Appendix A
Comparison Table

ESA

TABLE A-1 COMPARISON OF CP-HPS2 PROJECT CHANGES SINCE 2010[1,2,3]

Project Component	*2010 FEIR[4]*	*Addendum 1*	*Addendum 4*	*Addendum 5 (2018 Modified Project Variant)*	*Other Supporting Approval Documents for the 2010 FEIR, Addendum 1, Addendum 4, and/or Addendum 5*
Revisions to Land Use Plan					
Land Use Plan	The 2010 Project consists of 10,500 residential units with an associated population of 24,465 residents; 885,000 gsf of retail; 150,000 gsf of office; 2.5 million gsf of Research & Development (R&D) uses; a 220-room, 150,000 gsf hotel; 255,000 gsf of artist studio space and an arts center; 100,000 gsf of community services; 240 acres of new parks, sports fields, and waterfront recreation areas, as well as 97 acres of new and improved State parkland; a 69,000-seat 49ers stadium; and a 10,000-seat performance arena. The permanent employee population associated with the Project is 10,730. In addition, a 300-slip marina is provided. Shoreline improvements are provided to stabilize the shoreline. The Project includes structured and on-street parking and various infrastructure improvements to support the development. Refer to Section II.E (Project Characteristics), pp. II-7 to II-49, and Table II-3 (Proposed Land Use), p. II-9. Refer also to Table A of the Findings, which is provided in this Addendum as Table 3 in the Project Description.	No changes implemented.	The Addendum 4 changes included tower relocation at CP, height increases at CP, conversion of office space to neighborhood retail space at CP, relocation of displaced on-street parking to the CP center garage, change in phasing of Harney Way off-site improvements, and revisions to the configuration of Gilman Avenue). Refer to Table 1, Candlestick Point Land Use—Approved vs. Proposed, p. 4. The text description of the Addendum 4 land use plan is provided on pp. 5 to 11.	The Addendum 5 changes[5] would primarily include land use changes at HPS. In addition, the phasing schedule for both CP and HPS would be changed. The HPS2 proposed land use modifications under this Variant generally include the following: 1. Provide for land use changes, including 3,454 residential units at HPS2 (including 172 units previously approved for HPS1), the addition of new uses, reallocation of the square footage of commercial uses to provide for a greater mix of uses at HPS2, and adjustment of the location and acreage of parks and open space, providing for more parks and open space; 2. Adjust two approved tower locations; 3. Allow building height and/or bulk changes, which will increase and decrease heights in various locations; 4. Accommodate transportation network changes associated with the street layout (including the extension of Donahue Street from LaSalle Avenue/Kirkwood Avenue to Crisp Road) and street geometrics, bicycles, and transit; 5. Addition of two pedestrian bridges over Dry Dock 4; 6. The number of parking spaces for residential and commercial garages and on-street parking would be based on approved parking ratios[6] and revised street layouts, respectively. The number of spaces analyzed in Addendum 5 corresponds to the number of residential units and the square footage of nonresidential uses identified as part of the 2018 Modified Project Variant; 7. Provision of water taxi service from Dry Dock 4; 8. Provide for previously identified alternative utility systems (as generally described under 2010 FEIR Alternative 4, including a solar system, a recycled water facility, and district heating and cooling plants) and provide for new alternative utility systems (including a geothermal heating and cooling system as a component of the district heating and cooling plants and utility and building-scale battery storage systems); 9. Include an updated phasing plan; and 10. Include updated construction information.	• 2010 FEIR: CP and HPS Design for Development (D4D), June 2010, approved by the SFRA and SFPC • 2010 FEIR: HPS and BVHP Redevelopment Plans, June 2010, approved by the SFRA and SFPC • 2010 FEIR: Infrastructure Plan, Transportation Plan, Parks, Open Space, and Habitat Conservation Plan, and Sustainability Plan • Addendum 1: Major Phase Application, and conforming amendments to the Transportation Plan, Infrastructure Plan, Streetscape and Signage Plans, January 7, 2014, approved by OCII. • Addendum 4: CP D4D, March 2016, approved by OCII and SFPC)

