



FINAL

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

Potrero HOPE SF Master Plan

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
CASE NO. 2010.0515E

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2010112029

Draft EIR Publication Date:	November 5, 2014
Draft EIR Public Hearing Date:	December 11, 2014
Draft EIR Public Comment Period:	November 7, 2014 through December 22, 2014
Final EIR Certification Date:	December 10, 2015



**SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING
DEPARTMENT**

Written comments should be sent to:
Environmental Review Officer | 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 | San Francisco, CA 94103



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Planning Commission Motion NO. M-19529

HEARING DATE: December 10, 2015

Hearing Date: December 10, 2015
Case No.: **2010.0515E**
Project Address: **1095 Connecticut Street and various parcels**
Zoning: RM-2 (Residential – Mixed, Moderate Density), P - Public
40-X Height and Bulk Districts
Showplace Square/Potrero Area Plan
Block/Lot: Assessor's Block/Lots: 4167/004, 004A, 4220A/001, 4223/001, 4285B/001,
and 4287/001A
Project Sponsor: BRIDGE Housing Corporation
600 California Street, Suite 900
San Francisco, CA 94108
Staff Contact: Rachel A. Schuett – (415) 575-9030
Rachel.Schuett@sfgov.org

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

ADOPTING FINDINGS RELATED TO THE CERTIFICATION OF A FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR A PROPOSED PROJECT WHICH INCLUDES DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING 620 PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS ON SITE AND DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 1,700 RESIDENTIAL UNITS FOR A RANGE OF INCOME LEVELS, INCLUDING REPLACEMENT PUBLIC HOUSING, NEW VEHICLE AND PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIONS, A NEW STREET AND BLOCK LAYOUT, NEW TRANSIT STOPS, AND NEW WATER, WASTEWATER, AND STORM WATER INFRASTRUCTURE, AS WELL AS RETAIL USES, COMMUNITY FACILITIES, AND OPEN SPACE.

MOVED, that the San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") hereby CERTIFIES the final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (hereinafter "FEIR/EIS"), identified as Case No. 2010.0515E, the "Potrero HOPE SF Master Plan Project" at 1095 Connecticut Street and various other parcels, above (hereinafter 'Project'), based upon the following findings:

1. The City and County of San Francisco, acting through the Planning Department (hereinafter "Department") fulfilled all procedural requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Cal. Pub. Res. Code Section 21000 *et seq.*, hereinafter "CEQA"), the State CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Admin. Code Title 14, Section 15000 *et seq.*, hereinafter "CEQA Guidelines") and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code (hereinafter "Chapter 31").
 - A. The Department determined that an Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter "EIR") was required and provided public notice of that determination by publication in a newspaper of general circulation on November 10, 2010.

- B. The Department held a public scoping meeting on November 22, 2010 in order to solicit public comment on the scope of the Potrero HOPE SF Master Plan Project's environmental review.
 - C. The Department, in consultation with the Mayor's Office of Housing, determined that an Environmental Impact Statement (hereinafter "EIS") was also required under the National Environmental Policy Act (hereinafter "NEPA"), thus a combined Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (hereinafter "EIR/EIS") would be prepared, and provided public notice of that determination by publication in the Federal Register, the United States government's official daily newspaper on May 2, 2012.
 - D. The Department and the Mayor's Office of Housing held a public scoping meeting on May 17, 2012 in order to solicit public comment on the scope of the Potrero HOPE SF Master Plan Project's environmental review, consistent with the requirements of NEPA.
 - E. On November 5, 2014, the Department published the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (hereinafter "DEIR/EIS") and provided public notice in a newspaper of general circulation of the availability of the DEIR/EIS for public review and comment and of the date and time of the Planning Commission public hearing on the DEIR/EIS; this notice was mailed to the Department's list of persons requesting such notice.
 - F. Notices of availability of the DEIR/EIS and of the date and time of the public hearing were posted near the project site by Department staff on November 5, 2014.
 - G. On November 5, 2014 copies of the DEIR/EIS were mailed or otherwise delivered to a list of persons requesting it, to those noted on the distribution list in the DEIR/EIS, to adjacent property owners, and to government agencies, the latter both directly and through the State Clearinghouse.
 - H. Notice of Completion was filed with the State Secretary of Resources via the State Clearinghouse on November 5, 2014.
2. The Commission held a duly advertised public hearing on said DEIR/EIS on December 11, 2014 at which opportunity for public comment was given, and public comment was received on the DEIR/EIS. The period for acceptance of written comments ended on January 7, 2015.
 3. The Department prepared responses to comments on environmental issues received at the public hearing and in writing during the 62-day public review period for the DEIR/EIS, prepared revisions to the text of the DEIR/EIS in response to comments received or based on additional information that became available during the public review period, and corrected errors in the DEIR/EIS. This material was presented in a Comments and Responses document, published on October 8, 2015, distributed to the Commission and all parties who commented on the DEIR/EIS, and made available to others upon request at the Department.
 4. A Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (hereinafter "FEIR/EIS") has been prepared by the Department, consisting of the DEIR/EIS, any consultations and comments received during the review process, any additional information that became available, and the Comments and Responses document all as required by law.

5. Project EIR/EIS files have been made available for review by the Commission and the public. These files are available for public review at the Department at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, and are part of the record before the Commission.
6. A public hearing was held before the Planning Commission on October 22, 2015. At that hearing the certification of the FEIR/FEIS was continued to December 10, 2015.
7. On December 10, 2015, the Commission reviewed and considered the information contained in the FEIR/EIS and hereby does find that the contents of said report and the procedures through which the FEIR/EIS was prepared, publicized, and reviewed comply with the provisions of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.
8. The Planning Commission hereby does find that the FEIR/EIS concerning File No. 2010.0515E reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the City and County of San Francisco, is adequate, accurate and objective, and that the Comments and Responses document contains no significant revisions to the DEIR/EIS, and hereby does CERTIFY THE COMPLETION of said FEIR/EIS in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines.
9. The Commission, in certifying the completion of said FEIR/EIS, hereby does find that the project described in the EIR/EIS:
 - A. Will have significant cumulative effects on the environment by contributing to substantial delays at four study intersections (i.e., Pennsylvania Avenue/SB-280 Off-Ramp; 25th Street/Indiana Street/NB I-280 On-Ramp; Cesar Chavez Street/Vermont Street; and Cesar Chavez Street/US 101 Off-Ramp);
 - B. Will have significant, project-specific impacts to transit capacity on the Muni 10 Townsend line;
 - C. Will have significant, cumulative impacts to transit capacity on the Muni 10 Townsend and 48th-Quintara-24th Street lines;
 - D. Will have significant, cumulative impacts to transit capacity on the Muni Southeast screenline;
 - E. Will have significant, project-specific impacts to exterior noise levels by causing a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels;
 - F. Will have significant, project-specific construction-period air quality impacts; and
 - G. Will have significant cumulative construction-period air quality impacts.
10. The Planning Commission reviewed and considered the information contained in the FEIR/EIS prior to approving the Project.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Motion was ADOPTED by the Planning Commission at its regular meeting of December 10, 2015.

Jonas Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES: Commissioners Moore, Richards, Antonini, Johnson, Fong, Wu

NOES: None

ABSENT: Hillis

ADOPTED: December 10, 2015

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

Potrero HOPE SF Master Plan

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
CASE NO. **2010.0515E**

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2010112029

(●) Indicates material that has been revised since publication of the Draft EIR
Long changes are indicated with opening dots (◊) and closing dots (◐)

Draft EIR Publication Date:	November 5, 2014
Draft EIR Public Hearing Date:	December 11, 2014
Draft EIR Public Comment Period:	November 7, 2014 through December 22, 2014
Final EIR Certification Date:	December 10, 2015



SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING
DEPARTMENT

Potrero HOPE SF Master Plan

Draft EIR/EIS

Table of Contents

SUMMARY

S.1	Introduction	S-1
S.2	Project Purpose, Need, and Objectives	S-2
S.3	Type of EIR/EIS	S-3
S.4	CEQA/NEPA Requirements for Project Description and Evaluation of Alternatives	S-3
S.5	Description of Alternatives and Proposed Project	S-5
S.6	Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures	S-7
S.7	Scope and Areas of Known Controversy.....	S-7

CHAPTER 1 PROJECT PURPOSE, NEED, AND OBJECTIVES

1.1	Introduction	1-1
1.2	Project Overview	1-1
1.3	Project Purpose, Need, and Objectives	1-8
1.4	Type and Uses of EIR/EIS	1-9
1.5	Scope and Areas of Controversy.....	1-11
1.6	Agency Roles and Responsibilities.....	1-13
1.7	Regulatory Requirements, Permits, Authorizations, and Approvals	1-15
1.8	Public Participation and Additional Steps in the California Environmental Quality Act/National Environmental Policy Act Review Process.....	1-17
1.9	Organization of this Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement.....	1-18

CHAPTER 2 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES (EIS) / PROJECT DESCRIPTION (EIR)

2.1	Introduction	2-1
2.2	CEQA/NEPA Requirements for Project Description and Evaluation of Alternatives	2-3
2.3	Alternatives Carried Forward for Evaluation in this EIR/EIS	2-5
2.4	Alternatives Considered, But Eliminated from Further Consideration.....	2-24

CHAPTER 3 PLANS AND POLICIES

3.1	San Francisco Plans and Policies.....	3-1
3.2	Regional Plans and Policies	3-13

CHAPTER 4 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

4.1	Introduction	4.1-1
4.2	Land Use and Land Use Planning.....	4.2-1
4.3	Visual Quality/Aesthetics	4.3-1

4.4 Socioeconomics and Community/Population and Housing 4.4-1

4.5 Environmental Justice 4.5-1

4.6 Cultural and Paleontological Resources..... 4.6-1

4.7 Transportation and Circulation 4.7-1

4.8 Noise 4.8-1

4.9 Air Quality 4.9-1

4.10 Greenhouse Gas Emissions 4.10-1

4.11 Wind and Shadow 4.11-1

4.12 Recreation 4.12-1

● 4.13 Utilities and Service Systems 4.13-1

4.14 Public Services..... 4.14-1

4.15 Biological Resources 4.15-1

4.16 Geology and Soils 4.16-1

4.17 Hydrology and Water Quality 4.17-1

4.18 Hazards and Hazardous Materials 4.18-1

4.19 Mineral and Energy Resources 4.19-1

4.20 Agricultural and Forest Resources 4.20-1

CHAPTER 5 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

5.1 Approach to the Analysis 5-1

5.2 Land Use and Land Use Planning..... 5.2-1

● 5.3 Visual Quality/Aesthetics 5.3-1

5.4 Socioeconomics and Community/Population and Housing 5.4-1

5.5 Environmental Justice 5.5-1

5.6 Cultural and Paleontological Resources..... 5.6-1

5.7 Transportation and Circulation 5.7-1

5.8 Noise 5.8-1

5.9 Air Quality 5.9-1

5.10 Greenhouse Gas Emissions 5.10-1

5.11 Wind and Shadow 5.11-1

5.12 Recreation 5.12-1

5.13 Utilities and Service Systems 5.13-1

5.14 Public Services..... 5.14-1

5.15 Biological Resources 5.15-1

5.16 Geology and Soils 5.16-1

5.17 Hydrology and Water Quality 5.17-1

5.18 Hazards and Hazardous Materials 5.18-1

5.19 Mineral and Energy Resources 5.19-1

5.20 Agricultural and Forest Resources 5.20-1

 CHAPTER 6 OTHER CEQA/NEPA CONSIDERATIONS

6.1	Effects Found Not to be Significant.....	6-1
6.2	Significant and Unavoidable Impacts	6-1
6.3	Growth Inducement	6-3
6.4	Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources	6-7
6.5	Relationship between Short-Term Use of the Environment and the Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity.....	6-9
6.6	Environmentally Superior Alternative	6-10
6.7	Other Federal Laws/Executive Orders.....	6-10

 CHAPTER 7 REPORT PREPARERS

7.1	Agencies	7-1
7.2	Consultants	7-2

 CHAPTER 8 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

RTC 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1	Purpose of The Responses to Comments Document	RTC 1-1
1.2	Environmental Review Process.....	RTC 1-2
1.3	Document Organization.....	RTC 1-4

RTC 2 LISTS OF PERSONS COMMENTING

2.1	Organization of Comments	RTC 2-1
2.2	List of Agencies, Organizations and Individuals Commenting on the Draft EIR/EIS	RTC 2-2

RTC 3 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

3.1	Organization of Responses to Comments	RTC 3-1
3.2	Project Description.....	RTC 3-2
3.3	Alternatives.....	RTC 3-23
3.4	Land Use and Land Use Planning	RTC 3-29
3.5	Visual Quality/Aesthetics	RTC 3-31
3.6	Socioeconomics and Community/Population and Housing.....	RTC 3-55
3.7	Transportation and Circulation	RTC 3-61
3.8	Noise	RTC 3-87
3.9	Air Quality	RTC 3-90
3.10	Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	RTC 3-102
3.11	Wind and Shadow	RTC 3-103
3.12	Recreation.....	RTC 3-110
3.13	Utilities and Service Systems.....	RTC 3-113
3.14	Public Services.....	RTC 3-129
3.15	Biological Resources	RTC 3-132
3.16	Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....	RTC 3-136

