall be required to use “quiet” gasoline-powered compressors or electrically powered compressors and electric rather than gasoline- or diesel-powered forklifts for small lifting. • Stationary noise sources, such as temporary generators, shall be located as far from nearby receptors as possible; they shall be muffled and enclosed within temporary enclosures and shielded by barriers, which could reduce construction noise by as much as 5 dB, or other measures, to the extent feasible. • Prior to the issuance of the building permit, along with the submission of construction documents, the project sponsor shall submit to the Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection a list of measures for responding to and tracking complaints pertaining to construction noise. These measures shall include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Identification of measures that will be implemented to control construction noise. ○ A procedure and phone numbers for notifying the Department of Building Inspection, the Department of Public Health, or the Police Department of complaints (during regular construction hours and off hours). ○ A sign posted onsite describing noise complaint procedures and a complaint hotline number that shall be answered at all times during construction. ○ Designation of an onsite construction complaint and enforcement manager for the project. ○ A plan for notification of neighboring residents and nonresidential building managers within 300 feet of the project construction area at least 30 days in advance of extreme noise-generating activities 	

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>(defined as activities that generate noise levels of 90 dBA or greater) about the estimated duration of the activity and the associated control measures that will be implemented to reduce noise levels.</p> <p>Implement Mitigation Measure M-NOI-3.1.</p>	
<p>Impact NOI-2. Operation of the proposed project could result in the exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess the San Francisco Noise Ordinance or a substantial temporary, periodic, or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity, above levels existing without the project.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure M-NOI-2.1: Noise Control Plan for Special Outdoor Amplified Sound. To reduce potential impacts related to noise generated in by events in project outdoor use areas, the project sponsor shall develop and implement a Noise Control Plan for operations at the proposed entertainment venues to reduce the potential for noise impacts from public address and/or amplified music. This Noise Control Plan shall contain the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project sponsor shall comply with noise controls and restrictions in applicable entertainment permit requirements for outdoor concerts, and shall comply with the Port of San Francisco's "Good Neighbor" standards, unless the Port Commission makes a specific finding that a particular condition is unnecessary or infeasible. • Speaker systems shall be directed away from the nearest sensitive receptors to the degree feasible. • In order to limit or prevent sleep disturbance, events with amplified sound shall, to the extent reasonable and appropriate given the nature and context of the event, end at 10:00 p.m. <p>Mitigation Measure M-NOI-2.2: Stationary Equipment Noise Controls. Noise attenuation measures shall be incorporated into all stationary equipment (including HVAC equipment and emergency generators) installed on all buildings that include such stationary equipment as necessary to meet noise limits specified in Section 2909 of the Police Code. Interior noise limits shall be met under both existing and future noise conditions, accounting for foreseeable changes in noise conditions in the future (i.e., changes in on-site building configurations). Noise attenuation measures could include provision of sound enclosures/barriers, addition of roof parapets to block noise, increasing setback distances from sensitive receptors, provision of louvered vent openings, location of vent openings away from adjacent residential uses, and restriction of generator testing to the daytime hours.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure M-NOI-2.3: Design of Future Noise-Sensitive Uses. Prior to issuance of a building permit for a residential building on Mission Rock Boulevard between Terry A. Francois Boulevard and Third Street, a noise study shall be conducted by a qualified acoustician to determine the need to incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building design in order to meet Title 24's interior noise limit for residential uses as well as the City's (Article 29,</p>	<p>SUM</p>

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>Section 2909(d)) 45-dBA (Ldn) interior noise limit for residential uses. This evaluation shall account for the projected increase in traffic noise as a result of project traffic along Mission Rock Boulevard between Terry A. Francois Boulevard and Third Street and any new shielding benefits provided by surrounding buildings that exist at the time of development, future cumulative traffic noise increases on adjacent roadways, existing and planned stationary sources (i.e., emergency generators, HVAC, etc.), and future noise increases from all known cumulative projects located with direct line-of-sight to the project building.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure M-NOI-2.4: Design of Future Noise-Generating Uses near Residential Uses. Future land uses shall be designed to minimize the potential for sleep disturbance (defined as exceeding 45 dBA at residential interiors during the hours of 10 p.m. to 7 a.m.) at any future adjacent residential uses. Design approaches including, but not limited to, the following shall be incorporated into future development plans to minimize the potential for noise conflicts of future uses on the project site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design of Future Noise-Generating Uses. To reduce potential conflicts between sensitive receptors and new noise-generating land uses located adjacent to these receptors, exterior facilities such as loading areas/docks, trash enclosures, and surface parking lots shall be located on the sides of buildings facing away from existing or planned sensitive receptors (e.g., residences). If this is not feasible, these types of facilities shall be enclosed or equipped with appropriate noise shielding. • Design of Future Above-Ground Parking Structure on Block D2. For parking garage on Block D2, the sides of the parking structures facing adjacent or nearby existing or planned residential uses shall be designed to shield residential receptors from noise associated with parking cars. 	
<p>Impact NOI-3. Construction of the project would expose persons to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels related to annoyance. Construction of the project could expose persons to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels related to damage to buildings.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>M-NOI-3.1: Pile-Driving Control Measures - Annoyance. To reduce impacts associated with pile driving, a set of site-specific vibration attenuation measures shall be implemented under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant during the project construction period. These attenuation measures shall include as feasible, in consideration of technical and structural requirements and conditions, the following control strategy, as well as any other effective strategies to the extent necessary to achieve a PPV vibration level at neighboring properties of less than the strongly perceptible level of 0.10 in/sec.</p> <p>The project sponsor shall require the construction contractor to limit pile-driving activity so that the PPV vibration level at neighboring uses is less than 0.10 in/sec to the extent it is practical and necessary, and, to the extent it is practical,</p>	<p>SUM</p>

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>implement “quiet” pile-driving technology, such as predrilling piles, using sonic pile drivers, or using more than one pile driver to shorten the total duration of pile driving.</p> <p>M-NOI-3.2: Pile-Driving Vibration Control Measures – Damage. To reduce the potential for damage to Pier 48, the following measures shall be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Port of San Francisco shall be notified in writing prior to construction activity that construction may occur within 100 feet of the Pier 48 buildings. • The project sponsor shall retain a structural engineer, an architectural historian, and a licensed historical architect (hereafter referred to as the building evaluation team) to evaluate potentially affected buildings and determine their susceptibility to damage. The structural engineer shall evaluate the building structure. The architectural historian and licensed historical architect shall evaluate architectural elements. This building evaluation team shall then establish building-specific vibration thresholds that will (a) identify the level of vibration affected historic buildings will tolerate so as to preclude structural damage to the building of a nature that would result in material damage to any historic features of the buildings, and (b) identify the level of vibration at which cosmetic damage may begin to occur to buildings. • The building evaluation team shall inventory and document existing cracks in paint, plaster, concrete, and other building elements. • The building evaluation team shall develop a ground-borne vibration monitoring plan that will including monitoring vibration at the buildings of concern to determine if the established thresholds are exceeded. • The project sponsor shall retain a qualified acoustical consultant or engineering firm to implement the vibration monitoring plan at Pier 48. As part of the monitoring plan, the consultant shall conduct regular periodic inspections for cosmetic damage to each building within 160 feet of planned ground-disturbing activity on the project site. • Should vibration levels be observed in excess of the cosmetic damage threshold or cosmetic damage be observed below that level, the driving of piles within 100 feet of the Pier 48 structure (or within the impact distance determined by the study of building-specific vibration thresholds, per second bullet above, whichever distance is shorter) shall be halted until measures are implemented to prevent cosmetic damage to the extent feasible. These measures include use of alternative construction techniques, including, but not limited to, use of pre-drilled piles if soil conditions allow, use of smaller, lighter equipment, using vibratory hammers in place of 	

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>impact hammers, and using pile cushioning or equipping the impact hammer with wooden cushion blocks to increase the period of time over which the energy from the driver is imparted to the pile. Should cosmetic damage to a building occur as a result of ground-disturbing activity on the site notwithstanding the use of alternative construction techniques, the building(s) shall be remediated to its pre-construction condition at the conclusion of ground-disturbing activity on the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should vibration levels be observed that reach the threshold designed to protect historic buildings from material damage to historic features, pile-driving within impact distances of the Pier 48 building, as determined by the building evaluation team, shall be halted and a structural bracing program or other appropriate protective measures for the potentially affected buildings shall be designed by the building evaluation team and implemented by the project sponsor. The structural bracing program or other protective measures shall be designed to prevent damage to the potentially affected buildings that could materially impair their historic resource status consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)(2). In addition, the structural bracing program shall be consistent with the proposed rehabilitation of the Pier 48 buildings and meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. <p>Following completion of construction, the project sponsor shall conduct a second inspection to inventory changes in existing cracks and new cracks or damage, if any, that occurred as a result of pile driving. If new damage is found, then the project sponsor shall promptly arrange to have the damage repaired in accordance with recommendations made by the building evaluation team.</p>	
<p>Impact C-NOI-1. Construction activities for the proposed project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonable future projects in the city, would result in a substantial temporary increase in noise or noise levels in excess of the applicable local standards.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>Implement Mitigation Measure M-NOI-1.</p>	<p>SUM</p>