[1] The page numbers refer to location in the document where each particular project component was described. The environmental analysis of that project component also occurs in the referenced document, but in a different location. The purpose of this table is to describe how the project has changed since 2010, rather than to provide a summary of the environmental impacts of those changes.
[2] Refer to Table A-2 (Comparison of 2018 Modified Project Variant to 2010 FEIR Project), Table A-3 (Comparison of 2018 Modified Project Variant to 2010 R&D Variant 1), and Table A-4 (Comparison of 2018 Modified Project Variant to 2010 Housing/R&D Variant 2A) for a quantitative comparison of the various project elements of the 2018 Modified Project Variant against the 2010 Project, R&D Variant 1, and Housing/R&D Variant 2A (e.g., residential land uses, nonresidential land uses, parking, marina, water taxi, and parks and open space).
[3] The project components described in this table represent primary land uses or project features.
[4] Attachment A (CEQA Findings) of the 2010 FEIR included the following as approved project components: the stadium project (the "main" project evaluated in the EIR), two land use variants (R&D Variant 1 and Housing/R&D Variant 2A), Tower Variant 3D, Utilities Variant 4, and Sub-alternative 4A, which includes the preservation of four historic structures at HPS.
[5] In this table, "Addendum 5" and the "2018 Modified Project Variant" refer to the project described in Addendum 5, which is the 2018 Modified Project Variant. The previous two addenda (Addendum 1 and Addendum 4) did not have specific project or variant names; therefore, the revised land use program and project elements described in those addenda are referred to as "Addendum 1" and "Addendum 4," rather than by a specific project or variant name. The project evaluated in the 2010 FEIR is referred to as the "2010 Project."
[6] Each land use has a parking ratio identified in the 2010 FEIR, which will be maintained for the 2018 Modified Project Variant. Therefore, while the land use program has been modified, which will change the number of parking spaces required, the 2018 Modified Project Variant meets the same parking standards as provided in 2010 FEIR. Further, if any land uses change in the future, the number of parking spaces will be provided according to the established parking ratios identified in the 2010 FEIR and this addendum, unless different ratios are agreed upon between the Applicant, EP, OCII, and any other involved parties.

TABLE A-1 COMPARISON OF CP-HPS2 PROJECT CHANGES SINCE 2010[1,2,3]

Project Component	*2010 FEIR[4]*	*Addendum 1*	*Addendum 4*	*Addendum 5 (2018 Modified Project Variant)*	*Other Supporting Approval Documents for the 2010 FEIR, Addendum 1, Addendum 4, and/or Addendum 5*
				The CP proposed modifications generally include the following: 1. Provide for 7,218 housing units at CP; and 2. Include an updated phasing plan, which will re-order CP Phase 2 construction sub-phases to proceed with development in an easterly rather than northern direction; remove a parcel from the CP boundary (the Jamestown Parcel, in CP-02); and modify the boundary of CP-05. Refer specifically to Table 2 (2018 Modified Project Variant Land Use Program) p. 13, and Figure 5 (CP-HPS2 2010 Project Land Use Plan), p. 16 for a description and illustration of the land use program.	
Tower Locations	Under the 2010 Project, in CP, there are eleven residential towers ranging between 270 feet to 420 feet in height (pp. II-16 and II-17) in the Candlestick Point North and Candlestick Point South Districts. In addition, Variant 3 (Candlestick Point Tower Locations) provides an alternative arrangement of towers (pp. IV-173 to IV-180), ranging from a total of 10 to 12 towers. The Candlestick Point Tower Variants (A, B, C, and D) have different locations and heights and bulk of residential towers at Candlestick Point.; however, each has the same overall land use program as the Project.	No changes implemented.	