3.17 Cumulative Analysis RTC 3-144

3.18 Other CEQA/NEPA Considerations RTC 3-146

3.19 General Comments and Scope of the Draft EIR/EIS RTC 3-160

RTC 4 DRAFT EIR/EIS REVISIONS

Summary RTC 4-1

3.1.8 San Francisco Green Building Ordinance (SFBGO) RTC 4-4

4.3 Visual Quality/Aesthetics RTC 4-5

4.13 Utilities and Service Systems RTC 4-29

5.3 Visual Quality/Aesthetics RTC 4-33

5.6 Cultural and Paleontological Resources RTC 4-85

5.9 Air Quality RTC 4-88

5.10 Greenhouse Gas emissions RTC 4-90

5.11 Wind and Shadow RTC 4-90

5.13 Utilities and Service Systems RTC 4-90

5.16 Geology and Soils RTC 4-94

5.17 Hydrology and water quality RTC 4-95

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A Draft EIR Comment Letters

Attachment B Public Hearing Transcript Comments

● *Appendix 4.10B Project GHG Emissions Inventory (included as part of the EIR/EIS Appendices)*

 APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Notice of Intent (NOI)

- A NOP
- B NOP Comments
- C NOI
- D NOI Comments

Appendix 4.6. Cultural and Paleontological Resources

- A Historic Resources Evaluation Report (HRER), 1095 Connecticut Street (Potrero Terrace/Annex)
- B HRER, Evaluation Review and Update, Selected SFHA Properties
- C HRER, Potrero Annex Housing Development
- D Landscape Analysis. Potrero Terrace and Potrero Annex Housing Project
- E Northwest Info Center (NWIC). Rapid response record search results for the proposed Potrero HOPE SF Master Plan NEPA project. NWIC File No: 11-0390
- F Programmatic Agreement. CCSF, CHRO, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Re: Historic Properties Affected by use of Revenue from HUD
- G SHPO Concurrence. RE: Potrero Housing Complex, 1033 Texas Street and 1106-1120 Wisconsin Street, Determination of Eligibility
- H Stipulation XI Letter. SHPO. NWIC File No. 11-0390

Appendix 4.7. Transportation and Circulation

- A Potrero HOPE Transportation Study
- B Transportation Study Appendices
- C Potrero HOPE Transportation Study – 2040 Cumulative Analysis

Appendix 4.8. Noise

- A Noise Data

Appendix 4.9. Air Quality

- A Air Quality Technical Report (AQTR)
- B Alternative Analysis Memo
- C Errata to the AQTR
- D Errata to the Alternatives Analysis

Appendix 4.10. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- A Compliance Checklist Greenhouse Gas Analysis.
- B Project GHG Emissions Inventory

Appendix 4.13. Utilities and Service Systems

- A Water Demand and Wastewater Generation Discharge Memorandum
- B Paula Kehoe, Director of Water Resources, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, Letter to Bill Wycko RE: Water Supply Assessment
- C Water Supply Assessment

- D Public Utilities Commission Resolution No. 13-0110

Appendix 4.16. Geology and Soils

- A Geotechnical Investigation

Appendix 4.18. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Limited Asbestos and Lead Paint Sampling
- B City and County of San Francisco, Department of Public Health Environmental Health Section, "Review of Environmental Documents Potrero Annex and Potrero Terrace, Hope Project, San Francisco. DPH SAM 818" letter from Rajiv Bhatia, Director, Occupational and Environmental Health, to Charmaine Curtis, Curtis Development & Consulting, February 29, 2012.
- C City and County of San Francisco Department of Public Health, Occupational and Environmental Health, Potrero Terrace and Potrero Annex Redevelopment, Letter from Rajiv Bhatia, January 5, 2011.
- D ENGEO Incorporated, "Potrero Annex and Potrero Terrace, San Francisco, California. Response to San Francisco Department of Public Health," letter from Brian Flaherty and Jeffrey A. Adams, to Elyse D. Heilshorn, San Francisco Department of Public Health Local Oversight Program, April 10, 2012.
- E Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment, 1101 Connecticut Street, San Francisco, CA. April 8, 2013.

LIST OF FIGURES

1-1	Project Location – Aerial View	1-3	
1-2	Existing Buildings at Potrero Terrace.....	1-6	
2-1	Proposed Project Site Plan.....	2-7	
2-2	Proposed Project Land Use Plan	2-9	
2-3	Proposed Project Recreation and Open Space	2-11	
2-4	Proposed Project Building Heights.....	2-12	
2-5	Proposed Project Construction Phasing.....	2-18	
2-6	Reduced Development Alternative Land Use Plan.....	2-22	
4.2-1	Existing Land Uses.....	4.2-3	
4.2-2	Existing Zoning Districts.....	4.2-5	
4.3-1	(Revised) Viewpoints Location Map	4.3-10	●
4.3-2	(Revised) Existing Views (Viewpoints 1A and 1B)	4.3-11	●
4.3-3	(Revised) Existing Views (Viewpoints 1C and 1D).....	4.3-12	●
4.3-4	(Revised) Existing Views (Viewpoints 2A and 2B)	4.3-13	●
4.3-5	(Revised) Existing Views (Viewpoints 2C and 2D).....	4.3-14	●
4.3-6	(Revised) Existing Views (Viewpoints 2E and 2F)	4.3-15	●
4.3-7	(Revised) Existing Views (Viewpoints 3 and 4).....	4.3-16	●
4.3-8	(Revised) Existing Views (Viewpoints 5 and 6).....	4.3-17	●
4.3-9	(Revised) Existing Views (Viewpoints 7 and 8).....	4.3-18	●
4.3-10	(Revised) Existing Views (Viewpoint 9)	4.3-19	●
4.4-1	Census Tracts in the Project Area	4.4-2	
4.6-1	Archaeological Area of Potential Effect	4.6-3	
4.6-2	Historic Resource Area of Potential Effect.....	4.6-4	
4.7-1	Project Study Area.....	4.7-2	
4.7-2	Intersection Volumes and Geometric Configurations – Existing PM Peak Hour	4.7-8	
4.7-3	Existing Transit Network	4.7-13	
4.7-4	Existing Bicycle Network	4.7-20	
4.7-5	Parking Study Area.....	4.7-23	
4.8-1	Noise Monitoring Locations	4.8-8	
4.9-1	Confirmed Complaints Associated with the Southeast Treatment Plant and Predominant Wind Direction in the Project Vicinity	4.9-16	
4.12-1	Recreation Facilities in the Project Area.....	4.12-4	
4.15-1	Serpentine Outcrop Locations	4.15-6	
4.16-1	Regional Fault Map.....	4.16-3	
4.16-2	Seismic Hazard Zones	4.16-6	
5.3-1	(Revised) Proposed Project, 22nd Street Trail, Looking Northeast (Viewpoint 1A)	5.3-8	●
5.3-2	(Revised) Proposed Project, 22 nd Street Trail, Looking Southeast (Viewpoint 1B)	5.3-9	●
5.3-3	(Revised) Proposed Project, 22nd Street Trail, Looking South (Viewpoint 1C)	5.3-11	●
5.3-4	(Revised) Proposed Project, Bench below Tennis Courts, Looking East (Viewpoint 1D)	5.3-12	●
5.3-5	(Revised) Proposed Project, Potrero Hill Recreation Center, Looking South (Viewpoint 2A)	5.3-13	●

- 5.3-6 (Revised) Proposed Project, Potrero Hill Recreation Center, Looking South (Viewpoint 2B).....5.3-14
- 5.3-7 (Revised) Proposed Project, Potrero Hill Recreation Center, Looking South (Viewpoint 2C)5.3-15
- 5.3-8 (Revised) Proposed Project, Potrero Hill Recreation Center, Looking East from Playfields (Viewpoints 2D, 2D, 2F).....5.3-17
- 5.3-9 (Revised) Proposed Project, 23rd Street at Wisconsin Street, Looking East (Viewpoint 3)5.3-25
- 5.3-10 (Revised) Proposed Project, Wisconsin Street at 23rd Street, Looking South (Viewpoint 4)5.3-26
- 5.3-11 (Revised) Proposed Project, 24th Street at Wisconsin Street, Looking East (Viewpoint 5)5.3-28
- 5.3-12 (Revised) Proposed Project, 25th Street at Wisconsin Street, Looking East (Viewpoint 6)5.3-29
- 5.3-13 (Revised) Proposed Project, Wisconsin Street at 25th Street, Looking South (Viewpoint 7)5.3-30
- 5.3-14 (Revised) Proposed Project, Connecticut Street at Cesar Chavez Street, Looking North (Viewpoint 8)5.3-32
- 5.3-15 (Revised) Proposed Project, View from I-280 (Viewpoint 9)5.3-33
- 5.3-16 (Revised) Reduced Development Alternative, Connecticut Street, Looking South (Viewpoint 2)5.3-38
- 5.3-17 (Revised) Reduced Development Alternative, 24th Street at Wisconsin Street, Looking East (Viewpoint 5).....5.3-43
- 5.3-18 (Revised) Reduced Development Alternative, Connecticut Street at Cesar Chavez Street, Looking North (Viewpoint 8).....5.3-45
- 5.3-19 (Revised) Reduced Development Alternative, I-280, Looking Northwest (Viewpoint 9)5.3-46
- 5.7-1 Project Trip Distribution—Inbound (PM Peak Hour)5.7-9
- 5.7-2 Project Trip Distribution—Outbound (PM Peak Hour)5.7-10
- 5.7-3 Intersection Volumes and Geometric Configurations—Existing Plus Project PM Peak Hour (Proposed Project)5.7-28
- 5.7-4 Intersection Volumes and Geometric Configurations—Existing Plus Project PM Peak Hour (Alternative 1)5.7-29
- 5.7-5 New Vehicle and Pedestrian Connections.....5.7-49
- 5.7-6 Planned MUNI Routes5.7-50
- 5.7-7 Construction Emergency Vehicle Access—Proposed Project and Alternative 15.7-78
- 5.7-8 Intersection Volumes and Geometric Configurations—2030 Cumulative PM Peak Hour5.7-96
- 5.7-9 Intersection Volumes and Geometric Configurations—2030 Cumulative Plus Project PM Peak Hour5.7-97
- 5.7-10 Intersection Volumes and Geometric Configurations—2030 Cumulative Plus Project PM Peak Hour (Alternative 1).....5.7-105
- 5.11-1 Project Shadow at Sunrise on September/March 20th5.11-7

5.11-2 Project Shadow at 9:00 a.m. PDT on September/March 20th5.11-8
5.11-3 Project Shadow at 10:00 a.m. PDT on June 21st5.11-9
5.11-4 Project Shadow 9:00 a.m. on December 20th.....5.11-10
5.11-5 Project Shadow 10:00 a.m. on December 20th.....5.11-11
5.11-6 Project Shadow 3:00 p.m. on December 20th.....5.11-12
5.11-7 Project Shadow at Sunrise on December 20th.....5.11-14
5.12-1 Proposed Recreation and Open Space.....5.12-5
5.17-1 Preliminary Stormwater Management Features.....5.17-14

LIST OF TABLES

- S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures 10
- 1-1 Potrero HOPE SF Master Plan Parcels by Assessor’s Parcel Number (APN) 1-4
- 1-2 Existing Residential Units 1-7
- 2-1 Proposed Project Summary Table 2-8
- 2-2 Alternative 1, Reduced Development Alternative, Summary Table 2-20
- 2-3 Proposed Project and Alternatives Comparison Summary Table 2-24
- 4.3-1 List of Figures and Viewpoints 4.3-9
- 4.4-1 Population Trends in San Francisco 2010–2030 4.4-3
- 4.4-2 Household Population and Household Growth in Census Tract 614 and the City and County of San Francisco 2010–2030 4.4-4
- 4.4-3 San Francisco City and County Housing Characteristics 4.4-5
- 4.4-4 ABAG Regional Housing Needs Allocation for San Francisco 4.4-7
- 4.4-5 San Francisco Employment Trends and Projections, 1990–2030 4.4-8
- 4.5-1 Study Area Household Income Statistics 4.5-3
- 4.5-2 Study Area Race and Ethnicity Statistics (Percentage of Population) 4.5-4
- 4.6-1 Properties Evaluated within the APE 4.6-13
- 4.7-1 Existing Intersection Operations – Weekday PM Peak Hour 4.7-9
- 4.7-2 Existing Freeway Segment Operations – Weekday AM and PM Peak Hours 4.7-11
- 4.7-3 Existing Ramp Junction Operations – Weekday PM Peak Hour 4.7-12
- 4.7-4 Nearby Muni Service – Weekday Conditions 4.7-14
- 4.7-5 Muni Route Analysis – Existing Weekday PM Peak Hour 4.7-15
- 4.7-6 Muni Screenline Analysis – Existing Weekday PM Peak Hour 4.7-16
- 4.7-7 Regional Transit Screenline Analysis – Existing Weekday PM Peak Hour 4.7-18
- 4.7-8 San Francisco Bicycle Plan Projects near the Project Site 4.7-21
- 4.7-9 Existing Study Area On-Street Parking Supply and Occupancy – Weekday PM Peak Period 4.7-24
- 4.8-1 Representative Environmental Noise Levels 4.8-3
- 4.8-2 Existing Peak-Hour Traffic Noise Measurements (Leq) 4.8-7
- 4.8-3 Existing Modeled Traffic Noise Levels along Local Roadways 4.8-10
- 4.9-1 Summary of San Francisco Air Quality Monitoring Data Measured at 16th and Arkansas Streets Station (2009–2013) 4.9-2
- 4.9-2 State and Federal Ambient Air Quality Standards and SFBAAB Attainment Status 4.9-6
- 4.9-3 Annual Average Ambient Concentrations of Carcinogenic toxic air contaminants Measured at 16th and Arkansas Streets Station 4.9-10
- 4.13-1 SFPUC Retail Water Demand (mgd) 4.13-3
- 4.13-2 SFPUC Retail Water Supply 4.13-4
- 4.14-1 Existing Classroom Capacity and Enrollment, SFUSD, 2013/2014 4.14-5
- 4.14-2 Existing Classroom Capacity and Enrollment, Schools within the Vicinity of the Project Site, 2013/14 4.14-6
- 4.15-1 Special-Status Plant and Wildlife Species Reported in the Vicinity (Approximately 5 Miles) of the Project Site 4.15-7
- 4.18-1 Summary of Database Review for Potrero Terrace and Potrero Annex 4.18-4