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>Impact C-NOI-2. Construction activities associated with project-related development, in combination with other past, present, and reasonable future projects in the city, would expose sensitive receptors to excessive ground-borne vibration related to annoyance and could result in similar impacts related to damage to buildings.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>Implement Mitigation Measure M-NOI-3.1, Pile-Driving Control Measure – Annoyance, and M-NOI-3.2, Pile-Driving Vibration Control Measures – Damage</p>	<p>SUM</p>
<p>Impact C-NOI-3. Operation of the proposed project, in combination with other past, present and reasonable future projects in the city, would result in the exposure of persons to noise in excess of the applicable local standards or a substantial permanent ambient noise level increase in the project vicinity.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>SU</p>
<p>Air Quality</p>			
<p>Impact AQ-1: Construction of the proposed project would generate fugitive dust and criteria air pollutants, which for criteria air pollutants but not fugitive dust, would 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.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1.1: Off-Road Construction Equipment Emissions Minimization. The project sponsor shall require all construction contractors to implement the following measures to reduce construction emissions.</p> <p>A. Engine Requirements</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All off-road equipment greater than 25 horsepower and operating for more than 20 total hours over the entire duration of construction activities shall have engines that meet or exceed either USEPA or ARB Tier 4 Interim off-road emissions standards. Tier 4 final equipment, which may be largely available in the Bay Area, may be used to comply with this requirement (since Tier 4 final engines must comply with a stricter standard than Tier 4 interim engines, Tier 4 final engines meet Tier 4 interim standards and thus comply with this requirement). 2. Where access to alternative sources of power are available, portable diesel engines shall be prohibited. 3. Diesel engines, whether for off-road or on-road equipment, shall not be left idling for more than 2 minutes at any location, except as provided in exceptions to the applicable state regulations regarding idling for off-road and on-road equipment (e.g., traffic conditions, safe operating conditions). The contractor shall post legible and visible signs in English, Spanish, and Chinese in designated queuing areas and at the construction site to remind operators of the 2-minute idling limit. 	<p>SUM</p>

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation											
		<p>4. The contractor shall instruct construction workers and equipment operators regarding the maintenance and tuning of construction equipment and require that such workers and operators properly maintain and tune equipment in accordance with manufacturers' specifications.</p> <p>B. Waivers.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Planning Department's Environmental Review Officer (ERO) or designee may waive the requirement for an alternative source of power from Subsection (A)(2) if an alternative source of power is limited or infeasible at the project site. If the ERO grants the waiver, the contractor must submit documentation that the equipment used for onsite power generation meets the requirements of Subsection (A)(1). 2. The ERO may waive the equipment requirements of Subsection (A)(1) if use of a particular piece of off-road equipment with a Tier 4 interim-compliant engine is not feasible or reasonable, the equipment would not produce the desired emissions reductions because of the expected operating modes, installation of the equipment would create a safety hazard or impair visibility for the operator, or there is a compelling emergency that requires use of off-road equipment that is not Tier 4 interim-compliant. If seeking an exception, the project sponsor shall demonstrate to the ERO's satisfaction that the resulting construction emissions would not exceed the health risk thresholds of significance for cancer risk and PM2.5 concentrations with respect to sensitive receptors, as identified within the EIR under Impact AQ-4. If the ERO grants the waiver, the contractor must use the next-cleanest piece of available off-road equipment, according to the table below. 3. Off-road Equipment Compliance Step-down Schedule <table border="1" data-bbox="1014 1125 1572 1365"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Compliance Alternative</th> <th colspan="2">Engine Emissions</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Standard</th> <th>Emissions Control</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Tier 3</td> <td>ARB Level 2 VDECS</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Tier 2</td> <td>Alternative Fuel*</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>VDECS = Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategies * Alternative fuels are not a VDECS.</p>	Compliance Alternative	Engine Emissions		Standard	Emissions Control	1	Tier 3	ARB Level 2 VDECS	2	Tier 2	Alternative Fuel*	
Compliance Alternative	Engine Emissions													
	Standard	Emissions Control												
1	Tier 3	ARB Level 2 VDECS												
2	Tier 2	Alternative Fuel*												

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>4. How to use the table: If the ERO determines that the equipment requirements cannot be met, then the project sponsor must attempt to meet Compliance Alternative 1. If the ERO determines that the contractor cannot supply off-road equipment that meets Compliance Alternative 1, then the contractor must meet Compliance Alternative 2.</p> <p>C. Construction Emissions Minimization Plan.</p> <p>Before starting onsite construction activities, the contractor shall submit a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan to the ERO for review and approval. The plan shall state, in reasonable detail, how the contractor shall meet the requirements of Section A.</p> <p>1. 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. The description may include, as such information is available, 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, the description may include 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, the description shall also specify the type of alternative fuel being used. Renewable diesel shall be considered an alternative fuel if it can be demonstrated to the Planning Department or the City’s air quality specialists that it is compatible with tiered engines and that emissions of ROG and NOx from the transport of fuel to the project site will not offset its NOx reduction potential.</p> <p>2. The project sponsor shall ensure that all applicable requirements of the plan have been incorporated into the contract specifications. The plan shall include a certification statement, stating that the contractor agrees to comply fully with the plan.</p> <p>3. The contractor shall make the plan available to the public for review onsite during working hours. The contractor shall post at the construction site a legible and visible sign summarizing the plan. The sign shall also state that the public may ask to inspect the plan for the project at any time during working hours and explain how to request to inspect the plan. The contractor shall post at least one copy of the sign in a visible location on each side of the construction site facing a public right of way.</p>	

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>D. Monitoring.</p> <p>After start of construction activities, the contractor shall submit quarterly reports to the ERO, documenting compliance with the plan. After completion of construction activities but prior to receiving a final certificate of occupancy, the project sponsor shall submit to the ERO a final report, summarizing construction activities, including the start and end dates, the duration of each construction phase, and the specific information required in the plan.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1.2: On-Road Material Delivery and Haul Trucks Construction Emissions Minimization. The project sponsor shall require all construction contractors to implement the following measures to reduce construction haul truck emissions.</p> <p>A. Engine Requirements</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The project sponsor shall also ensure that all on-road heavy-duty diesel trucks with a gross vehicle weight rating of 19,500 pounds or greater used at the project site (such as haul trucks, water trucks, dump trucks, and concrete trucks) be model year 2010 or newer. <p>B. <i>Construction Emissions Minimization Plan.</i> As part of the <i>Construction Emissions Minimization Plan</i> identified above for Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1.1 Section C, the contractor shall state, in reasonable detail, how the contractor shall meet the requirements of Section A.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The plan shall include estimates of the construction timeline by phase, with a description of how the on-road haul truck fleet required for every construction phase will comply with the engine requirements stated above. The plan shall also include expected fuel usage (or miles traveled) and hours of operation for the on-road haul truck fleet. For on-road trucks using alternative fuels, the description shall also specify the type of alternative fuel being used. Renewable diesel shall be considered as an alternative fuel if it can be demonstrated to the Planning Department or the City’s air quality specialists that it is compatible with on-road truck engines and that emissions of ROG and NOx from transport of fuel to the project site will not offset its NOx reduction potential. 2. See Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1.1 Section C, Part 2. 3. See Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1.1 Section C, Part 3. 	

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>C. <i>Monitoring.</i> See Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1.1 Section D.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1.3: Low-VOC Architectural Coatings. The project sponsor shall use low-VOC (i.e., ROG) coatings, beyond local requirements (i.e., Regulation 8, Rule 3: Architectural Coatings), for at least 90 percent of all residential and nonresidential interior and exterior paints. This includes all architectural coatings applied during both construction and reapplications throughout the project’s operational lifetime. At least 90 percent of coatings applied must meet the “super-compliant” VOC standard of less than 10 grams of VOC per liter of paint. After start of construction activities, the contractor shall submit quarterly reports to the ERO documenting compliance with this measure by providing an inventory listing the VOC content of all coatings purchased and applied during construction activities.</p> <p>For the reapplication of coatings during the project’s operational lifetime, the Declaration of Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions shall also contain a stipulation that low-VOC coatings must be used and a list of potential coatings shall be provided. A list of “super-compliant” coatings can be found on the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s website: http://www.aqmd.gov/home/regulations/compliance/architectural-coatings/super-compliant-coatings.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1.4: Best Available Control Technology for In-Water Construction Equipment. The project sponsor shall require all construction contractors to implement the following measures to reduce emissions from in-water equipment.</p> <p>A. <i>Engine Requirements</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The project sponsor shall ensure that the construction barge shall have engines that meet or exceed USEPA marine engine Tier 3 emissions standards. 2. The project sponsor shall also ensure that the construction work boat engine shall be model year 2005 or newer or meet NOx and PM emissions standards for that model year. <p>B. <i>Construction Emissions Minimization Plan.</i> As part of the <i>Construction Emissions Minimization Plan</i> identified above for Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1.1 Section C, the contractor shall state, in reasonable detail, how the contractor shall meet the requirements of Section A.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The plan shall include estimates of the construction timeline by phase, with a description of how each in-water equipment piece (e.g. barge engines, work boats) required for every construction phase will comply with the engine requirements stated above. The plan shall also include 	