Under the Addendum 4 changes, Tower G, located in CP Center (CP-02), was moved west from the middle of the block to a location on Arelious Walker Drive near Jamestown Avenue. Towers J and K were relocated in CP-04 immediately southeast of the approved locations; the heights would not change. Refer to pp. 5 to 6 and 30 to 31.	Under Addendum 5, in HPS2, Tower A would be located in the same location and on the same block as the encouraged tower location shown in the 2010 FEIR; however, a flexible tower zone would be added to the remainder of the block, allowing flexibility as to the ultimate location of this tower. Tower B would be located one block north from the approved location shown in the 2010 FEIR. A flexible tower location zone would also be created for the balance of this block, allowing flexibility for its ultimate location. The heights of both towers would remain the same. Refer to Project Description section "Tower Locations and Building Heights," p. 18, and Figure 7 (Tower Locations: Towers A and B), p. 19.	• CP and HPS Design for Development (D4D), June 2010 (associated with the 2010 FEIR, approved by the SFRA and SFPC) • HPS and BVHP Redevelopment Plans, June 2010 (associated with the 2010 FEIR, approved by the SFRA and SFPC) • CP D4D, March 2016 (associated with Addendum 4, approved by OCII and SFPC)
Building Heights and Bulk	The maximum building heights at HPS range from 40 feet to 105 feet, and the maximum building heights at CP range from 40 feet to 420 feet (refer to Figure II-5 [Proposed Maximum Building Heights], p. II-12).	No changes proposed.	Some maximum building heights were increased in the area in and adjacent to CP Center (within CP) and, while certain areas would increase in maximum height, CP would still have maximum heights from 40 feet to 420 feet, which is what was analyzed in the 2010 FEIR. The primary changes in building heights include the following: • An increase in the maximum height at CP Center on the corner of West Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue from 85 feet to 120 feet to allow for a performance venue above a two-story anchor retail space (see Exhibit D, p. 1 Candlestick Center Mixed Use Height Visuals). • An increase in the maximum height along Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue within and adjacent to the CP Center from 65 feet to 80 feet, while mandating a minimum floor-to-floor height of 20 feet for the ground floor retail, and restrict residential and commercial uses above the ground floor retail to a maximum of five floors (see Exhibit D, pp. 2 to 3). • An increase in the maximum height of the building located at the corner of Arelious Walker Drive and Harney Way from 65 feet to 80 feet (See, Exhibit E, Candlestick Center Hotel Height Visuals). This building would accommodate the 220-room hotel, performance venue space, and office space and would ensure consistency in the built form along Harney Way and allow greater flexibility to design the building as an iconic entry statement to CP Center.	The proposed building heights would both increase and decrease in various locations in HPS2 on a block-by-block basis. In general, maximum heights would generally increase from 65 feet to 85 feet and from 105 feet to 120 feet, although a number of blocks would remain at a maximum of 85 feet. In addition, other blocks would decrease from a maximum of 65 feet to a maximum of 45 feet. Facade composition strategies include a greater range of examples of facade modulation, articulation, fenestration and transparency, and the use of materials and color to achieve urban form consistent with the shipyard vision. Buildings with large floor-plates would be required to apply additional strategies to reduce building massing. Refer to Project Description section "Tower Locations and Building Heights," p. 18, and Figure 8 (Building Heights), p. 21.	• CP and HPS Design for Development (D4D), June 2010 (associated with 2010 FEIR, approved by the SFRA and SFPC) • HPS and BVHP Redevelopment Plans, June 2010 (associated with the 2010 FEIR, approved by the SFRA and SFPC) • CP D4D, March 2016 (associated with Addendum 4, approved by OCII and SFPC)