4.18-2 Summary of Database Review for Block X.....4.18-5

5.2-1 Zoning Changes for the Proposed Project and Alternatives.....5.2-2

5.3-1 Existing Residential Units5.3-5 ●

5.3-2 List of Figures and Viewpoints5.3-5 ●

5.7-1 Weekday Daily and PM Peak Hour Trip Generation Rates—Proposed Project and
Reduced Development Alternative5.7-5

5.7-2 Weekday Person-Trip Generation—Proposed Project and Reduced Development
Alternative.....5.7-5

5.7-3 Mode Split of Project-Related Trips.....5.7-6

5.7-4 Trip Generation by Mode—Weekday PM Peak Hour—Proposed Project5.7-7

5.7-5 Trip Distribution Patterns5.7-8

5.7-6 Project Trip Distribution to Study Intersections—PM Peak Hour5.7-11

5.7-7 Delivery/Service Vehicle Trips and Loading Space Demand—Proposed Project and
Reduced Development Alternative5.7-12

5.7-8 Parking Demand—Weekday Evening Peak Period—Proposed Project and Reduced
Development Alternative.....5.7-13

5.7-9 PM Peak Hour Intersection Operations—Existing vs. Existing Plus Project
Conditions.....5.7-30

5.7-10 Existing vs. Existing Plus Project Freeway Segment Operations—Weekday AM and
PM Peak Hours.....5.7-32

5.7-11 Existing vs. Existing Plus Project Ramp Junction Operations—Weekday PM Peak
Hour5.7-35

5.7-12 Existing vs. Existing Plus Project Muni Line-by-Line Analysis—Weekday PM Peak
Hour5.7-37

5.7-13 Existing vs. Existing Plus Project Muni Screenline Analysis—Weekday PM Peak
Hour5.7-42

5.7-14 Existing vs. Existing Plus Project Regional Screenline Analysis—Weekday PM Peak
Hour5.7-44

5.7-15 San Francisco Planning Code Off-Street Parking Requirements.....5.7-89

5.7-16 PM Peak Hour Intersection Operations—2030 Cumulative vs. Cumulative Plus
Project Conditions5.7-98

5.7-17 AM and PM Peak Hour Freeway Segment Operations—2030 Cumulative vs. 2030
Cumulative Plus Project Conditions5.7-109

5.7-18 PM Peak Hour Ramp Junction Operations—2030 Cumulative vs. 2030 Cumulative
Plus Project Conditions5.7-113

5.7-19 Muni Line-by-Line Ridership Analysis—2030 Cumulative vs. Cumulative Plus
Project Weekday PM Peak Hour.....5.7-115

5.7-20 2030 Cumulative vs. Cumulative Plus Project Muni Screenline Analysis—Weekday
PM Peak Hour5.7-119

5.7-21 2030 Cumulative vs. Cumulative Plus Project Regional Transit Screenline Analysis—
Weekday PM Peak Hour.....5.7-122

5.8-1 Summary of Noise Levels Identified as Requisite to Protect Public Health and
Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety.....5.8-1

5.8-2 Groundborne Vibration Impact Criteria for General Assessment5.8-3

5.8-3 Noise Level of Typical Construction Equipment5.8-11

5.8-4 Proposed Project Modeled Traffic Noise Levels along Roadways in the Project Site
Vicinity (dBA).....5.8-15

5.8-5 Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment.....5.8-19

5.8-6 Alternative 1 – Reduced Development Modeled Traffic Noise Levels Along
Roadways in the Project Site Vicinity (dBA).....5.8-23

5.9-1 General Conformity Rule de minimis Thresholds
for the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin5.9-2

5.9-2 Criteria Air Pollutant Significance Thresholds5.9-8

5.9-3a Maximum Daily Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions during Construction5.9-18

5.9-3b Maximum Annual Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions during Construction5.9-19

5.9-4a Mitigated Maximum Daily Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions during Construction.....5.9-21

5.9-4b Mitigated Maximum Annual Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions during Construction5.9-23

5.9-5 Net Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions at Project Buildout.....5.9-28

5.9-6 Existing Cancer Risk and PM2.5 Concentrations5.9-30

5.9-7 Proposed Project Cumulative Risk.....5.9-34

5.9-8 Cumulative PM2.5 Concentrations5.9-35

5.9-9 Mitigated Cumulative PM2.5 Concentrations At Buildout5.9-36

5.9-10 Proposed Project Mitigated Cumulative Risk.....5.9-37

5.9-11 Mitigated Cumulative PM2.5 Concentrations5.9-38

5.9-12a Maximum Daily Alternative 1 Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions During Construction ...5.9-46

5.9-12b Maximum Annual Alternative 1 Criteria
Air Pollutant Emissions During Construction.....5.9-47

5.9-13a Mitigated Maximum Daily Alternative 1 Criteria
Air Pollutant Emissions During Construction.....5.9-48

5.9-13b Mitigated Maximum Annual Alternative 1 Criteria
Air Pollutant Emissions During Construction.....5.9-49

5.9-14 Alternative 1 Net Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions at Project Buildout.....5.9-52

5.9-15 Alternative 1 Cumulative Cancer Risk5.9-54

5.9-16 Alternative 1 Cumulative PM2.5 Concentrations5.9-55

5.9-17 Alternative 1 Mitigated Cumulative PM2.5 Concentrations at Buildout.....5.9-56

5.9-18 Alternative 1 Mitigated Cumulative Risk.....5.9-57

5.9-19 Alternative 1 Mitigated Cumulative PM2.5 Concentrations5.9-58

5.9-20a Maximum Daily Alternative 2 Construction Emissions by Year5.9-62

5.9-20b Maximum Annual Alternative 2 Construction Emissions by Year5.9-62

5.9-21a Maximum Daily Mitigated Alternative 2 Construction Emissions by Year.....5.9-63

5.9-21b Maximum Annual Mitigated Alternative 2 Construction Emissions by Year5.9-64

5.9-22 Alternative 2 Cumulative Cancer Risk5.9-67

5.9-23 Alternative 2 Cumulative PM2.5 Concentrations5.9-68

5.9-24 Alternative 2 Mitigated Cumulative Risk.....5.9-69

5.9-25 Alternative 2 Mitigated Cumulative PM2.5 Concentrations5.9-70

5.10-1 GHG Reductions from the AB 32 Scoping Plan Sectors5.10-6

5.10-2 City Greenhouse Gas Regulations Applicable to the Proposed Project and Alternatives5.10-16 ●

5.10-3 Annual Inventory of Project GHG Emissions5.10-20

5.10-4 Annual Inventory of Alternative 1 GHG Emissions5.10-22

5.10-5 Annual Inventory of Alternative 2 GHG Emissions5.10-24

5.13-1 Proposed Project Water Demand5.13-14

5.14-1 Proposed Project SFUSD Enrollment5.14-6

5.14-2 Schools Near Project Site5.14-7

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS TABLES

2-1 List of Commissioners Commenting on the DEIR/DEIS at the Public Hearing on December 11, 2014.....2-2

2-2 List of Agencies Commenting on the DEIR/DEIS.....2-2

2-3 List of Individuals Commenting on the DEIR/DEIS via Email or Letter2-3

2-4 List of Individuals and Organizations Commenting at the DEIR/DEIS at the Public Hearing on December 11, 2014.....2-4

4.13-1 SFPUC Retail Water Demand (mgd).....3-117

4.13-2 SFPUC Retail Water Supply3-119

5.10-2 City Greenhouse Gas Regulations Applicable to the Proposed Project and Alternatives.....3-123

3-1 Impact Criteria Not Covered Under NEPA in the Draft EIR/EIS3-150

S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures3-152

S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures3-156

S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures3-158

S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures3-184

S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures4-1

S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures4-2

S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures4-3

S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures4-3

S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures4-4

4.3-1 List of Figures and Viewpoint.....4-14

4.13-1 SFPUC Retail Water Demand (mgd).....4-30

4.13-2 SFPUC Retail Water Supply4-32

5.3-1 Existing Residential Units.....4-37

5.3-2 List of Figures and Viewpoints4-37

5.10-2 City Greenhouse Gas Regulations Applicable to the Proposed Project and Alternatives.....4-89 ●

 ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

°F	Fahrenheit
µg/m ³	micrograms per cubic meter
AB	Assembly Bill
AB 1327	California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991
AB 32	Assembly Bill 32
ABAG	Association of Bay Area Governments
AC Transit	Alameda-Contra Costa Transit
ACM	asbestos-containing materials
ACS	American Community Survey
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
ADMP	Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan
ADRP	archaeological data recovery plan
ADT	average daily traffic
AMP	archaeological monitoring program
APE	Area of Potential Effect
APN	Assessor's Parcel Number
ARB	California Air Resources Board
ASD	acceptable separation distance
ATCM	Airborne Toxic Control Measure
ATEC	Assessment Tools for Environmental Compliance
ATP	archaeological testing plan
AWSS	auxiliary water supply system
BAAQMD	Bay Area Air Quality Management District
BART	Bay Area Rapid Transit
Basin Plan	Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay Basin
Bay Area	San Francisco Bay Area
BCDC	Bay Conservation and Development Commission
Bicycle Plan	San Francisco Bicycle Plan
BLIP	Branch Library Improvement Program
BMP	best management practice
BRIDGE Housing	BRIDGE Housing Corporation
Building Code	San Francisco Building Code
BWWFs	Bayside Wet Weather Facilities
C&D	construction and demolition
C-3	Downtown Commercial

CAA	Clean Air Act
CAFE	corporate average fuel economy
Cal/EPA	California Environmental Protection Agency
Cal/OSHA	California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Occupational Safety and Health
CalRecycle	Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CALVENO	California Vehicle Noise Reference Energy Mean Emission Levels
CAP	Clean Air Plan
CBC	California Building Code
CBRS	Coastal Barrier Resources System
CCAA	California Clean Air Act
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CCSF	City and County of San Francisco
CDBG	Community Development Block Grant
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CDMG	California Division of Mines and Geology
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CFW Code	California Fish and Wildlife Code
CGS	California State Geologist
CH ₄	methane
CHP	California Highway Patrol
CHRIS	California Historical Resources Information System
CIP	capital improvement program
City	City of San Francisco
CIWMB	California Integrated Waste Management Board's
CMP	Congestion Management Plan
CNDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level
CNPS	California Native Plant Society
CO	carbon monoxide
CO ₂	carbon dioxide

CO ₂ E	carbon dioxide equivalent
CRHR	California Register of Historic Resources
CSO	combined sewer overflow
CSO Control Policy	Combined Sewer Overflow Control Policy
CUPA	Certified Unified Program Agency
CWA	Clean Water Act
CY	cubic yards
CZMA	Coastal Zone Management Act
dB	decibel
dBA	A-weighted decibels
dBC	C-weighted decibels
DBI	San Francisco Department of Building Inspection
DCDG	Development Controls and Design Guidelines
DCP	Dust Control Plan
DD-60	Deputy Directive 60
Design Guidelines	Design Standards and Guidelines
District 10	Tenth Supervisorial District
DNL	Day/Night Noise Level
DPH	San Francisco Department of Public Health
DPM	diesel particulate matter
DPW	Department of Public Works
DTSC	California Department of Toxic Substances Control
Dust Ordinance	Construction Dust Control Ordinance
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EISA	Energy and Independence Security Act of 2007
EMT	Emergency Medical Technicians
EO	Executive Order
EO 12898	Executive Order 12898
EOC	Emergency Operations Center
ER	Emergency Response Plan
ERO	Environmental Review Officer
ESA	Environmental Site Assessment
ESL	environmental screening level
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
FARR	Final Archaeological Resources Report

FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FESA	federal Endangered Species Act
FFPA	Federal Farmland Protection Act
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FIRMs	Flood Insurance Rate Maps
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
FTA Guidelines	Transit Noise Impact and Vibration Assessment
FY	Fiscal Year
General Plan	San Francisco General Plan
GGNRA	Golden Gate National Recreation Area
GGT	Golden Gate Transit
GHG	greenhouse gas
gpm	gallons per minute
GPR	GreenPoint Rated
GVW	gross vehicle weight
GWh	gigawatt-hours
Harry Tracy WTP	Harry Tracy Water Treatment Plant
HCD	California Department of Housing and Community Development
HEPA	High Efficiency Particulate Air Filter
HFCs	hydrofluorocarbons
HMUPA	Hazardous Materials Unified Program Agency
HOME	Home Investment Partnership Program
HOPE	Housing Opportunities for People Everywhere
HOPE SF	San Francisco Housing Opportunities for People Everywhere SF Program
hp	horsepower
HRE	Historical Resources Evaluation Report
HRER	Historic Resource Evaluation Response
HUD	U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
HVAC	heating, ventilation, and air conditioning
HWCA	Hazardous Waste Control Act
I-280	Interstate 280
I-80	Interstate 80
IBC	International Building Code
in/sec	inch per second