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>expected fuel usage and hours of operation for in-water equipment. For in-water equipment using alternative fuels, the description shall also specify the type of alternative fuel being used. Renewable diesel shall be considered as an alternative fuel if it can be demonstrated to the Planning Department or the City's air quality specialists that it is compatible with tiered engines and that emissions of ROG and NOx from transport of fuel to the project site will not offset its NOx reduction potential.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. See Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1.1 Section C, Part 2. 3. See Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1.1 Section C, Part 3. <p><i>D. Monitoring.</i> See Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1.1 Section D.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1.5: Emissions Offsets for Construction and Operational Ozone Precursor Emissions. Prior to the estimated first year of exceedance, the project sponsor, with oversight of the Planning Department, shall either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Directly implement a specific offset project or program to achieve emission reductions of 9.6 tons of ozone precursors to offset the combined emissions from construction and operations remaining above significance levels after implementation of identified mitigation measures. To qualify under this mitigation measure, the specific emissions reduction project must result in emissions reductions within the SFBAAB that are real, surplus, quantifiable, and enforceable and would not otherwise be achieved through compliance with existing regulatory requirements or any other legal requirement. Prior to implementation of the offset project, the project sponsor must obtain the Planning Department's approval of the proposed offset project by providing documentation of the estimated amount of emissions of ROG and NOx to be reduced (tons per year) within the SFBAAB from the emissions reduction project(s). The project sponsor shall notify the Planning Department within 6 months of completion of the offset project for Planning Department verification. 2. Pay a mitigation offset fee to the BAAQMD Bay Area Clean Air Foundation (Foundation) in an amount to be determined prior to the estimated first year of exceedance. The mitigation offset fee, currently estimated at approximately \$18,030 per weighted ton, and not to exceed \$35,000 per weighted ton of ozone precursors per year requiring emissions offsets plus an administrative fee of no more than 5 percent of the total offset to fund one or more emissions reduction projects within the SFBAAB. The fee will be determined by the Planning Department, the project sponsor, and the 	

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>BAAQMD and be based on the type of projects available at the time of the payment. This fee is intended to fund emissions reduction projects to achieve reductions totaling 9.6 tons of ozone precursors per year, the estimated maximum tonnage of operational and construction-related emissions offsets required to reduce emissions below significance levels after implementation of other identified mitigation measures This total emissions offset amount was calculated by summing the maximum daily construction and operational emissions of ROG and NO_x (pounds/day), multiplying by 260 work days per year for construction and 365 days per year for operation, and converting to tons. The amount represents the total estimated operational and construction-related ROG and NO_x emissions offsets required. Documentation of payment shall be provided to the Planning Department.</p> <p>Unless directly implementing a specific offset project (or program) as described above, the project sponsor would enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the BAAQMD Foundation. The MOU will include details regarding the funds to be paid, the administrative fee, and the timing of the emissions reductions project. Acceptance of this fee by the BAAQMD shall serve as acknowledgment and a commitment to (1) implement an emissions reduction project(s) within a time frame to be determined, based on the type of project(s) selected, after receipt of the mitigation fee to achieve the emissions reduction objectives specified above and (2) provide documentation to the Planning Department and the project sponsor describing the project(s) funded by the mitigation fee, including the amount of emissions of ROG and NO_x reduced (tons per year) within the SFBAAB from the emissions reduction project(s). To qualify under this mitigation measure, the specific emissions reduction project must result in emission reductions within the SFBAAB that are real, surplus, quantifiable, and enforceable and would not otherwise be achieved through compliance with existing regulatory requirements or any other legal requirement.</p>	
<p>Impact AQ-2. During project operations, the proposed project would result in emissions of criteria air pollutants 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.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>Implement Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1.1 through M-AQ-1.5. Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2.1: Best Available Control Technology for Operational Diesel Generators. The project sponsor shall ensure that the operational backup diesel generators comply with the following: (1) ARB Airborne Toxic Control Measure (ATCM) emissions standards for model year 2008 or newer engines; and (2) meet or exceed one of the following emission standards for particulate matter: (A) Tier 4 interim certified engine or (B) Tier 2 or Tier 3 certified engine that is equipped with an ARB Level 3 VDECS. A nonverified diesel emissions control strategy may be used if the filter has the</p>	<p>SUM</p>

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>same particulate matter reduction as the identical ARB-verified model and BAAQMD approves of its use. The project sponsor shall submit documentation of compliance with the BAAQMD NSR permitting process (Regulation 2, Rule 2, and Regulation 2, Rule 5) and the emissions standard requirement of this measure to the Planning Department for review and approval prior to issuance of a permit for a backup diesel generator from any City agency.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2.2: Reactive Organic Gases Emissions Reduction Measures. To reduce ROG emissions associated with the project, the project sponsor shall provide education for residential and commercial tenants to help reduce area source (e.g., architectural coatings, consumer products, and landscaping) emissions associated with residential and building operations. Prior to receipt of any building permit and every 5 years thereafter, the project sponsor shall work with the San Francisco Department of Environment to develop electronic correspondence, which will be distributed by email annually to tenants of the project that encourages the purchase of consumer products that are better for the environment and generate fewer VOC emissions. The correspondence shall encourage environmentally preferable purchasing and include contact information and links to SF APPROVED. While microbreweries do not typically implement emission control devices, to further reduce ROG (primarily ethanol) emissions associated with Pier 48 industrial operations, the project sponsor shall implement technologies to reduce ethanol emissions if available and practicable. Such measures could include wet scrubbers, ethanol recovery and capture (e.g., carbon absorption) or incineration.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2.3: Transportation Demand Management. The project sponsors shall prepare and implement a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan. The TDM Plan shall have a goal of reducing estimated aggregate daily one-way vehicle trips by 20 percent compared to the aggregate daily one-way vehicle trips identified in the project’s travel demand memo, prepared by Adavant Consulting, dated June 30, 2015 (“Travel Demand Memo”), and attached as Appendix 4-4 to the Draft EIR. The project sponsors shall be responsible for monitoring implementation of the TDM Plan and proposing adjustments to the TDM Plan if its goal is not being achieved, in accordance with the following provisions.</p> <p>The TDM Plan may include, but is not limited to, the types of measures summarized below by way of example. TDM Plan measures shall generally be consistent with the City’s adopted TDM Program Standards and the draft proposed TDM Plan prepared by Nelson Nygaard, dated September 2016, and attached as Appendix 4-5 to the Draft EIR. The TDM Plan describes the scope and applicability of candidate measures in detail, and may include, for example:</p>	

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active Transportation: Provision of streetscape improvements to encourage walking, secure bicycle parking, shower and locker facilities for cyclists, subsidized bike share memberships for project occupants, bicycle repair and maintenance services, and other bicycle-related services; • Car-Share: Provision of car-share parking spaces and subsidized memberships for project occupants; • Delivery: Provision of amenities and services to support delivery of goods to project occupants; • Family-Oriented Measures: Provision of on-site childcare and other amenities to support the use of sustainable transportation modes by families; • High-Occupancy Vehicles: Provision of carpooling/vanpooling incentives and shuttle bus service; • Information and Communications: Provision of multimodal wayfinding signage, transportation information displays, and tailored transportation marketing services; • Land Use: Provision of on-site affordable housing and healthy food retail services in underserved areas; • Parking: Provision of unbundled parking, short-term daily parking provision, parking cash out offers, and reduced off-street parking supply. <p>The TDM Plan shall describe each measure, including the degree of implementation (e.g., how long will it be in place, how many tenants or visitors it will benefit, on which locations within the site it will be placed, etc.) and the population that each measure is intended to serve (e.g., residential tenants, retail visitors, employees of tenants, visitors). The TDM Plan shall commit to monitoring vehicle trips to and from the project site to determine the TDM Plan’s effectiveness, as required by TDM Plan Monitoring and Reporting outlined below.</p> <p>The TDM Plan shall have been approved by the Planning Department prior to site permit application for the first building and the TDM Plan shall be implemented as to each new building upon the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for that building.</p> <p>The TDM Plan shall remain a component of the proposed project to be implemented for the duration of the project.</p> <p><i>TDM Plan Monitoring and Reporting:</i> the TDM Coordinator shall collect data, prepare monitoring reports and submit them to the Planning Department. To ensure the goal of reducing by 20 percent the aggregate daily one-way vehicle trips is reasonably achievable, the project sponsor shall monitor daily one-way vehicles trips for all buildings that have received a Certificate of Occupancy, and</p>	