TABLE A-1 COMPARISON OF CP-HPS2 PROJECT CHANGES SINCE 2010[1,2,3]

Project Component	*2010 FEIR[4]*	*Addendum 1*	*Addendum 4*	*Addendum 5 (2018 Modified Project Variant)*	*Other Supporting Approval Documents for the 2010 FEIR, Addendum 1, Addendum 4, and/or Addendum 5*
Stadium Lighting	Under the 2010 Project, the top of the stadium light towers at the new HPS2 stadium (relocated from CP) are at an approximate elevation of 192 feet. The stadium lighting meets criteria for lighting for players, spectators and television broadcasts, and provides 250 footcandles to 300 foot-candles at the field level. The 192-foot tall lighting units allows the light to be angled downward and uses fixtures that focus light on the field and reduce glare. In addition, because the stadium height reaches 156 feet above the playing field, the illuminated portion of the playing field is not be visible from adjacent areas.	No changes proposed.	No changes proposed.	No changes proposed.	
Revisions to Phasing					
Project Phasing Schedule	Project phasing (or construction activities) begins in 2011 and ends in 2031 (for a total of 20 years). Refer to 2010 FEIR Table III.C-8 (Project Construction Employment), p. III.C-13.	Under Addendum 1, the project phasing changed because the Candlestick Park stadium site is available for development sooner than previously anticipated due to the 49ers football team's move to a new stadium in Santa Clara in 2014. In response to these changes, the project sponsor changed the Project Phasing Schedule as follows: ● Demolition of Candlestick Park stadium and construction of the Candlestick Point Regional Retail Center in Major Phase 1 instead of Major Phase 3 as shown in the 2010 Project Phasing Schedule. ● Development of all of the research and development blocks on Parcel C in HPS Phase II in Major Phase 3 instead of splitting this development between Major Phases 2 and 3 as shown in the 2010 Project Phasing Schedule. ● Development of all improvements in the HPS Phase II South area in Major Phase 4 instead of splitting this development among Major Phases 2, 3, and 4 as shown in the 2010 Project Phasing Schedule. Under the modified Phasing Schedule, construction activities at Candlestick Point will occur from 2014 through 2035. Refer to pp. 3 to 4 and Tables 1 to 3, pp. 7 to 8.	No changes proposed.	The Project phasing (or construction activities) under the 2018 Modified Project Variant would total 21 years, which is the same construction time period assumed in the 2010 FEIR. However, the beginning date of construction would be delayed by approximately 3 years (from 2011 to 2014) and the construction would end three years later (in 2034 rather than 2031). Refer to Table 8 (Construction Employment), p. 86. The HPS2 phasing plan under the 2018 Modified Project Variant would update the phasing and construction schedule for HPS2 by reducing the number of major phases from four to three, although it is anticipated the three Major Phase applications would be submitted at the same time. The CP phasing plan under the 2018 Modified Project Variant would update the phasing and construction schedule for CP by reducing the number of major phases from four to three, consolidating Sub-phases CP-05 and CP-09 to advance the development of the Alice Griffith neighborhood and renumbering and resequencing the rest of the CP sub-phases to allow development to advance towards the northeast, rather than to the north. Boundary changes would also occur in CP, including reordering CP Major Phase 2 construction sub-phases to proceed with development in an easterly rather than northern direction; removing a parcel from the CP boundary (the Jamestown Parcel, in CP-02); and modifying the boundary of CP-05.	● Phasing Plan (Appendix to Disposition and Development Agreement), June 2010 (associated with 2010 FEIR, approved by the SFRA)
Revisions to Utility Systems					
Auxiliary Water Supply System (AWSS)	The Project provided an AWSS loop within CP. At HPS2, the AWSS connects to the existing AWSS system at the intersection of Earl Street and Innes Avenue and at the Palou Avenue and Griffith Avenue intersection with a looped service along Spear Avenue/Crisp Road. Refer to p. II-46.	The modified Plan proposed a different piping layout than previously contemplated in the 2010 FEIR, as well as the addition of two Portable Water Supply Systems (PWSS), instead of loop systems; this also necessitated a revision to MM UT-2. Refer to pp. 4 to 5, 10, and 50 to 51.	No changes proposed.	No changes proposed.	● Infrastructure Plan (appendix to Disposition and Development Agreement), June 2010 (associated with the 2010 FEIR, approved by the SFRA) ● Infrastructure Plan, November 2014 (associated with Addendum 1, approved by the SFPUC)