ISCOTT	Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation
Islais Basin	Islais Valley groundwater basin
ITE	Institute of Transportation Engineers
kWh	kilowatt-hours
LBP	lead-based paint
L _{dn}	day-night average sound level
LEED NC	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design-New Construction
LEED®	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design
LEED-ND	Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design-Neighborhood Development
LID	Low Impact Design
L _n	sound levels
LOS	level of service
LUA	Land Use Allocation
LVW	loaded vehicle weight
M	magnitude
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MCS	Motor Coach Standard
MEI	maximally exposed individual
mg/kg	milligrams per kilogram
mgd	million gallons per day
MLD	most likely descendant
MLP	maximum load point
MOD	Mayor's Office of Disability
MOH	Mayor's Office of Housing
MOHCD	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
mpg	miles per gallon
mph	miles per hour
MRZ-4	Mineral Resource Zone 4
msl	mean sea level
MTC	Metropolitan Transportation Commission
MTS	Metropolitan Transportation System
Muni	San Francisco Municipal Railway
MWh	megawatt-hours

MY	model year
N ₂ O	nitrous oxide
NAAQS	national ambient air quality standards
NAG	Noise Assessment Guidelines
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NCRS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NESHAP	National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants
NFPA	National Fire Protection Association
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NHTSA	National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NO ₂	nitrogen dioxide
NOA	naturally occurring asbestos
NOI	Notice of Intent
NOIRROF	Notice of Intent to Request a Release of Funds
NOP	Notice of Preparation
NO _x	nitrogen oxides
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NPPA	Native Plant Protection Act
NPRA	National Park and Recreation Association
NPS	National Park Service
NPWWF	North Point Wet Weather Facility
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NSR	New Source Review
NWIC	Northwest Information Center
OEHHA	Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
OHP	Office of Historic Preservation
OSHA	Occupation Safety and Health Administration
OSP	Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant
P	Public
PA	Programmatic Agreement
PAR	Preliminary Archaeological Review
PCBs	polychlorinated biphenyls
PDR	production, distribution, and repair
PG&E	Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Phase I ESA	Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
PHF	peak hour factor
Plan	Construction Emissions Minimization Plan
Planning Code	San Francisco Planning Code
PM	particulate matter
PM10	10 microns in diameter or less
PM2.5	particulate matter of 2.5 microns in diameter or less
POPOS	privately-owned public open spaces
PPD	per person per day
pphm	parts per hundred million
ppm	parts per million
PPV	peak particle velocity
PRC	Public Resources Code
PSD	Prevention of Significant Deterioration
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RECs	recognized environmental conditions
RFS	Renewable Fuel Standard
RHNA	Regional Housing Needs Allocation
RM	Residential Mixed
RM-2	Residential Mixed Moderate Density District
ROG	reactive organic gases
ROSE	Recreation and Open Space Element
ROWD	report of waste discharge
RPD	Recreation and Park Department
RPP	Residential Parking Permit
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
RWS	Regional Water System
SAAQS	state ambient air quality standards (California)
SAM	Site Assessment & Mitigation Program
SamTrans	San Mateo Transit District
San Francisco Bay RWQCB	San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board
SAR	Sampling and Analysis Report
SB	Senate Bill
SCP	Stormwater Control Plan

SDG	Stormwater Design Guidelines
SEP	Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant
SEWPCP	Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant
sf	square feet
SF Environment	San Francisco Department of the Environment
SFBAAB	San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin
SFBC	San Francisco Building Code
SF-CHAMP	San Francisco County Transportation Authority's Chain Activity Modeling Process
SFDPH	San Francisco Department of Public Health
SFFD	San Francisco Fire Department
SFGBO	San Francisco Green Building Ordinance
SFHA	San Francisco Housing Authority
SFMTA	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority
SFO	San Francisco International Airport
SFPD	San Francisco Police Department
SFPL	San Francisco Public Library
SFPUC	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
SFRPD	San Francisco Recreation and Park Department
SFRWQCB	San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board
SFUSD	San Francisco Unified School District
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SMO	Stormwater Management Ordinance
SMP	Site Management Plan
SO ₂	sulfur dioxide
SRI	Solar Reflectance Index
SS	Sustainable Sites
SSIP	Sewer System Improvement Program
State Water Board	State Water Resources Control Board
SUD	Special Use District
SVWTP	Sunol Valley Water Treatment Plant
SWPCP	Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TAAS	Theoretically Available Annual Sunlight

TACs	Toxic air contaminants
TASC	Transportation Advisory Staff Committee
TAZs	Traffic Analysis Zones
TCP	Transportation Control Plan
TCS	Trolley Coach Standard
TDM	transportation demand management
TEP	Transit Effectiveness Project
TIS	transportation impact study
TMDL	total maximum daily load
TOG	total organic gases
TSCA	Toxic Substances Control Act
TTLC	Total Threshold Limit Concentration
Unified Program	Unified Hazardous Waste and Hazardous Materials Management Regulatory Program
URA	Federal Uniform Relocation Act
US 101	U.S. Highway 101
USC	U.S. Code
USEPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
USEPA Levels	Information on Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USHA	United States Housing Act
UST	underground storage tank
UV	ultraviolet
UWMP	Urban Water Management Plan
VdB	vibration decibels
VDECS	Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy
VOC	volatile organic compounds
vph	vehicles per hour
VRAP	Voluntary Remedial Action Program
WDR	waste discharge requirement
WHO	World Health Organization
WSA	Water Supply Assessment
WSIP	Water System Improvement Program
WWII	World War II

SUMMARY

S.1 INTRODUCTION

This document is a joint Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) prepared for the Potrero HOPE SF Master Plan Project (Proposed Project). This EIR/EIS has been prepared by the San Francisco Planning Department in cooperation with the City of San Francisco's Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), as lead agencies under California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Policy Act¹ (NEPA), respectively. This Draft EIR/EIS is intended to comply with both CEQA and NEPA. See Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR) (the CEQA Guidelines), Section 15222 (*Preparation of Joint Documents*); and Title 40, Sections 1502.25, 1506.2, and 1506.4 of the Code of Federal Regulations (40 CFR 1502.25, 1506.2, 1506.4) (authority for combining federal and state environmental documents). This document analyzes the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Project. This Draft EIR/EIS uses "Proposed Project." The "Proposed Action" under NEPA is identified only after the analysis is complete, which is to say, after each of the proposed alternatives has been analyzed in full. Under NEPA all alternatives are analyzed in full so that the impacts each can be taken into account prior to selecting the "Proposed Action".

The San Francisco Housing for People Everywhere (HOPE) SF Program,² a partnership between the MOHCD and the San Francisco Housing Authority (SFHA), proposes to redevelop the Potrero Terrace and Annex (Potrero) housing developments as a part of its program to revitalize distressed public housing developments in San Francisco. The program, which also includes Hunters View, Sunnydale-Velasco, Westside Courts, and Alice Griffith public housing developments, proposes to replace every housing unit, provide homes for current residents, and add new housing at a variety of income levels. HOPE SF plans to redesign these communities with new buildings, streets, utilities infrastructure, parks, and landscaping. BRIDGE Housing Corporation is the developer and project applicant for Potrero HOPE SF.

In developing the Proposed Project, MOHCD, SFHA, and BRIDGE Housing, in consultation with current residents, neighbors, and neighborhood organizations, determined the appropriate mix of public housing, below market rate, and market rate housing that would best meet the objectives and goals of the HOPE SF program and the San Francisco General Plan policies applicable to the Project site, including the Residence Element and the Showplace Square/Potrero Area Plan.

The Project site is located in the southeastern area of the Potrero Hill neighborhood. The Project site is one and one-half blocks (0.2 miles) west of Interstate 280 (I-280), four blocks east of U.S. Highway

¹ National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321-4347

² Refer to the HOPE SF website for an in-depth description. Available at: <http://hope-sf.org/about.php>.

101 (US 101) (0.4 miles), and two blocks north of Cesar Chavez Street (0.2 miles), and is bordered to the northwest by the Potrero Hill Recreation Center. The eastern edge of the site sits on a ridge paralleling Pennsylvania Street below. As detailed in Chapter 1, *Project Purpose, Need, and Objectives*, the Project site comprises several parcels totaling approximately 39 acres, including roads. Areas of the Project site have very steep slopes. The highest topographic elevation is to the north at the intersection of 23rd Street and Arkansas Street at 265 feet above mean sea level (msl) and the lowest elevation is to the south at the intersection of 26th Street and Connecticut Street at 40 feet above msl.

S.2 PROJECT PURPOSE, NEED, AND OBJECTIVES

The HOPE SF program has identified the need for redevelopment of the Potrero housing developments and has included it as a part of its program to revitalize distressed public housing developments in San Francisco. The Project site is comprised of two of the oldest public housing developments in San Francisco, Potrero Terrace and Potrero Annex, and contains 620 residences³ that are in various stages of physical decay. Together, these public housing developments house a population of approximately 1,280 people, a Family Resource Center, and a child care center. In addition to distressed and deteriorated housing, the development contains dead-end streets and steep topography that isolate residents from the surrounding Potrero Hill neighborhood. The Proposed Project would replace the deteriorated existing housing units and provide new infrastructure and other site improvements.

Objectives are important for the selection and consideration of alternatives under CEQA and NEPA.

To meet this general goal, HOPE SF has identified the following project objectives:

- Implement the City's HOPE SF Initiative and the Showplace Square/Potrero Area Plan;
- Create an economically integrated neighborhood with new public housing units, affordable rental apartments, and market rate and/or rental homes;
- Establish physical and social connections between the Potrero Terrace and Annex Project site and the larger Potrero Hill neighborhood;
- Provide employment opportunities for current public housing residents;
- Provide community facilities, including space for on-site services and programs;
- Create a comprehensive services plan to address gaps in services and facilitate access to existing programs and resources;

³ This Draft EIR/EIS states throughout that there are 620 residential units currently at the Project site. However, 14 of these units are currently used as a childcare center and 606 are currently used for residential purposes. The 606 residential units would be replaced as affordable housing on a one-for-one basis. The remaining 14 units would be replaced in the childcare center in the proposed community center. Thus, the existing uses of all the 620 units would be replaced.

- Build a new 24th Street neighborhood center with a community center, senior housing, and a park;
- Build new safe streets and open spaces;
- Develop as much housing as possible and feasible in buildings that would range from three to six stories tall;
- Provide space for community-serving retail stores;
- Create a financially feasible plan for redevelopment within the constraint of limited availability of public subsidies; and
- Incorporate green and healthy development principles that include:
 - > Green construction and healthy buildings⁴
 - > A walkable neighborhood
 - > Stormwater management
 - > Meet requirements for Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design-Neighborhood Development (LEED-ND)

S.3 TYPE OF EIR/EIS

An EIR/EIS is composed of a draft document known as a Draft EIR/EIS, and the lead agency's written responses to public and public-agency comments on the draft document (a Final EIR/EIS). This Draft EIR/EIS evaluates the potential impacts on the human and natural environment resulting from implementation of the Proposed Project. The Draft EIR/EIS proposes mitigation measures and alternatives that may reduce or avoid adverse impacts. Following public review of this Draft EIR/EIS, a Final EIR/EIS will be prepared, in which the City, as lead agency, will provide responses to comments relating to the analysis provided in the Draft EIR/EIS.

This document is a joint EIR/EIS that complies with both CEQA and NEPA requirements for evaluation of project impacts.

S.4 CEQA/NEPA REQUIREMENTS FOR PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES

The *Project Alternatives and Project Description* chapter of an EIS is critical to evaluating environmental impacts and identifying a "Proposed Project" under NEPA. NEPA requires a

⁴ Healthy building-scale principles include energy-efficient buildings incorporating modern code-compliant materials. This would provide better indoor air quality and facilitate better occupant health. Water conservation measures are also part of meeting environmental goals. Buildings would be integrated with the streetscape and open space system. This would allow for better observation of semi-public and public open space and promote safety of the residents and greater sense of community.

thorough evaluation of the impacts and merits of all project alternatives, so that the “Proposed Action” is identified at the conclusion of the environmental review, after the analysis has been conducted, rather than at the outset. The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations state:

NEPA requires that an EIS must:

“[r]igorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives” and

“[d]evote substantial treatment to each alternative considered in detail including the proposed project so that reviewers may evaluate their comparative merits.”⁵

The EIS must consider and evaluate the no project alternative, identify the environment affected by the proposed project and indicate the direct and indirect effects of the proposed project and each alternative, together with their significance on various environmental values. It must evaluate impacts proportionately with respect to their significance and must consider a range of alternatives that will be considered by MOHCD and by the lead agency in making its decision.⁶

The guiding principles for the content of a project description in an EIR are provided by the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, Section 15124 of the California Code of Regulations [14 CCR Section 15124]). Section 15124 states that “[t]he description of the project shall contain the following information, but should not supply extensive detail beyond that needed for evaluation and review of the environmental impact.” The contents of a project description shall include:

- The precise location and boundaries of the proposed project, preferably on a detailed topographic map, along with the general location of the project on a regional map
- A statement of the objectives sought by the proposed project, including the underlying purpose of the project, designed to assist the lead agency in the formulation of alternatives and preparation of findings or a statement of overriding considerations, if necessary
- A general description of the project’s technical, economic, and environmental characteristics, considering the principal engineering proposals if any and supporting public service facilities
- A statement briefly describing the intended uses of the EIR, including (to the extent the information is known to the lead agency) a list of the agencies that are expected to use the EIR in their decision-making, a list of permits and other approvals required to implement the project, and a list of related environmental review and consultation requirements required by federal, state, or local laws, regulations, or policies

⁵ 40 Code of Federal Regulations 1502.14 (July 1, 2012)

⁶ Environmental impact statements shall serve as the means of assessing the environmental impact of proposed agency actions rather than justifying decisions already made. 40 CFR 1502.2(g).