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>compare these vehicle trips to the aggregate daily one-way vehicle trips anticipated for the those buildings based on the trip generation rates contained within the proposed project Travel Demand Memo.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Timing: The TDM Coordinator shall collect monitoring data and shall begin submitting monitoring reports to the Planning Department beginning 18 months after the completion and commencement of operation of the proposed garage on Block D. Thereafter, annual monitoring reports shall be submitted (referred to as “reporting periods”) until five consecutive reporting periods show that the project has met the reduction goal, at which point monitoring data shall be submitted to the Planning Department once every 3 years. The project sponsor shall complete each trip count and survey (see below for description) within 30 days following the end of the applicable reporting period. Each monitoring report shall be completed within 90 days following the applicable reporting period. The project sponsor shall modify the timing of monitoring reports such that a new monitoring report is submitted 12 months after adjustments are made to the TDM Plan in order to meet the reduction goal, as may be required under the “TDM Plan Adjustments” heading, below. In addition, the Planning Department may modify the timing of monitoring reports as needed to consolidate this requirement with other monitoring and/or reporting requirements for the project, such as annual reporting under the proposed project Development Agreement. ● Term: The Project Sponsor shall monitor, submit monitoring reports, and make plan adjustments as provided below until the earlier of: (i) the expiration of the Development Agreement, or (ii) the reduction goal has been met for up to eight consecutive reporting periods as determined by the Planning Department. Notwithstanding the foregoing or any other provision of this mitigation measure, all obligations for monitoring, reporting and for making adjustments to the TDM Plan shall terminate if the project sponsor has paid and/or made a commitment to pay the offset fee for any shortfall in the TDM Plan’s meeting the reduction goal as provided below. ● Components: The monitoring and reporting, including trip counts, surveys and travel demand information, shall include the following components or comparable alternative methodology and components, as approved, accepted or provided by Planning Department staff: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Trip Count and Intercept Survey: Provide a site-wide trip count and intercept survey of persons and vehicles arriving and leaving the project site, other than on AT&T Park ballgame or other major event (e.g., concert or other event substantially occupying the capacity of 	

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>AT&T Park) days or hours, for no less than two days during the reporting period between 6:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. One day shall be a Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday during one week without federally recognized holidays, and another day shall be a Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday during another week without federally recognized holidays. The trip count and intercept survey shall be prepared by a qualified transportation or survey consultant, and the Planning Department shall approve the methodology prior to the Project Sponsors conducting the components of the trip count and intercept survey. The Planning Department anticipates it will have a standard trip count and intercept survey methodology developed and available to project sponsors at the time of data collection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Travel Demand Information: The above trip count and survey information shall be able to provide the travel demand analysis characteristics (work and non-work trip counts, origins and destinations of trips to/from the project site, and modal split information), as outlined in the Planning Department’s <i>Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review</i>, October 2002, or subsequent updates in effect at the time of the survey. ○ Documentation of Plan Implementation: The TDM coordinator shall work in conjunction with the Planning Department to develop a survey (online or paper) that can be reasonably completed by the TDM coordinator and/or Transportation Management Association (TMA) staff members to document implementation of TDM program elements and other basic information during the reporting period. The project sponsors shall include this survey in the monitoring report submitted to the Planning Department. ○ Assistance and Confidentiality: The Planning Department will assist the TDM coordinator with questions regarding the components of the monitoring report and will assist the TDM coordinator in determining ways to protect the identity of individual survey responders. <p><i>TDM Plan Adjustments.</i> The project sponsors shall adjust the TDM Plan according to the monitoring results if three consecutive reporting periods demonstrate that measures within the TDM Plan are not achieving the reduction goal. The TDM Plan adjustments shall be made in consultation with the Planning Department and may require refinements to existing measures (e.g., changes to subsidies, increased bicycle parking), inclusion of new measures (e.g., a new technology or project operational changes not inconsistent with any agreements with the Port), or removal of existing measures (e.g., measures that are ineffective or induce</p>	

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>vehicle trips).³ If three consecutive reporting periods' monitoring results demonstrate that measures within the TDM Plan are not achieving the reduction goal, the project sponsors shall propose TDM Plan adjustments to be incorporated in the TDM Plan within 270 days following the last reporting period. The project sponsors shall implement the TDM Plan adjustments until the results of three consecutive reporting periods demonstrate that the reduction goal is being achieved.</p> <p>If after implementing TDM Plan adjustments as described above, and the project sponsors have not met the reduction goal for up to eight consecutive reporting periods as determined by the Planning Department, the project sponsors may, at any time thereafter, elect to address the shortfall in meeting the TDM Plan reduction target by, in addition to paying the emission offset fees set forth in Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1.5, also paying an additional offset fee in accordance with Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1.5, in the amount required to address, both the shortfall in reduction during the previously monitored years and the anticipated shortfall in the remaining expected years of project operations, the latter of which shall be based on the shortfall that occurred in the most recently monitored year. Calculations of emissions to be offset shall be based on the total amount of emissions anticipated to be reduced by achieving the 20 percent TDM goal adjusted for the actual percentage of aggregate daily one-way vehicle trip reduction achieved in the most recently monitored year.</p>	
<p>Impact AQ-3. During combined project construction and operations, the proposed project would result in emissions of criteria air pollutants 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.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>Implement Mitigation Measures M-AQ-1.1 through M-AQ-1.5, M-AQ-2.1 through M-AQ-2.3.</p>	<p>SUM</p>
<p>Impact AQ-4. Construction and operation of the proposed project would generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, and could expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>Implement Mitigation Measures M-AQ-1.1, M-AQ-2.2, M-AQ-1.4, M-AQ-2.1, and M-AQ-2.3.</p>	<p>LTS</p>

³ No parking-related restrictive measures on the project site shall by design or effect, restrict parking on the project site for patrons of AT&T ballpark games or events.

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Impact AQ-5. The proposed project would not conflict with, or obstruct implementation of, the 2010 Clean Air Plan.	S	Implement Mitigation Measures M-AQ-1.1 through M-AQ-1.5 and M-AQ-2.1 through M-AQ-2.3.	LTS
Impact AQ-6. The project would not result in significant exposure of sensitive receptors to asbestos during demolition activities.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact AQ-7. The proposed project would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact C-AQ-1. The proposed project's construction and operation, in combination with other past, present and reasonable future projects, would contribute to cumulative regional air quality impacts.	S	Implement Mitigation Measures M-AQ-1.5.	SUM
Impact C-AQ-2. The proposed project's construction and operation, in combination with other past, present and reasonable future projects, could generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, but would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	S	Implement Mitigation Measures M-AQ-1.1, M-AQ-1.2, M-AQ-1.4, and M-AQ-2.1.	LTS
Impact C-AQ-3. The proposed project's construction and operation, in combination with other past, present and reasonable future projects, would not conflict with, or obstruct implementation of, the 2010 Clean Air Plan.	S	Implement Mitigation Measures M-AQ-1.1 through M-AQ-1.5 and M-AQ-2.1 through M-AQ-2.3.	LTS
Impact C-AQ-4. The proposed project's construction, in combination with other past, present and reasonable future projects, would not expose sensitive receptors to asbestos during demolition activities.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact C-AQ-5. The proposed project's construction, in combination with other past, present and reasonable future projects, would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people.	LTS	None required.	NA

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
Impact GG-1: The proposed project would generate GHG emissions but not at levels that would result in a significant impact on the environment or conflict with any policy, plan, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.	LTS	None required.	NA
Wind/Shadow			
Impact WS-1. The project would alter wind in a manner that would substantially affect public areas.	S	<p>M-WS-1: Assessment and Mitigation of Wind Hazards on a Building-by-Building Basis.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prior to or as part of the submittal package for the schematic design of a new building (Proposed Building), the Proposed Building developer shall submit to the Planning Department, for its review and approval, a report from a Qualified Wind Consultant (QWC) that reviews the Proposed Building schematic design, absent landscaping.⁴ "QWC" means a wind consultant retained by the Proposed Building(s) developer and approved by the Planning Department for preparation of the report. The EIR wind consultant for the proposed project and any other wind consultant on the City's then approved list or otherwise approved by the City will be considered a QWC. 2. The QWC report shall evaluate whether the Proposed Building(s) would create a Significant Wind Impact. "Significant Wind Impact" means a substantial increase on a site-wide basis in the number of hours per year that the 26 mph wind hazard criterion is exceeded or, if baseline wind conditions are greater than 26 mph, a substantial increase in the area subjected to winds greater than 26 mph. This analysis shall focus on the entire project area that was studied in wind tunnel tests conducted for the EIR and not just the area immediately surrounding the Proposed Building(s). 3. The QWC shall consider the Proposed Building(s) in the context of the "Current Project," which, at any given time during construction of the Project, shall be defined as the building masses used in the Original Model (Wind Study Configuration B5), except as updated to reflect schematic design 	SUM

⁴ The scope of work for this report shall use the same methodology and wind test point locations as the Wind Study prepared for this EIR.

⁵ All references to the Wind Study refer to the Mission Rock EIR Pedestrian Wind Study Wind Tunnel Tests Report prepared by RWDI, final report, January 25, 2017, which can be found in Appendix 7-1 to this EIR.