TABLE A-1 COMPARISON OF CP-HPS2 PROJECT CHANGES SINCE 2010[1,2,3]

Project Component	*2010 FEIR[4]*	*Addendum 1*	*Addendum 4*	*Addendum 5 (2018 Modified Project Variant)*	*Other Supporting Approval Documents for the 2010 FEIR, Addendum 1, Addendum 4, and/or Addendum 5*
EcoDistrict	The Utilities Variant assumes the implementation of additional on-site utility infrastructure, including (1) district heating and cooling, (2) on-site wastewater treatment, and (3) an automated trash collection system. All land uses at CP and HPS2 were constructed at the same locations and at the same intensities proposed with the Project, although some minor shifts in building locations can occur to accommodate some elements of the proposed utility systems, which requires some additional built space. Additionally, the 2010 FEIR acknowledges the Project Sponsor's intentions to use renewable energy strategies at HPS2, including the use of photovoltaic cells to reduce energy usage. Refer to pp. IV-231 to IV-237.	No changes proposed.	No changes proposed.	The 2018 Modified Project Variant would include a ground source geothermal heating and cooling system (a form of a district heating and cooling system, as proposed in the 2010 FEIR), solar power (as proposed in the 2010 FEIR as photovoltaic cells), and recycled water (as proposed in the 2010 FEIR [on-site wastewater treatment]). The specific components of the geothermal heating and cooling system include three small-scale central utility plants (CUPs), a vertical bore geothermal heat exchange system, a four-pipe chilled and hot water return and supply distribution system, and water-to-air and water-to-water heat exchangers that transfer heating and cooling to building HVAC systems.	• Infrastructure Plan (appendix to Disposition and Development Agreement), June 2010 (associated with the 2010 FEIR, approved by the SFRA)
Revisions to Transportation and Transit System					
Transportation System (Vehicular and/or Pedestrian)	The street network extended the existing grid of the adjacent Bayview Hunters Point (BVHP) neighborhood into the Project site. The internal street network is composed of seven types of streets consistent with and classified by the San Francisco Better Streets Plan (Draft for Public Review, June 2008), including: Commercial Throughway; Residential Throughway, Neighborhood Commercial Street, Neighborhood Residential Street, Parkway, Park Edge Street and Alley. The street network, including proposed off-site improvements, is illustrated in Figure II-11 (Proposed Street Network), p. II-36.	This project refinement proposed changes to roadway cross-section dimensions and alignments from those shown in the previously approved August 3, 2010, Transportation Plan. Refinements to roadway cross sections were proposed to continue to encourage slow-speed auto traffic, and better accommodate transit, bicyclists, and on-street parking based on recent San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) design guidance for travel lane widths. The refinements included (1) cross-section dimensions for various street components, such as width of parking lanes, width of travel lanes, and width of bicycle lanes; (2) converting the proposed Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) lanes from a two-way, side-running alignment to a center-running alignment, where possible, to be consistent with other priority transit corridors in San Francisco; (3) reorientation of some streets in CP; (4) provision of a new cycle track facility that closes a gap in the bicycle network near the project's CP retail center, extending west of the project site, along Harney Way toward US-101 and replacing the originally-proposed Class II bicycle lanes on both sides of the street; (5) Class II bicycle lanes would be removed from Earl Street to narrow the street and to maximize the space available for public parks on the west side of the street; (6) widen the Yosemite Slough Bridge by 4 feet, which was wider than the previously-approved non-stadium alternative, but substantially narrower than the approved stadium alternative, and accommodated bicycle and pedestrian circulation and maintenance vehicles on both sides of the bridge; (7) streets in the Hunters Point South neighborhood were re-oriented to allow for the BRT route to penetrate the center of the neighborhood at the intersection of Crisp Avenue/Fischer Street; and (8) narrow the	No changes proposed.	The 2018 Modified Project Variant would incorporate refinements to certain elements of the approved transportation plan related to roadway cross-section dimensions and alignments and phasing at HPS2. Refinements to roadway cross sections would encourage slow-speed auto traffic and better accommodate transit, bicyclists, and on-street parking based on recent San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) design guidance for travel lane widths.	• Transportation Plan (Appendix to Disposition and Development Agreement), June 2010 (associated with 2010 FEIR, approved by the SFRA) • Transportation Plan, August 2014 (associated with Addendum 1, approved by the SFMTA)