The Proposed Project and Alternative descriptions summarized below and described in Chapter 2, *Project Alternatives and Project Description*, satisfy the NEPA and CEQA requirements.

S.5 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES AND PROPOSED PROJECT

This document analyzes the potential environmental consequences associated with the Proposed Project, two build alternatives, and the No Project Alternative. The alternatives are described in detail in Chapter 2, *Project Alternatives and Project Description*, and are summarized below.

The Proposed Project would increase the number of dwelling units on the site from 620 to approximately 1,700, an increase of approximately 1,080 residential units. The final number of units is dependent on the unit mix. Of the new units, 606 would be replacement public housing dwelling units, on a one-for-one basis, that would remain affordable housing, subsidized by the San Francisco Housing Authority but under management by, and ownership of, the project applicant or related entities.⁷ Of the additional approximately 1,080 units, 42 percent (approximately 450 units) would be affordable housing while 58 percent (approximately 630 units) would be market rate housing. In total, approximately 63 percent of the Proposed Project would be affordable housing while the remaining 37 percent would be set aside as market rate housing. The Proposed Project would include buildings between three and six stories, and ranging in height from 32 feet to 65 feet.

The proposed density of the Project could be approved through a Height and Map Amendment to change the height and bulk designations for portions of the site that are proposed above 40 feet. In addition, the Proposed Project would require a Special Use District (SUD) to allow the transfer of densities across newly created lots and to allow more retail uses, and a rezoning of the former San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) site, also referred to as Block X, from P to a RM-2 District. The zoning amendment would require Board of Supervisors approval, with recommendation from the Planning Commission. Other entitlement paths are possible to enable the project. Given the length of the buildout period for the Proposed Project, *Design Standards and Guidelines (Design Guidelines)* has been prepared to provide further description and design controls for the Proposed Project and would become an exhibit to the SUD.

Up to 15,000 square feet (sf) of ground-floor, neighborhood-serving retail or flex space⁸ would be developed along 24th Street between Arkansas Street and Missouri Street. The Proposed Project would also include a Community Center and public and private open space throughout the Project

⁷ This Draft EIR/EIS states throughout that there are 620 units at the Project site. Due to a change in the use of units (i.e., formerly residential units being used for daycare), there are currently 606 units available for occupancy at the Project site. The analysis in this Draft EIR/EIS assumes that 620 residential units are present.

⁸ Areas defined as flex space would ideally be used for retail and commercial uses. However, if demand is low for retail and commercial uses, then flex space would also allow active live/work use.

site. The Community Center, which would include daycare and preschool facilities, would be located on 24th Street between Arkansas Street and Missouri Street and would be up to 35,000 sf in size.

The Proposed Project would include approximately 1,055 off-street parking spaces, primarily within underground or structured parking garages. Of the proposed parking spaces, 45 would be handicap accessible. In addition, the Proposed Project would include approximately 600 unmetered on-street parking spaces.

Alternative 1 – Reduced Development Alternative

Alternative 1 would retain the same development footprint as the Proposed Project; however, the maximum building heights in this alternative would not exceed 40 feet. Thus, compared to the Proposed Project, fewer housing units would be developed if this alternative is implemented. Alternative 1 would develop up to 1,280 residential units, including up to 80 affordable senior units, up to 796 affordable units (including 620 replacement public housing units), and up to 404 market rate units.

Similar to the Proposed Project, the proposed density of Alternative 1 could be approved through a Height and Map Amendment to change the height and bulk designations for portions of the site. In addition, Alternative 1 would require a SUD to allow the transfer of densities across newly created lots and to allow more retail uses, and a rezoning of the former SFUSD site, also referred to as Block X, from P to a RM-2 District.

Alternative 2 – Housing Replacement Alternative

As part of Alternative 2, all existing housing units at the Project site would be demolished and rebuilt using the same building pattern that currently exists. The existing site plan and street pattern at the Project site would be retained. As such, this alternative would reconstruct the existing affordable housing units at the Project site, a 35-space preschool center, a 15-space child day care center, and associated residential parking facilities. Secured bicycle parking would be provided at the ground floor of each reconstructed residential building at or near building entrances. Other amenities provided under the Proposed Project, such as additional parks, retail facilities, and the Community Center, would not be provided as part of this alternative. Parking would remain the same with approximately 1,301 on-street parking spaces and 64 off-street parking spaces. Other amenities provided under the Proposed Project, such as additional parks, retail facilities, and the Community Center, would not be provided as part of this alternative.

Alternative 3 – No Project Alternative

Alternative 3 would analyze the continuation of uses on the site; therefore, existing buildings and tenants would remain at the Project site and no new buildings or uses would be constructed.

S.6 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The impact analysis of the Proposed Project and alternatives are discussed in Chapter 5, *Environmental Consequences*. Table S-1 summarizes the Proposed Project and alternatives impacts and mitigation measures.

S.7 SCOPE AND AREAS OF KNOWN CONTROVERSY

S.7.1 Scoping Process

On November 10, 2010, the Planning Department in compliance with CEQA and its CEQA procedures, issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) to prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Report (see Appendix 1). Individuals and agencies that received these notices included: all occupants of the Potrero Terrace and Annex housing developments; owners of properties within 300 feet of the Project site; owners and tenants of properties adjacent to the Project site; other potentially interested parties, including various regional and state agencies; and neighborhood organizations. A scoping meeting was held on November 22, 2010. The scoping meeting provided the public and affected governmental agencies with an opportunity to present their environmental concerns regarding the Proposed Project.

In July 2011, in accordance with applicable NEPA requirements, the MOHCD determined that the Proposed Project would have potentially significant and unavoidable operational and cumulative traffic impacts and, thus, an EIS would be required. On May 2, 2012, HUD issued a notice of intent (NOI) to prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (see Appendix 1) to inform agencies and the general public that a joint EIR/EIS was being prepared and invited comments on the scope and content of the document. The NOI provided contact information for City staff responsible for the NOI, and stated that a public scoping meeting would be held no less than 15 days following publication of the NOI. The scoping meeting held on May 17, 2012 provided the public and affected governmental agencies with an opportunity to present their environmental concerns regarding the Proposed Project.

Concerns that arose during the CEQA and NEPA scoping process are summarized in Section 1.5.2 of this chapter and can be found in Appendix 1. The comments made during the NOP and NOI scoping periods that pertain to potential environmental impacts and analysis are addressed in this Draft EIR/EIS.

As stated in the NOP and NOI, the Proposed Project could result in potentially significant environmental effects. As required by CEQA and NEPA, this Draft EIR/EIS will examine those effects, identify potential mitigation measures, and analyze whether proposed mitigation measures would reduce the environmental effects to a less-than-significant level. This Draft EIR/EIS will also present an analysis of alternatives to the Proposed Project that may reduce or eliminate one or more of the potential impacts of the Proposed Project. This Draft EIR/EIS will analyze the environmental

issues listed below. For each impact area, this Draft EIR/EIS will identify whether the subject area is analyzed for CEQA or NEPA purposes or both and if both, any differences in significance criteria applied under CEQA and NEPA.

- Land Use and Land Use Planning
- Visual Quality/Aesthetics
- Socioeconomics and Community
- Environmental Justice
- Cultural and Paleontological Resources
- Transportation and Circulation
- Noise
- Air Quality
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Wind and Shadow
- Recreation
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Public Services
- Biological Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral and Energy Resources
- Agricultural and Forest Resources

S.7.2 Changes to CEQA – Senate Bill 743

On September 27, 2013, Governor Brown signed Senate Bill (SB) 743, which became effective on January 1, 2014. Among other provisions, SB 743 added Section 21099 to the Public Resources Code (PRC) and eliminated the analysis of aesthetics and parking impacts for certain urban infill projects under CEQA. The Proposed Project meets the definition of a mixed-use residential project on an infill site within a transit priority area as specified by Section 21099. Accordingly, this document does not provide CEQA conclusions regarding aesthetics and parking, which can no longer be considered in determining the significance of the Proposed Project’s physical environmental effects under CEQA. Implementation of SB 743 was subsequent to the publication of the NOP, which had indicated that the EIR would include a discussion of aesthetics- and parking-related impacts of the Proposed Project. However, since the Proposed Project is subject to NEPA, comments submitted on the NOI relating to aesthetics and parking impacts are addressed in Sections 5.3, *Visual Quality/Aesthetics* and 5.7, *Transportation and Circulation*, and NEPA conclusions are provided.

S.7.3 Areas of Known Controversy and Issues to be Resolved

This Draft EIR/EIS assesses the Proposed Project’s contribution to land use changes at the Potrero Terrace and Annex housing developments. It also evaluates the public’s concerns raised during the scoping period. Issues raised during the scoping period included the following:

- Preservation of mature trees.
- Reduction or changes in open space.
- Location of affordable housing in relation to market rate housing.

- Preservation of the vistas for all neighborhood residents and overall aesthetics of the new development.
- Soil stability after gradation or development of the site.
- Increased noise from more people and traffic.
- Increased vehicular traffic.
- Safety.
- Vehicle parking.
- Displacement of residents during construction phase.

The Draft EIR/EIS addresses these concerns by analyzing the potential impacts and proposing mitigation measures, where needed, to minimize and avoid potential impacts to aesthetics, biological resources, geology and soils, population and housing, recreation, noise, transportation and safety. Refer to Appendix 1 for NOP and NOI comments.

[THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
Impacts/Effects	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative	Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative	Alternative 3: No Project Alternative	Mitigation Measures
5.2 Land Use and Planning					
Impact LU 1: Effects Related to Physical Division					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not physically divide an established community.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: This impact criterion is not applicable under NEPA. Please see Section 5.4, <i>Socioeconomics and Community</i> , for an analysis of socioeconomic effects related to physical barriers of a particular group.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Impact LU 2: Effects Related to Plan Consistency					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not be inconsistent with applicable land use plans and policies.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	n/a
Impact LU 3: Effects on Existing Character					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not have an adverse impact on the existing land use character of the Project site and vicinity.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not be incompatible with surrounding development.	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	Less than Significant	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
<i>Impacts/Effects</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>
Impact C-LU-1: Cumulative Effects on Land Use					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant adverse cumulative land use impacts.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant adverse cumulative land use impacts.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	n/a
5.3 Aesthetics					
● Impact AE-1: Effects on Scenic Views					
CEQA: This topic is not applicable under CEQA for the Proposed Project.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not block or disrupt views of scenic resources or reduce public opportunities to view scenic resources.	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	n/a
Impact AE-2: Effects on Visual Character during Construction					
CEQA: This topic is not applicable under CEQA for the Proposed Project.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would potentially introduce elements that are out of character or scale with the existing physical environment or detract from the aesthetic appeal of the surrounding area during construction.	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	No Impact	Improvement Measure IM-AE-2a – Construction Period Screening and Cleaning

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
Impacts/Effects	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative	Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative	Alternative 3: No Project Alternative	Mitigation Measures
Impact AE-3: Effects on Visual Character during Operation					
CEQA: This topic is not applicable under CEQA for the Proposed Project.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not introduce elements that are out of character or scale with the existing physical environment or that detract from the aesthetic appeal of the surrounding area during operation.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	n/a
Impact AE-4: Alteration of the Land Form or Existing Features					
CEQA: This topic is not applicable under CEQA for the Proposed Project.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not substantially alter the land form or demonstrably destroy or alter the natural or man-made features.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	n/a
Impact AE-5: Conformance to Locally Adopted Design Guidelines					
CEQA: This topic is not applicable under CEQA for the Proposed Project.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would conform to locally adopted design guidelines.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	n/a
Impact C-AE-1: Aesthetics Cumulative Impact					
CEQA: This topic is not applicable under CEQA for the Proposed Project.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
<i>Impacts/Effects</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>
NEPA: The Proposed Project and its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact related to aesthetics.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	n/a
5.4 Socioeconomics and Community					
Impact SC 1: Displacement Effects					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would temporarily displace existing housing units and residents, but this displacement would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not result in permanent displacement of existing residents or businesses.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
Impact SC 2: Effects on Growth					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not induce substantial population growth, either directly or indirectly.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not induce a substantial amount of unplanned growth.	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
Impact SC 3: Physical Barrier Effects					
CEQA: This topic is not covered under CEQA. Please see Section 5.2, <i>Land Use and Land Use Planning</i> , for an analysis of land use effects related to physical division of an established community.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
Impacts/Effects	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative	Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative	Alternative 3: No Project Alternative	Mitigation Measures
NEPA: The Proposed Project would not result in physical barriers or reduced access that would isolate a particular neighborhood or population group.	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
Impact SC 4: Employment Effects					
CEQA: This topic is not covered under CEQA.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not cause a decrease in local or regional employment.	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
Impact C-SC-1: Cumulative Impacts to Socioeconomics, Population, and Housing					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant adverse cumulative population and housing impacts.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, not would result in significant adverse cumulative socioeconomics impacts.	Less then Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	n/a
5.5 Environmental Justice					
Impact EJ-1: Socioeconomic Effects					
CEQA: This topic is not covered under CEQA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
Impacts/Effects	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative	Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative	Alternative 3: No Project Alternative	Mitigation Measures
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives could result in substantial environmental impacts that would disproportionately affect low-income and minority populations.	Construction: Less than Significant. Operation: Beneficial	Beneficial	Beneficial	Significant and Unavoidable	Mitigation Measures M-AQ-4, M-AQ-2a, M-AQ-2b, M-NO-1a, M-NO-1b; and M-HZ-2.1 through M-HZ-2.4. See below for more detailed information on these Mitigation Measures.
Impact C-EJ-1: Cumulative Impacts to Socioeconomics					
CEQA: This topic is not covered under CEQA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project and its alternatives, would result in a beneficial cumulative socioeconomic impact that affects low-income and minority populations	Beneficial	Beneficial	Beneficial	Beneficial	n/a
5.6 Cultural and Paleontological Resources					
Impact CP-1: Effects on Historical Resources					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5, including those resources listed in Article 10 or Article 11 of the <i>San Francisco Planning Code</i> .	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not have an adverse effect on an historic-era district, site, building, structure, or object listed in, or eligible for listing in, the NRHP maintained by the U.S. Secretary of the Interior.	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
Impacts/Effects	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative	Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative	Alternative 3: No Project Alternative	Mitigation Measures
Impact CP-2: Effects on Archaeological Resources					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	No Impact	Mitigation Measure M-CP-2a – Archaeological Resource Discovery, M-CP-2b – Archaeological Monitoring Program.
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives could have an effect on a prehistoric-era district, site, building, structure, or object listed in, or eligible for listing in, the NRHP maintained by the U.S. Secretary of the Interior	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	No Impact	Mitigation Measure M-CP-2a – Archaeological Resource Discovery, M-CP-2b – Archaeological Monitoring Program.
Impact CP-3: Effects on Paleontological Resources					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	No Impact	Mitigation Measure M-CP-3a – Discovery of Paleontological Resources
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Mitigation Measure M-CP-3a – Discovery of Paleontological Resources
Impact CP-4: Effects on Human Remains					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	No Impact	Mitigation Measure M-CP-2a – Archaeological Resource Discovery