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>submittals for any previously approved building that has not yet commenced construction, and construction permit designs for on-site buildings that are under construction or have completed construction. This model shall be referred to as the "Current Project" and shall be updated over time as architectural design for each proposed project block/building is completed.</p> <p>4. The Proposed Building shall be tested in the wind tunnel as proposed, including any architectural features that can be shown on plans to mitigate wind effects.⁶ Testing may not include any existing or proposed onsite landscaping. A separate test shall be conducted with existing and proposed onsite landscaping included, if required per Section 5, below. The accompanying report shall compare the wind tunnel results analyzing the Proposed Building in the context of the Current Project to the following two baselines: (1) the EIR baseline conditions for the project site (Wind Study Configuration A), and (2) Existing Plus Project (i.e., with Mission Rock proposed project) conditions used in the EIR (Wind Study Configuration B).</p> <p>5. No further analysis shall be required if the QWC concludes, and the Planning Department concurs, that the Proposed Building's schematic design, absent proposed onsite landscaping, would not create a Significant Wind Impact. If the QWC concludes that the Proposed Building's schematic design, absent proposed onsite and existing offsite landscaping, would create a Significant Wind Impact, as defined above, then a second wind tunnel test shall be conducted, taking into account proposed onsite landscaping and existing offsite landscaping. The intent of landscaping is to emulate the function and effect of a manmade wind screen. The following parameters have been determined to be the minimum requirements for landscaping features to be effective in controlling wind:⁷</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is the combined effect of a cluster or group of landscaping features that is most effective, rather than the maturity of one tree. • Since a general rule is that vertical wind control features should be taller than the average height of a person, foliage from the ground up is most effective at a height of approximately 6 to 8 feet. 	

⁶ These could include features such as setbacks, wind baffles, randomized balconies, overhands, canopies, awnings and the like, provided they are consistent with the project's Design Controls and shown on schematic architectural plans for the Proposed Building.

⁷ RWDI, Landscaping, December 8, 2016.

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Since winds can easily flow under tree crowns, underplantings (e.g., shrub plantings at the base of a tree) should be included where trunks are bare for the first 5 to 6 feet of a tree measured from the ground. Tree crowns with at least 60 percent cover (density of leafage) and even spread of branches are most effective. 	
Impact C-WS-1: The project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would alter wind in a manner that would substantially affect public areas.	S	Implement Mitigation Measure M-WS-1.	SUM
Impact WS-2. The proposed project would not create new shadow in a manner that would substantially affect outdoor recreation facilities or public areas.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact C-WS-2: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not create new shadow in a manner that would substantially affect outdoor recreational facilities or public areas.	LTS	None required.	NA
Public Services and Recreation			
Impact PS-1. The proposed project would increase demand for fire protection services but not to such an extent that construction of new or expanded facilities would be required.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact PS-2. The proposed project would increase demand for police services but not to such an extent that construction of new or expanded facilities would be required.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact PS-3. The proposed project would increase demand for school services but not to such an extent that construction of new or expanded facilities would be required.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact PS-4. The proposed project would increase demand for park and open space services but not to such an extent that construction of new or expanded facilities would be required.	LTS	None required.	NA

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Impact PS-5. The proposed project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood parks, regional parks, or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact PS-6. The proposed project would include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, but they would not have an adverse physical effect on the environment beyond that analyzed and disclosed in this EIR.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact PS-7. The proposed project would not increase demand for library services to the extent that construction of new or expanded library facilities would be required.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact C-PS-1: The proposed project, in combination with other development in the city, would not result in significant adverse cumulative impacts on fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, libraries and other services.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact C-PS-2: The proposed project, in combination with other development in the city, would not increase the use of existing neighborhood parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated.	LTS	None required.	NA
Utilities and Service Systems			
Impact UT-1. The project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, and no new or expanded entitlements would be needed. In addition, the project would not require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.	LTS	None required.	NA

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Impact UT-2. The project would not exceed treatment requirement standards of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and would not require or result in the construction of new wastewater or stormwater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact UT-3. The project would comply with solid waste regulations and would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact UT-4. The project would not encourage activities that would result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy or use these resources in a wasteful manner.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact C-UT-1. The project, combined with other development in the city, would have sufficient water supplies available from existing entitlements and resources; no new or expanded entitlements would be needed. In addition, the project would not require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact C-UT-2. The project, combined with other development in the city, would not exceed treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and would not require or result in the construction of new wastewater or stormwater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.	LTS	None required.	NA

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Impact C-UT-3. The project, combined with other development within Recology’s service area, would not exceed service area solid waste disposal capacity and would be expected to comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact C-UT-4. The project, in combination other development in the city, would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary energy use, and the project, in combination with other development served by PG&E, would not exceed existing gas and electric supply capacity.	LTS	None required.	NA
Biological Resources			
Impact BI-1: Construction and operation of the proposed project would not decrease water quality to the extent that a substantial adverse effect on a species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by CDFW, NMFS, or USFWS would occur.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact BI-2: Changes in shading and habitat at Pier 48 would not result in a substantial adverse effect on a species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by CDFW, NMFS, or USFWS.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact BI-3: Impact pile driving and vibratory driving and extraction from construction of Pier 48 seismic upgrades could have a substantial adverse effect on fish and marine mammal species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by CDFW, NMFS, or USFWS.	S	<p>M-BI-3.1: Conduct Impact Hammer Pile Driving during Periods that Avoid Special-Status Fish Species’ Spawning and Migration Seasons. In-water pile installation using impact hammers shall occur within the work window of June 1 to November 30, which has been established for dredging in San Francisco Bay to reduce potential effects on special-status fish species.</p> <p>M-BI-3.2: Pile-Driving Noise Reduction for the Protection of Fish. Prior to the start of pile driving in the Bay, the project sponsor shall develop an underwater noise monitoring and attenuation plan and obtain approval from NMFS. The NMFS-approved plan or any modifications shall be provided to the City Planning Department for determination of consistency with the requirements in this measure.</p>	LTS

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>The plan shall provide details regarding the estimated underwater sound levels expected, sound attenuation methods, methods used to monitor and verify sound levels during pile-driving activities, and management practices to be taken to reduce pile-driving sound in the marine environment to below NMFS thresholds for injury to fish. The plan shall incorporate, but not be limited to, the following BMPs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All steel pilings shall be installed with a vibratory pile driver to the deepest depth practicable. An impact pile driver may be used only where necessary, as determined by the contractor and/or project engineer, to complete installation of the steel pilings, in accordance with seismic safety or other engineering criteria. • The smallest pile driver and minimum force shall be used to complete the work necessary to meet NMFS requirements, as determined by the contractor and/or project engineer. • The hammer shall be cushioned using a 12-inch-thick wood block during all impact hammer pile-driving operations. • To reduce impacts to levels below injury thresholds, based on hydroacoustic monitoring and the amount of impact pile driving occurring on a particular day, a bubble curtain, wood block cushion, air barrier, or similar technology shall be employed during impact pile-driving activities. • A “soft start”⁸ technique shall be employed upon initial pile-driving activities every day to allow fish an opportunity to vacate the area. • During impact pile driving, the contractor shall limit the number of strikes per day to the minimum necessary to complete the work, as determined by the contractor and/or project engineer. • No pile driving shall occur at night. • During impact pile driving, a qualified fish biologist shall monitor the project site for fish that exhibit signs of distress. If fish are observed exhibiting signs of injury or distress, work shall be halted by the biologist, and the cumulative SEL up to that point shall be examined. If the cumulative SEL is close to the threshold or exceeds the threshold, then pile-driving activities will cease until the next day. 	

⁸ Soft starts require an initial set of three strikes from the impact hammer at 40 percent energy, followed by a 1-minute waiting period between subsequent three-strike sets. Soft starts for vibratory hammers will initiate noise at 15 seconds at reduced energy, followed by a 1-minute waiting period between subsequent starts. This process should continue for a period of no less than 20 minutes.

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>All pile-driving and pile-removal activity shall be monitored by a NMFS-approved biological monitor before and during all pile driving. The biological monitor shall maintain a monitoring log of daily pile-driving activities, any field sound measurements, fish sightings, and implementation of soft-start and shut-down requirements. A monitoring report shall be prepared for submission to NMFS and the City (submitted monthly and at the completion of all pile-driving/pile removal activities).</p> <p>M-BI-3.3: Pile-Driving Noise Reduction for Protection of Marine Mammals. Prior to the start of pile driving in the Bay, as part of the underwater noise monitoring and attenuation plan required by Mitigation Measure M-BI-3.2, the project sponsor shall provide details regarding the estimated underwater sound levels expected, not just from impact hammer pile driving that may affect fish but also from vibratory pile driving and removal because these sound levels may affect marine mammals. The plan shall also address sound attenuation methods, methods used to monitor and verify sound levels during pile-driving activities, and management practices to be taken to reduce pile-driving sound in the marine environment to below NMFS thresholds for injury to marine mammals. As part of implementation of the sound attenuation monitoring plan, the project sponsor shall take actions to reduce the effect of underwater noise transmission on marine mammals. These actions shall include, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The establishment of initial safety zones, based on the estimated NMFS injury threshold contours for the different marine mammals (as shown in Table 4.L-8 and Table 4.L-9). The initial size of the safety zones may be modified, based on subsequent analysis of the anticipated noise levels and the actually proposed piles, equipment, and activity prior to construction but only with the approval of NMFS. • Hydroacoustic monitoring, according to the NMFS-approved sound attenuation and monitoring plan, which shall be completed during initial pile driving to verify projected isopleths for pile driving and removal. The plan shall require real-time hydroacoustic monitoring for a sufficient number of piles to determine and verify modeled noise isopleths. The safety zones established prior to construction may be modified, based on field measurements of noise levels from different pile-driving activities, if the field measurements indicate that different noise threshold contours than those estimated prior to construction are appropriate but only with the approval of NMFS. • Halting of work activities when a marine mammal enters a safety zone (specific to that species) and resumed only after the animal has not been observed within the safety zone for a minimum of 15 minutes. 	