TABLE A-1 COMPARISON OF CP-HPS2 PROJECT CHANGES SINCE 2010[1,2,3]

Project Component	*2010 FEIR[4]*	*Addendum 1*	*Addendum 4*	*Addendum 5 (2018 Modified Project Variant)*	*Other Supporting Approval Documents for the 2010 FEIR, Addendum 1, Addendum 4, and/or Addendum 5*
		ultimate cross section of Arelious Walker Drive to include only two travel lanes in each direction separated by a median and to eliminate the previously proposed on-street parking and Class II bicycle lanes, which were replaced by a two-way cycle track running through the heart of the project along Harney Way and two-way BRT lanes would be provided between Egbert Street and Carroll Avenue. Refer to pp. 11 to 18 and revised MM TR-16, which relates to the widening of Harney Way. Also, all roadway improvements were implemented at the same triggers or sooner (relative to development levels) as described in the 2010 FEIR.			
Transit Improvements	Supported by Project revenues and infrastructure, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency implemented the following transit services: ● Extending existing Muni bus routes to better serve the Project site ● Increasing frequencies on existing routes to provide more capacity ● Complementing existing routes with new transit facilities and routes that would serve the Project's proposed land use program and transit demand Connecting to regional transit with BRT Bicycle routes provides connections within the Project site, to the surrounding neighborhoods, and to other parts of the City. Bicycle routes would be located along major roadways, consistent with City guidelines and adopted bicycle plans. As noted above, the Bay Trail, which accommodates bicycle travel, extends along the entire Project waterfront. Secure bicycle parking was provided in each commercial parking facility and residential garages. The Project pedestrian network, together with its land use design, encourages walking as a primary mode of transportation within the Project site. Refer to 2010 FEIR pp. II-39 to II-41.	At build out, the modified project's transit network was nearly identical to what was described in the 2010 FEIR, although two minor changes were proposed—specifically, changes to the routes for the 29 Sunset in CP and to all routes in HPS2 associated with a one-block shift of the planned Hunters Point Shipyard Transit Center. Changes to the transit phasing were expected to delay the provision of transit service to the Hunters Point Shipyard site in response to the corresponding delay in development of this site. In response to the acceleration of planned development in Candlestick Point, transit service at Candlestick Point was accelerated. In addition, there were minor refinements to the proposed bicycle network, minor changes to sidewalk widths, and a slight reduction in parking spaces. Refer to pp. 19 to 28.	No changes proposed.	In the approved transit network (refer to Figure 11 [HPS2 Transit Layover Detail], p. 31), the Hunters Point Transit Center was located on the south side of Spear Avenue near the intersection of Lockwood Street. Under the 2018 Modified Project Variant, the Hunters Point Transit Center would be located on the north side of Spear Avenue, near Dry Dock 2, as indicated on Figure 10 (HPS2 Transit Improvements), p. 30. The transit center would continue to serve the Shipyard North Residential and Shipyard Village Center Cultural Districts, but would have 14 bus bays (an increase of four bus bays). As shown on Figure 10 and Figure 11, in the HPS2 proposed modifications, four existing MUNI-bus lines servicing the Shipyard (Route 44-O'Shaughnessy, Route 48-Quintara, Route 28R-19th, and Route 24-Divisidero) would be extended to terminate and re-start at the Transit Center, and the proposed Hunters Point Express (HPX) bus service to Downtown San Francisco would also connect to the Transit Center. There would also be minor modifications to the bicycle network, as shown in Figure 26 (2018 Modified Project Variant Bicycle Network Plan), p. 129, as well as the provision of two new bridges over Dry Dock 4.	● Transportation Plan (Appendix to Disposition and Development Agreement), June 2010 (associated with 2010 FEIR, approved by the SFRA) ● Transportation Plan, August 2014 (associated with Addendum 1, approved by the SFMTA)
Bicycle Improvements	Bicycle routes provide connections within the Project site, to the surrounding neighborhoods, and to other parts of the City. Bicycle routes would be located along major roadways, consistent with City guidelines and adopted bicycle plans. As noted above, the Bay Trail, which accommodates bicycle travel, extends along the entire Project waterfront. Secure bicycle parking is provided in each commercial parking facility and residential garages. Refer to p. II-41.	No changes proposed.	No changes proposed.	The Bay Trail would remain the same, while the configuration and location of Class I to IV bike facilities would change, as shown in Figure 26 (2018 Modified Project Variant Bicycle Network Plan), p. 129.	● Transportation Plan (Appendix to Disposition and Development Agreement), June 2010 (associated with 2010 FEIR, approved by the SFRA)
Parking	Described in 2010 FEIR.	The modified Project resulted in slightly fewer parking spaces on-street than the maximum envelope anticipated in the 2010 FEIR.	● The modified project changed the number of on-street and off-street parking spaces.	Adjust the number of parking spaces for residential and commercial garages and on-street parking based on approved parking ratios and revised street layouts, respectively.	● Transportation Plan (Appendix to Disposition and Development Agreement), June 2010 (associated with 2010 FEIR, approved by the SFRA) ● Transportation Plan, August 2014 (associated with Addendum 1, approved by the SFMTA)