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
Impacts/Effects	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative	Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative	Alternative 3: No Project Alternative	Mitigation Measures
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives could have a significant impact on historic-era or prehistoric-era human remains eligible for listing in the NRHP maintained by the U.S. Secretary of the Interior.	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	No Impact	Mitigation Measure M-CP-2a – Archaeological Resource Discovery
Impact CP-5: Effects on Consistency with Cultural Resources Management Plans					
CEQA: This topic is not covered under CEQA.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not be inconsistent with established management plans and agreements for cultural resources, including the 2007 PA.	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	No Impact	Mitigation Measure M-CP-2a – Archaeological Resource Discovery
Impact C-CP-1: Cumulative Effects on Historic Archaeological Resources					
CEQA: The Proposed Project and its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a significant adverse cumulative impact related to historic architectural resources.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project and its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a significant adverse cumulative impact on historic architectural resources.	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
Impacts/Effects	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative	Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative	Alternative 3: No Project Alternative	Mitigation Measures
Impact C-CP-2: Cumulative Effects on Paleontological Resources					
CEQA: The Proposed Project and its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, could result in a significant cumulative impact related to archaeological resources.	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Mitigation Measure M-CP-2a – Archaeological Resource Discovery
NEPA: The Proposed Project and its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, could result in a significant cumulative impact related to archaeological resources.	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Mitigation Measure M-CP-2a – Archaeological Resource Discovery
Impact C-CP-3: Cumulative Effects on Paleontological Resources					
CEQA: The Proposed Project and its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, could result in a significant cumulative impact related to paleontological resources.	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Mitigation Measure M-CP-2a – Archaeological Resource Discovery
NEPA: The Proposed Project and its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, could result in a significant cumulative impact related to paleontological resources.	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Mitigation Measure M-CP-2a – Archaeological Resource Discovery
Impact C-CP-4: Cumulative Effects on Human Remains					
CEQA: The Proposed Project and its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, could result in a significant cumulative impact related to human remains resources.	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Mitigation Measure M-CP-2a – Archaeological Resource Discovery

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
<i>Impacts/Effects</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>
NEPA: The Proposed Project and its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, could result in a significant cumulative impact related to human remains resources.	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Mitigation Measure M-CP-2a – Archaeological Resource Discovery
5.7 Transportation and Circulation					
Impact TR-1(a): Effects on Levels of Service					
CEQA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would not cause levels of service at local intersections to deteriorate, and would therefore not conflict with any applicable congestion management programs, plans, ordinances, or policies establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system at those locations.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would not result in the deterioration in LOS to a significant extent.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a
Impact TR-1(b): Effects on Level of Service					
CEQA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would not cause levels of service at local intersections to deteriorate, and would therefore not conflict with any applicable congestion management programs, plans, ordinances, or policies establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system at those locations.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
Impacts/Effects	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative	Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative	Alternative 3: No Project Alternative	Mitigation Measures
NEPA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would not result in the deterioration in LOS to a significant extent.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
Impact TR-2(b): Effects on Freeway Segments					
CEQA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would not result in the deterioration of LOS or contribute substantial traffic volumes to a freeway ramp.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project and Reduced Development Alternative would not result in the deterioration of LOS or contribute substantial traffic volumes to a freeway segment.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a
Impact TR-2(b): Effects on Freeway Segments					
CEQA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would not result in the deterioration of LOS or contribute substantial traffic volumes to a freeway ramp.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would not result in the deterioration of LOS or contribute substantial traffic volumes to a freeway segment.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
Impacts/Effects	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative	Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative	Alternative 3: No Project Alternative	Mitigation Measures
Impact TR-3(a): Effects on Freeway Ramps					
CEQA: The Proposed Project and Reduced Development Alternative would not result in the deterioration of LOS at freeway ramp junctions.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project and Reduced Development Alternative would not result in the deterioration of LOS or contribute substantial traffic volumes to a freeway ramp.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a
Impact TR-3(b): Effects on Freeway Ramps					
CEQA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and No Project Alternative would not result in the deterioration of LOS or contribute substantial traffic volumes to a freeway ramp.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and No Project Alternative would not result in the deterioration of LOS or contribute substantial traffic volumes to a freeway ramp.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
Impact TR-4(a): Effects on Transit Capacity – Muni 10 Townsend Line					
CEQA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would increase ridership on the Muni 10 Townsend line, which would result in an exceedance of Muni's 85 percent capacity utilization threshold.	Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation	Significant and Unavoidable	—	—	Mitigation Measure M-TR-4 – Fair-Share Contribution to Improve 10 Townsend Line Capacity (Proposed Project and Reduced Development Alternative Only)
NEPA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would substantially increase transit demand that could not be accommodated by transit capacity.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
Impacts/Effects	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative	Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative	Alternative 3: No Project Alternative	Mitigation Measures
Impact TR-4(b): Effects on Transit Capacity – Muni 10 Polk and 48 Quintara-24 th Street Lines					
CEQA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would not increase ridership on the Muni 19 Polk and 48 Quintara-24 th Street lines, which would not result in an exceedance of Muni's 85 percent capacity utilization threshold.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would not substantially increase transit demand that could not be accommodated by transit capacity.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a
Impact TR-4(c): Effects on Transit Capacity – Muni 19 Polk, 10 Townsend, and 48 Quintara-24 th Street Lines					
CEQA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would not increase ridership on Muni 19 Polk, 10 Townsend, and 48 Quintara-24 th Street lines, which would not result in an exceedance of Muni's 85 percent capacity utilization threshold.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would not substantially increase transit demand that could not be accommodated by transit capacity.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
<i>Impacts/Effects</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>
Impact TR-5(a): Effects on Screenline Ridership					
CEQA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would result in a minimal increase in Muni Southeast screenline ridership and would not result in an exceedance of capacity utilizations.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would result in a minimal increase in Muni Southeast screenline ridership and would not result in an exceedance of capacity utilizations.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a
Impact TR-5(b): Effects of Screenline Ridership					
CEQA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would result in a minimal increase in Muni Southeast screenline ridership and would not result in an exceedance of capacity utilizations.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would result in a minimal increase in Muni Southeast screenline ridership and would not result in an exceedance of capacity utilizations.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
Impact TR-6(a): Effects on Screenline Ridership					
CEQA: The Proposed Project and Reduced Development Alternative would result in a minimal increase in regional screenline ridership and would not result in an exceedance of capacity utilizations.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
Impacts/Effects	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative	Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative	Alternative 3: No Project Alternative	Mitigation Measures
NEPA: The Proposed Project and Reduced Development Alternative would result in a minimal increase in regional screenline ridership and would not result in an exceedance of capacity utilizations.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a
Impact TR-6(b): Effects on Screenline Ridership					
CEQA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would result in a minimal increase in regional screenline ridership and would not result in an exceedance of capacity utilizations.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
Impact TR-7(a): Effects on Transit Operations					
NEPA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would result in a minimal increase in regional screenline ridership and would not result in an exceedance of capacity utilizations.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
CEQA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would not affect Muni operations due to underground parking driveway placement in the Project site.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would not affect Muni operations due to underground parking driveway placement in the Project site.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
<i>Impacts/Effects</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>
Impact TR-7(b): Effects on Transit Operations					
CEQA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would not affect Muni operations due to underground parking driveway placement in the Project site.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would not affect Muni operations due to underground parking driveway placement in the Project site.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
Impact TR-8(a): Effects on Street Network					
CEQA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would modify the existing street network within the Project site, resulting in rerouting of the 10 Townsend, 19 Polk, and 48 Quintara-24 th Street Muni lines.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would modify the existing street network within the Project site, resulting in rerouting of the 10 Townsend, 19 Polk, and 48 Quintara-24 th Street Muni lines.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a
Impact TR 8(b): Effects on Street Network					
CEQA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would not modify the existing street network within the Project site and, therefore, would not result in the rerouting of the 10 Townsend, 19 Polk, and 48 Quintara-24 th Street Muni lines.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
Impacts/Effects	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative	Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative	Alternative 3: No Project Alternative	Mitigation Measures
NEPA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would not modify the existing street network within the Project site and, therefore, would not result in the rerouting of the 10 Townsend, 19 Polk, and 48 Quintara-24 th Street Muni lines.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
Impact TR-9(a): Effects on Bus Stops					
CEQA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would modify the existing street network, resulting in relocation of bus stops for 10 Townsend, 19 Polk, and 48 Quintara-24 th Street Muni lines within the Project site.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would modify the existing street network, resulting in relocation of bus stops for 10 Townsend, 19 Polk, and 48 Quintara-24 th Street Muni lines within the Project site.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a
Impact TR 9(b): Effects on Bus Stops					
CEQA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would not modify the existing street network and, therefore, would not result in the relocation of bus stops for 10 Townsend, 19 Polk, and 48 Quintara-24 th Street Muni lines within the Project site.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
<i>Impacts/Effects</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>
NEPA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would not modify the existing street network and, therefore, would not result in the relocation of bus stops for 10 Townsend, 19 Polk, and 48 Quintara-24 th Street Muni lines within the Project site.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
Impact TR-10(a): Effects on Pedestrian Facilities					
CEQA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would increase the demand for additional pedestrian facilities.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would increase the demand for additional pedestrian facilities.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a
Impact TR-10(b): Effects on Pedestrian Facilities					
CEQA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would not increase the demand for additional pedestrian facilities.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would not increase the demand for additional pedestrian facilities.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
Impact TR-11(a): Effects on Bicycle Facilities					
CEQA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would result in the demand for new bicycle parking spaces and additional bicycle routes.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
Impacts/Effects	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative	Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative	Alternative 3: No Project Alternative	Mitigation Measures
NEPA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would result in the demand for new bicycle parking spaces and additional bicycle routes.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a
Impact TR-11(b): Effects on Bicycle Facilities					
The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would not result in the demand for new bicycle parking spaces and additional bicycle routes.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would not result in the demand for new bicycle parking spaces and additional bicycle routes.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
Impact TR-12(a): Effects on Loading					
CEQA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would include activities that would increase loading space demand.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would include activities that would increase loading space demand.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a
Impact TR-12(b): Effects on Loading					
CEQA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would not include activities that would increase loading space demand.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
<i>Impacts/Effects</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>
NEPA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would not include activities that would increase loading space demand.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
Impact TR-13(a): Effects on Circulation					
CEQA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would modify the Project site circulation network and connections to the existing off-site roadway network, but this would not adversely affect emergency access.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would modify the Project site circulation network and connections to the existing off-site roadway network, but this would not adversely affect emergency access.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a
Impact TR-13(b): Effects on Circulation					
CEQA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would retain the existing Project site circulation network and connections to the existing off-site roadway network.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would retain the existing Project site circulation network and connections to the existing off-site roadway network.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
Impacts/Effects	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative	Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative	Alternative 3: No Project Alternative	Mitigation Measures
Impact TR-14(a): Construction Effects on Circulation					
CEQA: The Proposed Project, the Reduced Development Alternative, and the Housing Replacement Alternative would involve extensive construction over several years that could result in the following temporary conditions: street closures and detours, rerouting of Muni lines and bus stops, and sidewalk closures.	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	—	Mitigation Measure M-TR-14 – Construction Traffic Control Plan (Proposed Project, Reduced Development Alternative, and Housing Replacement Alternative)
NEPA: The Proposed Project, the Reduced Development Alternative, and the Housing Replacement Alternative would involve extensive construction over several years that could result in the following temporary conditions: street closures and detours, rerouting of Muni lines and bus stops, and sidewalk closures.	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	—	Mitigation Measure M-TR-14 – Construction Traffic Control Plan (Proposed Project, Reduced Development Alternative, and Housing Replacement Alternative)
Impact TR-14(b): Construction Effects on Circulation					
CEQA: The No Project Alternative would not involve construction over several years that could result in the following temporary conditions: street closures and detours, rerouting of Muni lines and bus stops, and sidewalk closures.	—	—	—	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The No Project Alternative would not involve construction over several years that could result in the following temporary conditions: street closures and detours, rerouting of Muni lines and bus stops, and sidewalk closures.	—	—	—	No Impact	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
<i>Impacts/Effects</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>
Impact TR-15(a): Effects on Parking					
CEQA: This topic is not covered under CEQA.	n/a	n/a	—	—	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would provide parking consistent with local planning requirements.	No Impact	No Impact	—	—	n/a
Impact TR-15(b): Effects on Parking					
CEQA: This topic is not covered under CEQA.	—	—	n/a	n/a	n/a
NEPA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would provide parking consistent with local planning requirements.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
Impact TR-16(a): Effects on Site Access and On-Site Circulation					
CEQA: The newly constructed roadway network associated with the Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would effectively connect the local roadway system, but could impact internal circulation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	—	—	Mitigation Measure M-TR-16 – Design of Bulb-Outs and Driveways (Proposed Project, Reduced Development Alternative, and Housing Replacement Alternative)
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	—	—	Mitigation Measure M-TR-16 – Design of Bulb-Outs and Driveways (Proposed Project, Reduced Development Alternative, and Housing Replacement Alternative)