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Use of a “soft start”⁹ technique each day upon commencement of pile-driving activity, any time after ceasing pile-driving activity for more than 1 hour, and any time after shutdown due to marine mammal entry into a safety zone. ● Monitoring by an NMFS-approved biological monitor of all pile-driving and pile-removal activity before and during all pile driving/removal to inspect the work zone and adjacent Bay waters for marine mammals and implement the safety zone requirements described above. The biological monitor shall maintain a monitoring log of daily pile-driving/removal activities, any field sound measurements, marine mammal sightings, and implementation of soft-start, shut-down, and safety-zone requirements. A monitoring report shall be prepared for submission to the City and NMFS (submitted monthly and at the completion of all pile-driving/pile-removal activities). 	
Impact BI-4: The project would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or established native-resident or migratory wildlife corridors.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact BI-5: Construction of the proposed project could affect migratory nesting birds.	S	<p>M-BI-5: Conduct Pre-Construction Surveys for Nesting Migratory Birds. To facilitate compliance with state and federal laws (California Fish and Game Code and the MBTA) and prevent impacts on nesting migratory birds, the project sponsor shall avoid vegetation/structure removal, ground-disturbing activities, and elevated noise levels near suitable nesting habitat during the nesting season (February 1 through August 31) or conduct pre-construction surveys, as described below. Alternatively, the project sponsor may remove vegetation or structures that may support nesting birds outside of the breeding season such that no breeding habitat would be present should construction start in the normal breeding season. If it is not feasible to avoid the nesting season and suitable nesting areas remain on the project site, the project sponsor shall hire a qualified wildlife biologist with demonstrated nest-searching experience to conduct surveys for nesting birds, including raptors. The following list details the nesting bird survey requirements for this project.</p>	LTS

⁹ Soft starts require an initial set of three strikes from the impact hammer at 40 percent energy, followed by a 1-minute waiting period between subsequent three-strike sets. Soft starts for vibratory hammers will initiate noise at 15 seconds at reduced energy, followed by a 1-minute waiting period between subsequent starts. This process should continue for a period of no less than 15 minutes.

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One nesting bird assessment is required at the beginning of each year, at the start of the nesting bird season (February), to determine if suitable nesting habitat remains or has been reinstated (e.g., the project site is revegetated). • If suitable nesting habitat is present, one nesting survey shall be conducted between February and April, and one nesting survey shall be conducted between April and June. • Additional nesting surveys are required when construction work stops at a portion of the site where suitable nesting habitat remains for more than 15 days or if construction is phased in such a way that no disturbance has occurred in a portion of the project site. • If active nests are observed during construction when the wildlife biologist is not present, all work within 250 feet of the nest shall stop, and wildlife biologist shall be contacted immediately. All personnel shall move at least 250 feet away from the nest. To the extent feasible, after consulting with the wildlife biologist, construction equipment shall be shut down or moved 250 feet away from the nest. <p>Nesting bird surveys shall be performed no earlier than 7 days prior to the commencement of ground-disturbing activities and vegetation removal (including clearing, grubbing, and staging). The area surveyed shall include all construction areas as well as areas within 250 feet outside the boundaries of the areas to be cleared or as otherwise determined by the biologist.</p> <p>If the wildlife biologist finds any active nests (e.g., a nest with eggs, chicks, or young) during the survey, the biologist shall establish no-disturbance species-specific buffer zones for each nest, marked with high-visibility fencing, flagging, or pin flags. No construction activities shall be allowed within the buffer zones. The size of the buffer shall be based on the species' sensitivity to disturbance and planned work activities in the vicinity; typical buffer sizes are 250 feet for raptors and 50 feet for other birds. The buffer shall remain in effect until the chicks have fledged from the nest or the nest is no longer active, which will be verified by the biologist.</p> <p>If inactive nests are identified, the project sponsor or its contractor shall remove those nests from the structure/vegetation and install nest exclusion measures on structures (i.e., fine mesh netting, panels, or metal projectors) outside of the nesting season, if deemed necessary and suitable by the qualified wildlife biologist. All exclusionary devices shall be monitored and maintained throughout the breeding season to ensure that they are successful in preventing the birds from accessing the cavities or nest sites.</p>	

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		After each survey and/or after nest-deterrence activities are completed, the wildlife biologist shall complete a memorandum detailing the survey effort and results and submit the memorandum to the project sponsor within 7 days of survey completion.	
Impact BI-6: The proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact C-BI-1: The proposed project, in combination with future development in the city, would affect water quality but not to the extent that a substantial adverse effect on a species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by CDFW, NMFS, or USFWS would occur. As such, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact C-BI-2: Future development in the city may result in shading that could result in a substantial adverse effect on a species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by CDFW, NMFS, or USFWS. However, the project would not result in a net permanent increase in shading of the Bay, and the proposed project's contribution would be not cumulatively considerable.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact C-BI-3: The proposed project, in combination with future development in the city, would not have a substantial adverse effect on a fish species or marine mammals identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by CDFW, NMFS, or USFWS due to pile driving.	S	Implement Mitigation Measures M-BI-3.1: Conduct Impact Hammer Pile Driving during Periods that Avoid Special-Status Fish Species' Spawning and Migration Seasons, M-BI-3.2: Pile-Driving Noise Reduction for the Protection of Fish, and M-BI-3.3: Pile-Driving Noise Reduction for Protection of Marine Mammals.	LTS

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Impact C-BI-4: The proposed project, in combination with future development in the city, would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or established native-resident or migratory wildlife corridors.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact C-BI-5: Construction of the proposed project, in combination with future development in the city, could affect nesting birds.	S	Implement Mitigation Measure M-BI-5: Conduct Pre-Construction Surveys for Nesting Migratory Birds.	LTS
Impact C-BI-6: The proposed project, in combination with future development in the city, would not result in a considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts on local policies or ordinances to protect biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.	LTS	None required.	NA
Geology and Soils			
Impact GE-1a. The project would not expose people or structures to risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact GE-1b. The project would not expose people or structures to risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact GE-1c. The project would not expose people or structures to risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismically related ground failure, including liquefaction.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact GE-2. The project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact GE-3. The project would not be located on geologic unit or soil that is unstable or would become unstable and potentially result in lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact GE-4. The project would not create substantial risks to life or property through location on expansive or corrosive soil.	LTS	None required.	NA

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Impact GE-5. The project would could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.	S	<p>M-GE-5: Accidental discovery of paleontological resource. Given the potential for paleontological resources to be present at the project site at excavation depths within the Colma Formation, the following measures shall be undertaken to avoid any significant adverse effect from the proposed project on paleontological resources. Before the start of any drilling or pile-driving activities, the project sponsor shall retain a qualified paleontologist, as defined by the SVP, who is experienced in teaching nonspecialists. The qualified paleontologist shall train all construction personnel who are involved with earthmoving activities, including the site superintendent, regarding the possibility of encountering fossils, the appearance and types of fossils that are likely to be seen during construction, and proper notification procedures should fossils be encountered. Procedures to be conveyed to workers include halting construction within 50 feet of any potential fossil find and notifying a qualified paleontologist, who shall evaluate the significance.</p> <p>If paleontological resources are discovered during earthmoving activities, the construction crew shall immediately cease work near the find and notify the project sponsor and the San Francisco Planning Department. Construction work in the affected areas shall remain stopped or be diverted to allow recovery of fossil remains in a timely manner. The project sponsor shall retain a qualified paleontologist to evaluate the resource and prepare a recovery plan in accordance with SVP guidelines. The recovery plan may include a field survey, construction monitoring, sampling and data recovery procedures, museum storage coordination for any specimen recovered, and a report of findings. Recommendations in the recovery plan that are determined by the San Francisco Planning Department to be necessary and feasible shall be implemented before construction activities can resume at the site where the paleontological resources were discovered. The San Francisco Planning Department shall be responsible for ensuring that the monitor’s recommendations regarding treatment and reporting are implemented.</p>	LTS
Impact C-GE-1. The proposed project, in combination with other development within the city, would not substantially increase the risk of exposure for people or structures to seismic hazards.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact C-GE-2. The proposed project, in combination with other development within the city, would not substantially increase soil erosion potential.	LTS	None required.	NA

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Impact C-GE-3. The proposed project, in combination with other development within the city, would not substantially increase soil hazards.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact C-GE-4. The proposed project, in combination with other development within the city, could not result in impacts to paleontological resources. However, the project's contribution would be less than cumulatively considerable.	S	Implement M-GE-5: Accidental discovery of paleontological resource.	LTS
Hydrology and Water Quality			
Impact HY-1. The proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements and/or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact HY-2. The proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, resulting in a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact HY-3. The proposed project would alter the existing drainage pattern of the site but would not result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact HY-4. The proposed project would alter the existing drainage pattern of the site but would not result in a substantial increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff in a matter that would result in flooding onsite or offsite.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact HY-5. The proposed project would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of the planned stormwater drainage system or provide additional sources of polluted runoff.	LTS	None required.	NA