TABLE A-1 COMPARISON OF CP-HPS2 PROJECT CHANGES SINCE 2010[1,2,3]

Project Component	*2010 FEIR[4]*	*Addendum 1*	*Addendum 4*	*Addendum 5 (2018 Modified Project Variant)*	*Other Supporting Approval Documents for the 2010 FEIR, Addendum 1, Addendum 4, and/or Addendum 5*
Pedestrian Bridges	None.	None.	None.	Addition of two pedestrian bridges over Dry Dock 4.	
Water Taxi Service	None.	None.	None.	Provision of water taxi service from Dry Dock 4.	
Revisions to Mitigation Measures					
MM TR-16	**MM TR-16** Widen Harney Way as shown in Figure 5 in the Transportation Study. Prior to issuance of the grading permit for Development Phase 2 of the Project, the Project Applicant shall widen Harney Way as shown in Figure 5 in the Transportation Study. Prior to the issuance of grading permits for Phases 2, 3 and 4, the Project Applicant shall fund a study to evaluate traffic conditions on Harney Way and determine whether additional traffic associated with the next phase of development would result in the need to modify Harney Way to its ultimate configuration, as shown in Figure 6 in the Transportation Study, unless this ultimate configuration has already been built. This study shall be conducted in collaboration with the SFMTA, which would be responsible for making final determinations regarding the ultimate configuration. The ultimate configuration would be linked to intersection performance, and it would be required when study results indicate intersection LOS at one or more of the three signalized intersection on Harney Way at mid-LOS D (i.e., at an average delay per vehicle of more than 45 seconds per vehicle). If the study and SFMTA conclude that reconfiguration would be necessary to accommodate traffic demands associated with the next phase of development, the Project Applicant shall be responsible to fund and complete construction of the improvements prior to occupancy of the next phase.	*The project sponsor revised mitigation measure MM TR-16 to provide that Harney Way would be widened prior to the issuance of occupancy permits for the second sub-phase of Major Phase 1 (CP-02), since the first sub-phase in Major Phase 1 in Candlestick Point (CP-01) would not connect to Harney Way and improvements to Harney Way would not affect auto capacity associated with CP-01:* **MM TR-16** Widen Harney Way as shown in Figure 5 in the Transportation Study. Prior to issuance of the ~~grading~~ occupancy permit for ~~Development Phase 1 of the Project,~~ Candlestick Point Sub-Phase CP-02, the Project Applicant shall widen Harney Way as shown in Figure 5 in the Transportation Study, with the modification to include a two-way cycle track, on the southern portion of the project right of way. Prior to the issuance of grading permits for Candlestick Point Major Phases 2, 3 and 4, the Project Applicant shall fund a study to evaluate traffic conditions on Harney Way and determine whether additional traffic associated with the next phase of development would result in the need to modify Harney Way to its ultimate configuration, as shown in Figure 6 in the Transportation Study, unless this ultimate configuration has already been built. This study shall be conducted in collaboration with the SFMTA, which would be responsible for making final determinations regarding the ultimate configuration. The ultimate configuration would be linked to intersection performance, and it would be required when study results indicate intersection LOS at one or more of the three signalized intersection on Harney Way at mid-LOS D (i.e., at an average delay per vehicle of more than 45 seconds per vehicle). If the study and SFMTA conclude that reconfiguration would be necessary to accommodate traffic demands associated with the next phase of development, the Project Applicant shall be responsible to fund and complete construction of the improvements prior to occupancy of the next phase.	*Delays associated with two nearby major transportation projects—the extension of Geneva Avenue and the replacement of the US 101/Harney Way interchange—delayed the final design of the BRT alignment. Given these delays, it is unlikely that the BRT alignment would be finalized by 2019. Consequently, the improvements anticipated in the initial configuration of Harney Way, which includes several BRT-related improvements, would be changed by this delay, which are proposed by further changes to MM TR-16:* **MM TR-16** Widen Harney Way as shown in Figure 5 in the Transportation Study. ~~Prior to the issuance of the occupancy permit for Candlestick Point Sub-Phase CP-02, t~~The The Project Applicant shall widen Harney Way as shown in figure 5 in the Transportation Study, with the modification to include a two-way cycle track, on the southern portion of the project right of way. The portion between Arelious Walker Drive and Executive Park East (Phase 1-A) shall be widened to include a two-way cycle track and two-way BRT lanes, prior to issuance of an occupancy permit for Candlestick Sub-Phase CP-02. The remaining portion, between Thomas Mellon Drive and Executive Park East (Phase 1-B), shall be widened prior to implementation of the planned BRT route which coincides with construction of CP-07 and HP-04 in 2023, as outlined in the transit improvement implementation schedule identified in Addendum 1, based on the alignment recommendations from an ongoing feasibility study conducted by the San Francisco County Transportation Agency. Prior to the issuance of grading permits for Candlestick Point Major Phases 2, 3, and 4, the Project Applicant shall fund a study to evaluate traffic conditions on Harney Way and determine whether additional traffic associated with the next phase of development would result in the need to modify Harney Way to its ultimate configuration, as shown in Figure 6 in the Transportation Study, unless this ultimate configuration has already been built. This study shall be conducted in collaboration with the SFMTA, which would be responsible for making final determinations regarding the ultimate configuration. The ultimate configuration would be linked to intersection performance, and it would be required when study results indicate intersection LOS at one or more of the three signalized intersections on Harney Way at mid-LOS D (i.e., at an average delay per vehicle	**MM TR-16** Widen Harney Way as shown in Figure 5 in the Transportation Study. The Project Applicant shall widen Harney Way as shown in Figure 5 in the Transportation Study with the modification to include a two-way cycle track, on the southern portion of the project right-of-way. The portion between Arelious Walker Drive and Executive Park East (Phase 1-A) shall be widened to include a two-way cycle track and two-way BRT lanes, prior to issuance of an occupancy permit for Candlestick Sub-phase CP-02. The remaining portion, between Thomas Mellon Drive and Executive Park East (Phase 1-B), shall be widened prior to implementation of the planned BRT route which coincides with construction of ~~CP-07 and~~ HP-04 ~~in 2023~~, as outlined in the transit improvement implementation schedule identified in Addendum 1, based on the alignment recommendations from an ongoing feasibility study conducted by the San Francisco County Transportation ~~Agency~~ Authority. Prior to the issuance of grading permits for Candlestick Point Major Phases 2~~,~~ and 3~~, and 4~~, the Project Applicant shall fund a study to evaluate traffic conditions on Harney Way and determine whether additional traffic associated with the next phase of development would result in the need to modify Harney Way to its ultimate configuration, as shown in Figure 6 in the Transportation Study, unless this ultimate configuration has already been built. This study shall be conducted in collaboration with the SFMTA, which would be responsible for making final determinations regarding the ultimate configuration. The ultimate configuration would be linked to intersection performance, and it would be required when study results indicate intersection LOS at one or more of the three signalized intersections on Harney Way at mid-LOS D (i.e., at an average delay per vehicle of more than 45 seconds per vehicle). If the study and SFMTA conclude that reconfiguration would be necessary to accommodate traffic demands associated with the next phase of development, the Project Applicant shall be responsible to fund and complete construction of the improvements prior to occupancy of the next phase.	