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
Impacts/Effects	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative	Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative	Alternative 3: No Project Alternative	Mitigation Measures
Impact TR-16(b): Effects on Site Access and On-Site Circulation					
CEQA: With the Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative the existing roadway would remain, therefore; would not result in an impact to internal circulation.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: With the Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative the existing roadway would remain, therefore; would not result in an impact to internal circulation.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
Impact C-TR-1(a): 2030 Cumulative Impacts					
CEQA: The Proposed Project and its alternatives would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to delay exceedances at intersection #2—Cesar Chavez Street/ Pennsylvania Avenue/Northbound I-280 Off-Ramp.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to delay exceedances at intersection #2—Cesar Chavez Street/Pennsylvania Avenue/Northbound I-280 Off-Ramp.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
<i>Impacts/Effects</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>
Impact C-TR-1(b): CEQA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to delay exceedances at four intersections: #3 – Pennsylvania Avenue/SB I-280 Off-Ramp, #4 – 25 th Street/Indiana Street/NB I-280 On-Ramp, #12 – Cesar Chavez Street/Vermont Street and #13 – Cesar Chavez Street/US 101 Off-Ramp.	Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation	Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation	—	—	<p>Mitigation Measure C-M-TR-1a – Pennsylvania Avenue/Southbound I 280 Off-Ramp Traffic Signal (Proposed Project and Reduced Development Alternative Only)</p> <p>Mitigation Measure C-M-TR-1b – 25th Street/Indiana Street/Northbound I 280 On-Ramp Eastbound Approach Turn Lane Modification or Traffic Signal (Proposed Project Only)</p> <p>Mitigation Measure C-M-TR-1c – Cesar Chavez Street/Vermont Street Intersection Traffic Signal (Proposed Project and Reduced Development Alternative Only)</p> <p>Mitigation Measure C-M-TR-1d – Cesar Chavez Street/U.S. 101 Off-Ramp Traffic Signal (Proposed Project and Reduced Development Alternative Only)</p>

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
Impacts/Effects	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative	Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative	Alternative 3: No Project Alternative	Mitigation Measures
<p>NEPA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to delay exceedances at four intersections: #3 – Pennsylvania Avenue/SB I-280 Off-Ramp, #4 – 25th Street/Indiana Street/NB I-280 On-Ramp, #12 – Cesar Chavez Street/Vermont Street and #13 – Cesar Chavez Street/US 101 Off-Ramp.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</p>			<p>Mitigation Measure C-M-TR-1a – Pennsylvania Avenue/Southbound I 280 Off-Ramp Traffic Signal (Proposed Project and Reduced Development Alternative Only)</p>
					<p>Mitigation Measure C-M-TR-1b – 25th Street/Indiana Street/Northbound I 280 On-Ramp Eastbound Approach Turn Lane Modification or Traffic Signal (Proposed Project Only)</p>
					<p>Mitigation Measure C-M-TR-1c – Cesar Chavez Street/Vermont Street Intersection Traffic Signal (Proposed Project and Reduced Development Alternative Only)</p>
					<p>Mitigation Measure C-M-TR-1d – Cesar Chavez Street/U.S. 101 Off-Ramp Traffic Signal (Proposed Project and Reduced Development Alternative Only)</p>

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
<i>Impacts/Effects</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>
Impact C-TR-1(c): 2030 Cumulative Effects					
CEQA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to delay exceedances at Project study intersections.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to delay exceedances at Project study intersections.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
Impact C-TR-2(a): 2030 Cumulative Effects on LOS					
CEQA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to LOS F conditions in the PM peak hour at the Northbound I-280 (north of Indiana Street On-Ramp) freeway segment.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to LOS F conditions in the PM peak hour at the Northbound I-280 (north of Indiana Street On-Ramp) freeway segment.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
Impacts/Effects	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative	Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative	Alternative 3: No Project Alternative	Mitigation Measures
Impact C-TR-2(b): 2030 Cumulative Effects on LOS					
CEQA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to LOS F conditions in the PM peak hour at the Northbound I-280 (north of Indiana Street On-Ramp) freeway segment.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to LOS F conditions in the PM peak hour at the Northbound I-280 (north of Indiana Street On-Ramp) freeway segment.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
Impact C-TR-3(a): 2030 Cumulative Effects on Freeways					
CEQA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to freeway ramp junction operations.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to freeway ramp junction operations.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a
Impact C-TR-3(b): 2030 Cumulative Effects on Freeways					
CEQA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to freeway ramp junction operations	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
Impacts/Effects	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative	Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative	Alternative 3: No Project Alternative	Mitigation Measures
NEPA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to freeway ramp junction operations	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
Impact C-TR-4(a): 2030 Cumulative Effects on Transit Capacity					
CEQA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to capacity utilization exceedances on the 10 Townsend and 48 Quintara-24 th Street Muni lines.	Significant and Unavoidable	Significant and Unavoidable	—	—	Mitigation Measure M-TR-4 – Fair-Share Contribution to Improve 10 Townsend Line Capacity (Proposed Project and Reduced Development Alternative Only)
NEPA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to capacity utilization exceedances on the 10 Townsend and 48 Quintara-24 th Street Muni lines.	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	—	—	Mitigation Measure M-TR-4 – Fair-Share Contribution to Improve 10 Townsend Line Capacity (Proposed Project and Reduced Development Alternative Only)
Impact C-TR-4(b): 2030 Cumulative Effects on Transit Capacity					
CEQA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to capacity utilization exceedances on the 10 Townsend and 48 Quintara-24 th Street Muni lines.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to capacity utilization exceedances on the 10 Townsend and 48 Quintara-24 th Street Muni lines.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
<i>Impacts/Effects</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>
Impact C-TR-5(a): 2030 Cumulative Effects on Municipal Screenline Capacity					
CEQA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to capacity utilization exceedances on Muni Southeast screenline.	Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation	Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation	—	—	Mitigation Measure C-M-TR-5 – Fair-Share Contribution for Southeast Screenline Improvements (Proposed Project and Reduced Development Alternative Only)
NEPA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to capacity utilization exceedances on Muni Southeast screenline.	Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation	Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation	—	—	Mitigation Measure C-M-TR-5 – Fair-Share Contribution for Southeast Screenline Improvements (Proposed Project and Reduced Development Alternative Only)
Impact C-TR-5(b): 2030 Cumulative Effects on Municipal Screenline Capacity					
CEQA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to capacity utilization exceedances on Muni Southeast Screenline.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to capacity utilization exceedances on Muni Southeast Screenline.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
<i>Impacts/Effects</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>
Impact C-TR-6(a): 2030 Cumulative Effects on Regional Screenline Capacity					
CEQA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would not result in a substantial contribution to capacity utilization of regional transit screenline providers.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative would not result in a substantial contribution to capacity utilization of regional transit screenline providers.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a
Impact C-TR-6(b): 2030 Cumulative Effects on Regional Screenline Capacity					
CEQA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would not result in a substantial contribution to capacity utilization of regional transit screenline providers.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Housing Replacement Alternative and the No Project Alternative would not result in a substantial contribution to capacity utilization of regional transit screenline providers.	—	—	No Impact	No Impact	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
Impacts/Effects	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative	Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative	Alternative 3: No Project Alternative	Mitigation Measures
5.8 Noise					
Impact NO 1: Exposure of Persons to or Generation of Noise Levels in Excess of Standards					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not result in exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.	Construction: Less than Significant with Mitigation; Operation: Less than Significant	Construction: Less than Significant with Mitigation; Operation: Less than Significant	Construction: Less than Significant with Mitigation; Operation: Less than Significant	No Impact	Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a – Submit a Construction Noise Plan to Reduce Construction Noise Mitigation Measure M-NO-1b – Implement a Construction Noise Plan to Reduce Construction Noise
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not expose residents of public housing to background noise levels that exceed HUD's acceptable noise level of 65 dB DNL.	Construction: Less than Significant with Mitigation; Operation: Less than Significant	Construction: Less than Significant with Mitigation; Operation: Less than Significant	Construction: Less than Significant with Mitigation; Operation: Less than Significant	No Impact	Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a – Submit a Construction Noise Plan to Reduce Construction Noise Mitigation Measure M-NO-1b – Implement a Construction Noise Plan to Reduce Construction Noise
Impact NO 2: Exposure of Persons to or Generation of Excessive Groundborne Vibration					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive vibration.	Construction: Less than Significant; Operation: Less than Significant	Construction: Less than Significant; Operation: Less than Significant	Construction: Less than Significant; Operation: Less than Significant	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive vibration.	Construction: Less than Significant; Operation: Less than Significant	Construction: Less than Significant; Operation: Less than Significant	Construction: Less than Significant; Operation: Less than Significant	No Impact	Mitigation Measures M-NO-1a, M-NO-1b

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
<i>Impacts/Effects</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>
Impact NO 3: Substantial Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the project.	Significant and Unavoidable	Significant and Unavoidable	Less than Significant	No Impact	Mitigation Measures M-NO-1a, M-NO-1b
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels for existing off-site sensitive receptors.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	Mitigation Measures M-NO-1a, M-NO-1b
Impact NO 4: Substantial Temporary Increase in Ambient Noise Levels					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would cause a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels during construction.	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	No Impact	Mitigation Measures M-NO-1a
NEPA: This topic is analyzed separately under NEPA.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Impact C-NO-1: Cumulative Noise Impacts					
CEQA: The Proposed Project and its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact related to noise.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project and its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact related to noise.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
Impacts/Effects	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative	Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative	Alternative 3: No Project Alternative	Mitigation Measures
5.9 Air Quality					
Impact AQ-1: Conflict with Air Quality Plan					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	n/a
Impact AQ-2: Violate Air Quality Standard during Construction					
CEQA: During the construction, the Proposed Project or its alternatives would violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing air quality violation, and result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants.	Significant and Unavoidable	Significant and Unavoidable	Less than Significant with Mitigation	No Impact	Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2a – Utilize Efficient Construction Equipment
NEPA: During construction, the Proposed Project or its alternatives would violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants.	Significant and Unavoidable	Significant and Unavoidable	Less than Significant with Mitigation	No Impact	Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2a – Utilize Efficient Construction Equipment
					Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2b – Utilize Efficient Construction Equipment after 2016