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Impact HY-6. The proposed project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area. The proposed project may place housing in areas that could be inundated by flooding due to SLR but would not exacerbate the frequency or severity of flooding or cause flooding in areas that otherwise would not be subject to flooding without the project.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact HY-7: The proposed project would not place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area. The proposed project may place structures in areas that could be inundated by flooding due to SLR but would not exacerbate the frequency or severity of flooding or cause flooding in areas that otherwise would not be subject to flooding without the project.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact HY-8. The project area is subject to flooding from tsunami inundation, but the project would not exacerbate flooding or cause flooding in areas that otherwise would not be subject to flooding without the project. The project site is not subject to inundation by seiche or mudflows.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact C-HY-1. Cumulative Water Quality Impacts. The proposed project, in combination with other foreseeable development in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to cumulative impacts on water quality.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact C-HY-2. Cumulative Groundwater Impacts. The proposed project, in combination with other foreseeable development in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to cumulative impacts on groundwater recharge and supplies.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact C-HY-3. Cumulative Storm Drain Impacts. The proposed project, in combination with other foreseeable development in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to cumulative impacts on storm drain capacity.	LTS	None required.	NA

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Impact C-HY-4. Cumulative Flooding Impacts. The proposed project, in combination with other foreseeable development in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to cumulative impacts on flooding.	LTS	None required.	NA
Hazardous Materials			
Impact HZ-1. The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact HZ-2. The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the release of hazardous materials.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact HZ-3. The proposed project would not create a potentially significant hazard for children at nearby schools from the emission or handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact HZ-4. The proposed project would not create a potentially significant hazard for the public or environment related to development of a hazardous materials site included in a list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact HZ-5. The proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact C-HZ-1: The proposed project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not create a significant hazard to human health and/or the environment involving the management or release of hazardous materials.	LTS	None required.	NA

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Impact C-HZ-2: The proposed project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not create a significant hazard to human health and/or the environment involving the disturbance of subsurface hazardous materials.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact C-HZ-3: The proposed project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not create a potentially significant hazard for children at nearby schools from the emission or handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact C-HZ-4: The proposed project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not create a potentially significant hazard for the public or environment related to development of a hazardous materials site included in a list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.	LTS	None required.	NA
Impact C-HZ-5: The proposed project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan.	LTS	None required.	NA

TABLE S-2. COMPARISON OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS OF PROJECT TO IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVES

	Proposed Project	Alternative A: No Project Alternative	Alternative B: Reduced Height/Intensity Alternative	Alternative C: No Change to Pier 48 Alternative
Description	Construction of up to approximately 2.7 to 2.8 million gross square feet (gsf) of residential, commercial, production, and active/retail uses on Seawall Lot 337, plus 263,000 gsf for the reuse of the existing Pier 48 structure. Total of 1,000 to 1,600 residential uses on Seawall Lot 337. Building heights would range from 90 feet (approximately 6 stories) to a maximum of 240 feet (approximately 23 stories). Includes seismic safety improvements to Pier 48 involving underwater construction activities in San Francisco Bay.	No change to existing conditions.	Mission Rock Square and the Mission Rock Square Garage would not be constructed. In their place, a building (Building K) would be constructed in the middle of Seawall Lot 337. The area where Building K would be located under the proposed project would be an extension of China Basin Park under this alternative.	Pier 48 remains in its existing condition (i.e., no surface or in-water construction activities proposed). No change to proposal for remaining portions of Project Site.
Ability to Meet Project Sponsor's Objectives	Meets all of the sponsor's objectives.	Would not meet any of the sponsor's objectives.	Would achieve most but not all of the sponsor's objectives but to a lesser extent than the proposed project.	Would achieve most but not all of the sponsor's objectives, but to a lesser extent than the proposed project. Would not achieve any of the Pier 48 objectives.
Land Use and Land Use Planning				
	All impacts would be less than significant.	NI <	LS =/ <	LS =/ <
Aesthetics				
	All impacts would be less than significant.	NI <	LS =/ <	LS =/ <
Population and Housing				
	All impacts would be less than significant.	NI <	LS =/ <	LS =/ <
Cultural Resources				
	Impact CP-1. The proposed project, including rehabilitation and reuse of the existing historic Pier 48 structures, in accordance with applicable Secretary of the Interior's Rehabilitation Standards, as well as new construction on Seawall Lot 337, would not have a substantial adverse effect on a historical or potential historical resource. Impacts on	NI <	LS =/ <	LS =/ <

	Proposed Project	Alternative A: No Project Alternative	Alternative B: Reduced Height/Intensity Alternative	Alternative C: No Change to Pier 48 Alternative
	historical resources would be less than significant.			
	Impact CP-2. The proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource. Identified mitigation would reduce this impact to less than significant with mitigation.	NI <	LSM =/ <	LSM =/ <
	Impact CP-3. The proposed project could disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. Identified mitigation would reduce this impact to less than significant with mitigation.	NI <	LSM =/ <	LSM =/ <
	Impact CP-4: The proposed project could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource. Identified mitigation would reduce this impact to less than significant with mitigation.	NI <	LSM =/ <	LSM =/ <
	Impact C-CP-1. The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects in the city, could result in a significant cumulative impact on historic resources. However, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. Impacts would be less than significant.	NI <	LS =/ <	LS =/ <
	Impact C-CP-2: The proposed project, in combination with future development in the city, would not result in a significant cumulative impact on archeological resources, tribal cultural resources, and human remains. As such, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable.	NI <	LSM =/ <	LSM =/ <
Transportation and Circulation				
	Impact TR-1: Construction of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts on the transportation and circulation network. Impacts would be less than significant.	NI <	LS <	LS <
	Impact TR-2: The proposed project would not cause substantial additional VMT nor substantially induce automobile travel. Impacts would be less than significant.	NI <	LS =	LS =
	Impact TR-3: The proposed project would result in queues that would create traffic hazards. This impact would be less than significant with mitigation.	NI <	LSM =	LSM =

	Proposed Project	Alternative A: No Project Alternative	Alternative B: Reduced Height/Intensity Alternative	Alternative C: No Change to Pier 48 Alternative
	Impact TR-4: The proposed project would result in an adverse impact by increasing ridership by more than 5 percent on two individual Muni routes that exceed 85 percent capacity utilization under baseline conditions. This impact would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation.	NI <	SUM =	SUM =
	Impact TR-5. The proposed project would not cause significant impacts on regional transit routes. This impact would be less than significant.	NI <	LS =	LS =
	Impact TR-6. The project would result in an adverse impact related to a substantial increase in transit delays on Third Street between Channel Street and Mission Rock Street. This impact would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation.	NI <	SUM =	SUM =
	Impact TR-7: The proposed project would have a substantial adverse effect on pedestrian travel by creating potentially hazardous conditions for pedestrians adjacent to the Block D2 parking structure. This impact would be less than significant with mitigation.	NI <	LSM =	LSM <
	Impact TR-8: Existing pedestrian facilities on the Third Street Bridge, the Fourth Street Bridge, and the Fourth Street/King Street intersection are sized adequately to accommodate pedestrian traffic generated by the proposed project. This impact would be less than significant.	NI <	LS =	LS =
	Impact TR-9. The proposed project would have significant impacts on pedestrian safety at the unsignalized intersections of Fourth Street/Mission Rock Street and Fourth Street/Long Bridge Street, resulting in significant and unavoidable with mitigation impact.	NI <	SUM =	SUM =
	Impact TR-10: The proposed project would create potentially hazardous conditions for bicyclists and would interfere with bicycle accessibility to the project site or adjoining areas. This impact would be less than significant with mitigation.	NI <	LSM =	LS <

	Proposed Project	Alternative A: No Project Alternative	Alternative B: Reduced Height/Intensity Alternative	Alternative C: No Change to Pier 48 Alternative
	Impact TR-11. The proposed project’s loading demand during the peak loading hour would not be adequately accommodated by the proposed onsite/off-street loading supply or in proposed on-street loading zones, which may create hazardous conditions or significant delays for transit, bicycles, or pedestrians, resulting in less than significant impacts with mitigation.	NI <	LSM =	LSM =
	Impact TR-12: The proposed project could result in significant impacts on emergency access to the project site or adjacent locations. This impact would be less than significant with mitigation.	NI <	LSM =	LSM =
	Impact TR-13: The proposed project would not result in a substantial parking deficit that would create hazardous conditions or significant delays affecting transit, bicycles, or pedestrians, and particular characteristics of the proposed project would not render the use of other modes infeasible. This impact would be less than significant.	NI <	LS =	LS =
	Impact C-TR-1, Impact C-TR-2, Impact C-TR-5, Impact C-TR-10, and Impact C-TR-11: Cumulative impacts related to construction, VMT, regional transit routes, emergency vehicle access, and parking would be less than significant.	NI <	LS =	LS =
	Impact C-TR-3. The proposed project would not contribute to a major traffic hazards. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.	NI <	LSM =	LSM =
	Impact C-TR-4. The proposed project would contribute considerably to a significant cumulative transit impact because it would increase ridership by more than 5 percent on one individual Muni route that would exceed 85 percent capacity utilization. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation.	NI <	SUM =	SUM =
	Impact C-TR-6. The proposed project would contribute considerably to significant cumulative impacts related to transit delay. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation.	NI <	SUM =	SUM =
	Impact C-TR-7. The proposed project would contribute considerably to significant cumulative pedestrian impacts. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation.	NI <	SUM =	SUM =