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
<i>Impacts/Effects</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>
Impact AQ-3: Violate Air Quality Standard during Operation					
CEQA: At buildout, the Proposed Project or its alternatives would not violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: At buildout, the Proposed Project or its alternatives would not violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	n/a
Impact AQ-4: Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	No Impact	Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4: Construction Emissions Minimization
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	No Impact	Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4: Construction Emissions Minimization
Impact AQ-5: Expose Residents to Objectionable Odors					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not expose residents to objectionable odors	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or it's alternatives would not expose residents to objectionable odors.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
Impacts/Effects	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative	Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative	Alternative 3: No Project Alternative	Mitigation Measures
Impact AQ-6: Trigger Need for General Conformity Assessment					
CEQA: This topic is not covered under CEQA.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or it's alternatives would not generate criteria pollutants or their precursors in quantities that would trigger the need for a general conformity assessment.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	n/a
Impact C-AQ-1:					
CEQA: The Proposed Project and its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would result in a significant cumulative impact related to air quality.	Significant and Unavoidable	Significant and Unavoidable	Significant and Unavoidable	No Impact	Mitigation Measures M-AQ-2a, M-AQ-2b and M-AQ-4
NEPA: The Proposed Project and its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would result in a significant cumulative impact related to air quality.	Significant and Unavoidable	Significant and Unavoidable	Significant and Unavoidable	No Impact	Mitigation Measures M-AQ-2a, M-AQ-2b and M-AQ-4
5.10 Greenhouse Gas Emissions					
Impact C-GG 1: Cumulative Greenhouse Gas Effects					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would generate greenhouse gas 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 greenhouse gas emissions.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
<i>Impacts/Effects</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would generate greenhouse gas emissions, but not to the level that would exceed the Clean Air Act Reporting Limit of 25,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO ₂ E) per year.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
5.11 Wind and Shadow					
Impact WS-1: Wind Effects					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Impact WS-2: Shadow Effects on Recreation Facilities					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not result in new shadows in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Impact C-WS-1: Wind Effects					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not alter wind or shadow in a manner that substantially affects public areas.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	n/a
NEPA: This topic is not analyzed under NEPA.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
<i>Impacts/Effects</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>
5.12 Recreation					
Impact RE 1: Effects Due to Increased Use					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration or degradation of the facilities would occur or be accelerated.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not exceed the existing or proposed capacity of public services, resulting in the need for new or expanded facilities for parks and recreation.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
Impact RE 2: Effects Due to Construction					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would include the construction of recreational facilities; however, construction would be temporary and would not have an adverse physical effect on the environment.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: This topic is not covered under NEPA.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Impact C-RE-1: Cumulative Impacts to Recreation					
CEQA: The Proposed Project and the alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact related to recreation.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
<i>Impacts/Effects</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant adverse recreation impacts.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	n/a
5.13 Utilities and Service Systems					
Impact UT 1: Effects on Wastewater Conveyance and Treatment					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not exceed the existing or proposed capacity of municipal utility systems or providers of wastewater conveyance and treatment.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	n/a
Impact UT 2: Effects Related to Construction of New Facilities					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: This topic is not separately analyzed under NEPA.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
Impacts/Effects	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative	Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative	Alternative 3: No Project Alternative	Mitigation Measures
Impact UT 3: Effects on Water Supply					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would have sufficient water supply available to serve the Proposed Project of Alternative from existing entitlements and resources and would not require the expansion of existing water treatment facilities.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not exceed the existing or proposed capacity of municipal utility systems or providers of water supply.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	n/a
Impact UT 4: Effects on Solid Waste Collection and Disposal					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives 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.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not exceed the existing or proposed capacity of municipal utility systems or providers of solid waste collection and disposal.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	n/a
Impact C-UT-1: Cumulative Impacts to Utilities and Service Systems					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact related to utilities and service systems.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
<i>Impacts/Effects</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant adverse utilities and service systems impacts.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	n/a
5.14 Public Services					
Impact PS 1: Effects on Public Services					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for police protection, fire services, schools, and libraries.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not exceed the existing or proposed capacity of public services, resulting in the need for new or expanded facilities for police services, fire protection and emergency medical services, schools, or libraries.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
Impact C-PS-1: Cumulative Effects on Public Services					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact related to public services.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
Impacts/Effects	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative	Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative	Alternative 3: No Project Alternative	Mitigation Measures
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant adverse public services impacts.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	n/a
5.15 Biological Resources					
Impact BI-1: Effects on Special-Status Species					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not have a substantial adverse effect on special-status species (identified at the federal, state or local level) or other legally protected species.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	n/a
Impact BI-2: Effects on Habitat					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
Impacts/Effects	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative	Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative	Alternative 3: No Project Alternative	Mitigation Measures
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not have a substantial adverse effect on sensitive or critical habitat (identified at the federal, state, or local level).	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	n/a
Impact BI-3: Effects on Wetlands					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not have a substantial adverse effect on wetlands or other waters of the U.S. subject to jurisdiction under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
Impact BI-4: Effects on Wildlife Movement					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives could interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	No Impact	Mitigation Measure M-BI-4a – Bird Nest Pre-Construction Survey
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not interfere substantially with an existing wildlife corridor.	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	No Impact	Mitigation Measure M-BI-4b – Bird Nest Buffer Zone Mitigation Measure M-BI-4a – Bird Nest Pre-Construction Survey

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
<i>Impacts/Effects</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>
					Mitigation Measure M-BI-4b – Bird Nest Buffer Zone
Impact BI-5: Effects on Local Biological Resources					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not have a substantial adverse effect on locally-protected trees.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	n/a
Impact BI-6: Effects Related to Habitat Conservation Plans					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans.	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not conflict with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan.	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
Impact C-BI-1: Cumulative Effects on Biological Resources					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact related to biological resources.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
<i>Impacts/Effects</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant adverse biological resource impacts.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	n/a
5.16 Geology and Soils					
Impact GE 1: Seismic Effects					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, seismic ground-shaking, liquefaction, or lateral spreading.	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation [Landslide Hazard Only]	Less than Significant	No Impact	Mitigation Measure M-GE-1 – Landslide Hazard Mitigation (Proposed Project, and Reduced Development Alternative Only)
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives could result in substantial risk of injury or death due to collapse of structures or damage to infrastructure because of ground failure or groundshaking, nor would it result in substantial damage to foundations or other infrastructure due to liquefaction, differential settlement, lateral spreading, expansive soils, corrosive soils, or other adverse engineering properties of soils.	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation [Landslide Hazard Only]	Less than Significant	No Impact	Mitigation Measure M-GE-1 – Landslide Hazard Mitigation (Proposed Project, and Reduced Development Alternative Only)
Impact GE 2: Erosion Effects					
CEQA: The Proposed Project Site or its alternatives is susceptible to substantial erosion, however, with mitigation substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil would not occur.	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	No Impact	Mitigation Measure M-GE-2a – Preventative Erosion Control Measures (Proposed Project, Reduced Development Alternative, and Housing Replacement Alternative)

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
<i>Impacts/Effects</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>
					Mitigation Measure M-GE-2b – Cut Slopes and Engineered Fill (Proposed Project, Reduced Development Alternative, and Housing Replacement Alternative)
					Mitigation Measure M-GE-2c – Erosion Control Measures in Response to Heavy Rains (Proposed Project, Reduced Development Alternative, and Housing Replacement Alternative)
NEPA: The Proposed Project Site or its alternatives is susceptible to substantial erosion; however, with mitigation, substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil would not occur.	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	No Impact	Mitigation Measure M-GE-2a – Preventative Erosion Control Measures (Proposed Project, Reduced Development Alternative, and Housing Replacement Alternative)
					Mitigation Measure M-GE-2b – Cut Slopes and Engineered Fill (Proposed Project, Reduced Development Alternative, and Housing Replacement Alternative)
					Mitigation Measure M-GE-2c – Erosion Control Measures in Response to Heavy Rains (Proposed Project, Reduced Development Alternative, and Housing Replacement Alternative)

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
<i>Impacts/Effects</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>
Impact GE 3: Effects on Unstable Geologic Units					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives could be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the Proposed Project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact	Mitigation Measure M-GE-3 – Unstable Soils and Slopes (Proposed Project and Reduced Development Alternative Only)
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives could destabilize existing geologic conditions or accelerate adverse geologic processes.	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact	Mitigation Measure M-GE-3 – Unstable Soils and Slopes (Proposed Project and Reduced Development Alternative Only)
Impact GE 4: Effects from Expansive Soils					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property.	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	No Impact	No Impact	Mitigation Measure M-GE-4 – Expansive Soils (Proposed Project and Reduced Development Alternative Only)
NEPA: This topic is not separately covered under NEPA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Impact GE 5: Effects on Septic Tanks					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater.	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
<i>Impacts/Effects</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater.	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
Impact GE 6: Effects on Topography					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not substantially change the topography or any unique geologic or physical features of the Project site.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: This topic is not separately covered under NEPA.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Impact C-GE-1: Cumulative Geology and Soils Effects					
CEQA: The Proposed Project and Reduced Development Alternative, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a significant adverse geologic impacts.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project and Reduced Development Alternative, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant cumulative impacts on geology and soils.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
<i>Impacts/Effects</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>
Impact C-GE-2: Cumulative Geology and Soils Effects					
CEQA: The Housing Replacement Alternative, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant adverse geologic impacts.	—	—	Less than Significant	—	n/a
NEPA: The Housing Replacement Alternative, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant impacts on geology and soils.	—	—	Less than Significant	—	n/a
Impact C-GE-3: Cumulative Geology and Soils Effects					
CEQA: The No Project Alternative, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant adverse cumulative impact related to geology and soils.	—	—	—	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The No Project Alternative, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a significant adverse cumulative impact related to geology and soils.	—	—	—	No Impact	n/a
5.17 Hydrology and Water Quality					
Impact HY-1: Effects on Water Quality Standards					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	No Impact	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
Impacts/Effects	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative	Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative	Alternative 3: No Project Alternative	Mitigation Measures
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not result in depletion or degradation of surface water quality (such as through violation of existing or proposed water quality standards).	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
Impact HY-2: Effects on Groundwater					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not result in depletion of groundwater volume or degradation of groundwater quality.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
Impact HY-3: Effects on Drainage					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the Project site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives Project would modify drainage patterns, but not in a manner that would result in on-site or off-site impacts.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	No Impact	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
<i>Impacts/Effects</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>
Impact HY-4: Effects on Stormwater Capacity					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems, provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: This topic is not covered under NEPA.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Impact HY-5: Flooding Effects on Occupied Structures					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not place any buildings or structures within a designated 100-year flood hazard area, a special flood hazard area, or locate a critical action within a 500-year floodplain or coastal high hazard area.	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not locate occupied structures where there are potential risks associated with flooding.	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact
Impact HY-6: Effects from Seiche, Tsunami, Mudflow, Levee or Dam Failure					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow, or flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
<i>Impacts/Effects</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow, or flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
Impact C-HY-1: Cumulative Hydrology and Water Quality Effects					
CEQA: The Proposed Project and Reduced Development Alternative, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact related to hydrology and water quality.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project and Reduced Development Alternative, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant impacts to hydrology or water quality.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	—	—	n/a
Impact C-HY-2: Cumulative Hydrology and Water Quality Effects					
CEQA: The Housing Replacement Alternative, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant impacts to hydrology or water quality.	—	—	Less than Significant	—	n/a
NEPA: The Housing Replacement Alternative, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant impacts to hydrology or water quality.	—	—	Less than Significant	—	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
<i>Impacts/Effects</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>
Impact C-HY-3: Cumulative Hydrology and Water Quality Effects					
CEQA: The No Project Alternative, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant impacts to hydrology or water quality.	—	—	—	Less than Significant	n/a
NEPA: The No Project Alternative, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant impacts to hydrology or water quality.	—	—	—	Less than Significant	n/a
5.18 Hazards and Hazardous Materials					
Impact HZ-1: Effects Related to Hazardous Materials Emissions or Disposal					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not result in a human health or environmental hazard through the use or disposal of hazardous substances.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	n/a
Impact HZ-2: Effects Related to Release of Hazardous Materials					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	No Impact	Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2.1 – Voluntary Remedial Action Program (VRAP) Applications and Work Plans

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
<i>Impacts/Effects</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>
					Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2.2 – Site Mitigation Plan (SMP)
					Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2.3 – Dust Control Plan and Worker Health and Safety Plan
					Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2.4 – Underground Storage Tanks
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives could result in the release of hazardous substances that creates a human health or environmental hazard.	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	No Impact	Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2.1, M-HZ-2.2, M-HZ-2.3, M-HZ-2.4
Impact HZ-3: Effects of Hazardous Materials on Schools					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives could emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant with Mitigation	No Impact	Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2.1, M-HZ-2.2, M-HZ-2.3, M-HZ-2.4
NEPA: This topic is not covered under NEPA.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Impact HZ-4: Effects Related to Hazardous Materials Sites					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
<i>Impacts/Effects</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not locate an occupied structure on filled land that contains toxic chemicals or radioactive materials at concentrations that would result in exposures above U.S. EPA acceptable risk levels, nor would it locate occupied structures on or near a site which could pose potential environmental hazards, such as dumps, landfills, or industrial locations that might contain hazardous wastes.	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
Impact HZ-5: Effects on Emergency/Evacuation Plans					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: This topic is not covered under NEPA.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Impact HZ-6: Effects on Emergency/Evacuation Plans					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would be located at an acceptable separation distance from a fire or explosive hazards.	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
<i>Impacts/Effects</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>
Impact C-HZ-1: Cumulative Hazards and Hazardous Materials Effects					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternative, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact related to hazards and hazardous materials.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant adverse cumulative hazards or hazardous materials impacts.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	n/a
5.19 Mineral and Energy Resources					
Impact ME 1: Effects on Known Mineral Resources					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: This topic is not covered under NEPA.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Impact ME 2: Effects on Mineral Resource Recovery Sites					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not result in the loss of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: This topic is not covered under NEPA.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
<i>Impacts/Effects</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>
Impact ME 3: Effects on Natural Resource Consumption					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not encourage activities that would result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, energy, or other resources in a wasteful manner.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would incorporate sufficient energy efficiency measures and would not result in energy consumption requiring a significant increase in energy production for the energy provider.	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact	
Impact C-ME-1: Cumulative Effects on Minerals and Energy					
CEQA: The Proposed Project and its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a significant adverse cumulative mineral and energy impact.	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project and its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a significant adverse cumulative energy impact.	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
Impacts/Effects	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative	Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative	Alternative 3: No Project Alternative	Mitigation Measures
5.20 Agricultural and Forest Resources					
Impact AG 1: Effects on Farmland and Forestry					
CEQA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not (a) convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance; (b) conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract; (c) conflict with existing zoning for or cause rezoning of forest land or timberland; (d) result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to nonforest use; or (e) involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use or forest land to nonforest use.	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	n/a
NEPA: The Proposed Project or its alternatives would not contribute to the unnecessary conversion of prime or important farmland to nonagricultural uses or significantly affect soils that may be better suited for natural resource management activities such as farming or forestry.	No Impact	No Impact	: No Impact	No Impact	n/a
Impact C-AG-1: Cumulative Effects to Agricultural and Forestry Resources					
CEQA: The Proposed Project and its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact related to agricultural or forest resources.	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	n/a

Table S-1 Summary of CEQA Impacts, NEPA Effects, and Mitigation Measures					
<i>Impacts/Effects</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Housing Replacement Alternative</i>	<i>Alternative 3: No Project Alternative</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>
NEPA: The Proposed Project and its alternatives, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact related to agricultural or forest resources.	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	n/a