	Proposed Project	Alternative A: No Project Alternative	Alternative B: Reduced Height/Intensity Alternative	Alternative C: No Change to Pier 48 Alternative
	Impact C-TR-8. The proposed project would not contribute considerably to a significant cumulative bicycle impact. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.	NI <	LSM =	LTS =
	Impact C-TR-9. The proposed project could contribute to a significant cumulative loading impact. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.	NI <	LSM =	LSM =
Noise				
	Impact NOI-1. Construction of the proposed project would generate noise levels in excess of standards or result in substantial temporary increases in ambient noise levels, resulting in significant and unavoidable impacts with mitigation.	NI <	SUM =	SUM =
	Impact NOI-2: Operation of the proposed project could result in the exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of the San Francisco Noise Ordinance or a substantial permanent, temporary, periodic or increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity, above levels existing without the project. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.	NI <	SU =	SU =
	Impact NOI-3: Construction of the project would expose persons to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels related to annoyance. Construction of the project could expose persons to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels related to damage to buildings.	NI <	SUM =	SUM =
	Impact C-NOI-1: Construction activities for the proposed project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonable future projects in the city, would result in a substantial temporary increase in noise or noise in excess of the applicable local standards. Cumulative impacts would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation.	NI <	SUM =	SUM =
	Impact C-NOI-2: Construction activities associated with project-related development, in combination with other past, present, and reasonable future projects in the city, would expose sensitive receptors to excessive ground-borne vibration related to annoyance and could result in similar impacts related to damage to buildings.	NI <	SUM =	SUM =

	Proposed Project	Alternative A: No Project Alternative	Alternative B: Reduced Height/Intensity Alternative	Alternative C: No Change to Pier 48 Alternative
	Impact C-NOI-3: Operation of the proposed project, in combination with other past, present and reasonable future projects in the city, would result in the exposure of persons to noise in excess of the applicable local standards or a substantial permanent ambient noise level increase in the project vicinity. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.	NI <	SU =	SU =
Air Quality				
	Impact AQ-1: Construction of the proposed project would generate fugitive dust and criteria air pollutants, which for criteria air pollutants but not fugitive dust, would 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. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation for criteria air pollutants.	NI <	SUM =	SUM =
	Impact AQ-2. During project operations, the proposed project would result in emissions of criteria air pollutants 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. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation.	NI <	SUM =	SUM =
	Impact AQ-3. During combined project construction and operations, the proposed project would result in emissions of criteria air pollutants 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. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation.	NI <	SUM =	SUM =
	Impact AQ-4. Construction and operation of the proposed project would generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, and could expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.	NI <	LSM =	LSM =

	Proposed Project	Alternative A: No Project Alternative	Alternative B: Reduced Height/Intensity Alternative	Alternative C: No Change to Pier 48 Alternative
	Impact AQ-5. The proposed project would not conflict with, or obstruct implementation of, the 2010 Clean Air Plan. This impact would be less than significant with mitigation.	NI <	LSM =	LSM =
	Impact AQ-6: The project would not result in significant exposure of sensitive receptors to asbestos during demolition activities. This impact would be less than significant.	NI <	LS =<	LS =<
	Impact AQ-7: The proposed project would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. This impact would be less than significant.	NI <	LS =<	LS =<
	Impact C-AQ-1. The proposed project's construction and operation, in combination with other past, present and reasonable future projects would contribute to cumulative regional air quality impacts. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation.	NI <	SUM =<	SUM =<
	Impact C-AQ-2. The proposed project's construction and operation, in combination with other past, present and reasonable future projects, could generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, but would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.	NI <	LSM =<	LSM =<
	Impact C-AQ-3: The proposed project's construction and operation, in combination with other past, present and reasonable future projects, would not conflict with, or obstruct implementation of, the 2010 Clean Air Plan. This impact would be less than significant with mitigation.	NI <	LSM =<	LSM =<
	Impact C-AQ-4: The proposed project's construction, in combination with other past, present and reasonable future projects, would not expose sensitive receptors to asbestos during demolition activities. This impact would be less than significant.	NI <	LS =<	LS =<

	Proposed Project	Alternative A: No Project Alternative	Alternative B: Reduced Height/Intensity Alternative	Alternative C: No Change to Pier 48 Alternative
	Impact C-AQ-5. The proposed project’s construction, in combination with other past, present and reasonable future projects, would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. This impact would be less than significant.	NI <	LS =/ <	LS =/ <
Greenhouse Gas Emissions				
	Impact GG-1. The proposed project would generate GHG emissions but not at levels that would result in a significant impact on the environment or conflict with any policy, plan, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. Impacts would be less than significant.	NI <	LS =/ <	LS =/ <
Wind/Shadow				
	Impact WS-1. The project would alter wind in a manner that would substantially affect public areas, and impacts would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation.	NI <	SUM =/ <	SUM = =
	Impact WS-2: The project would not create new shadow in a manner that would substantially affect outdoor recreation facilities or public areas and impacts would be less than significant.	NI <	LS =/ <	LS = =
	Impact C-WS-1: The project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future project, would alter wind in a manner that would substantially affect public areas, and impacts would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation.	NI <	SUM =/ <	SUM = =
	Impact C-WS-2: The project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future project, would not create new shadow in a manner that would substantially affect outdoor recreational facilities of public areas, and impacts would be less than significant.	NI <	LS =/ <	LS =/ <
Public Services and Recreation				
	All impacts would be less than significant.	NI <	LS =/ <	LS =/ <

	Proposed Project	Alternative A: No Project Alternative	Alternative B: Reduced Height/Intensity Alternative	Alternative C: No Change to Pier 48 Alternative
Utilities and Service Systems				
	All impacts would be less than significant	NI <	LS =/ <	LS =/ <
Biological Resources				
	Impact BI-1 and Impact BI-4: Water quality impacts on candidate, sensitive, or special-status species and impacts related to the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, would be less than significant.	NI <	LS =/ <	LS =/ <
	Impact BI-2: Changes in shading and habitat at Pier 48 would not result in a substantial adverse effect on a species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by CDFW, NMFS, or USFWS. Impacts would be less than significant.	NI <	LS =/ <	NI <
	Impact BI-3: Impact pile driving and vibratory driving and extraction from construction of Pier 48 seismic upgrades could have a substantial adverse effect on fish and marine mammal species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by CDFW, NMFS, or USFWS. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.	NI <	LSM =	NI <
	Impact BI-5: Construction of the proposed project could affect migratory nesting birds. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.	NI <	LSM =	LSM =
	Impact BI-6: The proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. Impacts would be less than significant.	NI <	LS =	LS =
	Impact C-BI-1, Impact C-BI-2, and Impact C-BI-4: Cumulative water quality impacts on candidate, sensitive, or special-status species and impacts related to the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or future development in the city may result in shading would be less than significant.	NI <	LS =	LS =

	Proposed Project	Alternative A: No Project Alternative	Alternative B: Reduced Height/Intensity Alternative	Alternative C: No Change to Pier 48 Alternative
	Impact C-BI-3: The proposed project, in combination with future development in the city, would not result in permanent noise from pile driving and have a substantial adverse effect on a fish species or marine mammals identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by CDFW, NMFS, or USFWS. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.	NI <	LSM =	NI <
	Impact C-BI-5: Construction of the proposed project, in combination with future development in the city, could affect nesting birds. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.	NI <	LSM =	LSM =
	Impact C-BI-6: The proposed project, in combination with future development in the city, would not result in a considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts on local policies or ordinances to protect biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.	NI <	LSM =	LSM =
Geology and Soils				
	Impact GE-1a, Impact GE-1b, Impact GE-1c, Impact GE-2, Impact GE-3, and Impact GE-4: Impacts related to rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, ground failure or liquefaction, soil erosion, expansive soils, lateral spreading, or the loss of topsoil would be less than significant.	NI <	LS =/ <	LS =/ <
	Impact GE-5. The project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.	NI <	LSM =	LSM =
	Impact C-GE-1, Impact CE-2, Impact C-GE-3: Cumulative impacts related to rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, ground failure or liquefaction, soil erosion, expansive soils, lateral spreading, or the loss of topsoil would be less than significant.	NI <	LS =/ <	LS =/ <
	Impact C-GE-4. The proposed project, in combination with other development within the city, could result in impacts to paleontological resources. However, the project's contribution would be less than cumulatively considerable. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.	NI <	LSM =	LSM =

	Proposed Project	Alternative A: No Project Alternative	Alternative B: Reduced Height/Intensity Alternative	Alternative C: No Change to Pier 48 Alternative
Hydrology and Water Quality				
	All impacts would be less than significant.	NI <	LS =/ <	LS =/ <
Hazards/Hazardous Materials				
	All impacts would be less than significant.	NI <	LS =/ <	LS =/ <