TABLE A-1 COMPARISON OF CP-HPS2 PROJECT CHANGES SINCE 2010[1,2,3]

Project Component	*2010 FEIR[4]*	*Addendum 1*	*Addendum 4*	*Addendum 5 (2018 Modified Project Variant)*	*Other Supporting Approval Documents for the 2010 FEIR, Addendum 1, Addendum 4, and/or Addendum 5*
			of more than 45 seconds per vehicle). If the study and SFMTA conclude that reconfiguration would be necessary to accommodate traffic demands associated with the next phase of development, the Project Applicant shall be responsible to fund and complete construction of the improvements prior to occupancy of the next phase.		
MM TR-17	**MM TR-17** Implement the Project's Transit Operating Plan. The Project Applicant shall work with SFMTA to develop and implement the Project's Transit Operating Plan. Elements of the Project Transit Operating Plan shall include: ● Extension of the 24-Divisadero, the 44-O'Shaughnessy, and the 48-Quintara-24th Street into Hunters Point Shipyard. ● Increased frequency on the 24-Divisadero to 6 minutes in the AM and PM peak periods. Extension of the 29-Sunset from its current terminus near the Alice Griffith housing development, near Gilman Avenue and Giants Drive, into the proposed Candlestick Point retail area. The 29-Sunset would operate a short line between Candlestick Point and the Balboa Park BART station. This would increase frequencies on the 29-Sunset by reducing headways between buses from 10 minutes to 5 minutes during the AM and PM peak periods between Candlestick Point and the Balboa BART station. Every other bus would continue to serve the Sunset District (to the proposed terminus at Lincoln Drive and Pershing Drive in the Presidio) at 10-minute headways. ● Convert T-Third service between Bayview and Chinatown via the Central Subway from one-car to two-car trains or comparable service improvement. Extension of the 28L-19th Avenue Limited from its TEP-proposed terminus on Geneva Avenue, just east of Mission Street, into the Hunters Point Shipyard transit center. The 28L-19th Avenue Limited would travel along Geneva Avenue across US-101 via the proposed Geneva Avenue extension and new interchange with US-101, to Harney Way. East of Bayshore Boulevard, the 28L-19th Avenue Limited would operate as BRT, traveling in exclusive bus lanes into the Candlestick Point area. The BRT route would travel through the Candlestick Point retail corridor, and cross over Yosemite Slough into the Hunters Point Shipyard transit center. ● The 28L-19th Avenue Limited would operate a short line to the Balboa Park BART station. This would increase frequencies on the 28L-19th Avenue Limited by reducing headways between buses from 10 minutes to 5 minutes for the segment between Hunters Point Shipyard and the Balboa Park BART station. Every other bus would continue to the Sunset District (to the proposed terminus at North Point Street and Van Ness Avenue) at 10-minute headways. If the TEP-proposed extension of the 28L has not been implemented by the SFMTA by the time implementation of this measure is called for in the Transportation Study (Appendix D), the Project Applicant shall fund the extension of that line between its existing terminus and Bayshore Boulevard.	No changes proposed.	No changes proposed.	**MM TR-17** Implement the Project's Transit Operating Plan. The Project Applicant shall work with SFMTA to develop and implement the Project's Transit Operating Plan. Elements of the Project Transit Operating Plan shall include: ● Extension of the 24-Divisadero, the 44-O'Shaughnessy, and the 48-Quintara-24th Street into Hunters Point Shipyard. ● Increased frequency on the 24-Divisadero to ~~6~~10 minutes in the AM and PM peak periods. Extension of the 29-Sunset from its current terminus near the Alice Griffith housing development, near Gilman Avenue and Giants Drive, into the proposed Candlestick Point retail area. The 29-Sunset would operate a short line between Candlestick Point and the Balboa Park BART station. This would increase frequencies on the 29-Sunset by reducing headways between buses from 10 minutes to 5 minutes during the AM and PM peak periods between Candlestick Point and the Balboa BART station. Every other bus would continue to serve the Sunset District (to the proposed terminus at Lincoln Drive and Pershing Drive in the Presidio) at 10-minute headways. ● Convert T-Third service between Bayview and Chinatown via the Central Subway from one-car to two-car trains or comparable service improvement. Extension of the 28L-19th Avenue Limited from its TEP-proposed terminus on Geneva Avenue, just east of Mission Street, into the Hunters Point Shipyard transit center. The 28L-19th Avenue Limited would travel along Geneva Avenue across US-101 via the proposed Geneva Avenue extension and new interchange with US-101, to Harney Way. East of Bayshore Boulevard, the 28L-19th Avenue Limited would operate as BRT, traveling in exclusive bus lanes into the Candlestick Point area. The BRT route would travel through the Candlestick Point retail corridor, and cross over Yosemite Slough into the Hunters Point Shipyard transit center. ● The 28L-19th Avenue Limited would operate a short line to the Balboa Park BART station. This would increase frequencies on the 28L-19th Avenue Limited by reducing headways between buses from 10 minutes to 5 minutes for the segment between Hunters Point Shipyard and the Balboa Park BART station. Every other bus would continue to the Sunset District (to the proposed terminus at North Point Street and Van Ness Avenue) at 10-minute headways. If the TEP-proposed extension of the 28L has not been implemented by the SFMTA by the time implementation of this measure is called for in ~~the Transportation Study (Appendix D)~~ Addendum 5, based on the revised project phasing, the Project	

TABLE A-1 COMPARISON OF CP-HPS2 PROJECT CHANGES SINCE 2010[1,2,3]

Project Component	*2010 FEIR[4]*	*Addendum 1*	*Addendum 4*	*Addendum 5 (2018 Modified Project Variant)*	*Other Supporting Approval Documents for the 2010 FEIR, Addendum 1, Addendum 4, and/or Addendum 5*
	• New CPX-Candlestick Express to downtown serving the Candlestick Point site, traveling along Harney Way (with potential stops at Executive Park), before traveling on US-101 toward downtown, terminating at the Transbay Terminal. • New HPX-Hunters Point Shipyard Express to downtown serving the Hunters Point Shipyard site, traveling from the Hunters Point Shipyard Transit Center, along Innes Avenue, with stops at the India Basin and Hunters View areas, before continuing along Evans Avenue to Third Street, eventually entering I-280 northbound at 25th/Indiana. The HPX would continue non-stop to the Transbay Terminal in Downtown San Francisco.			Applicant shall fund the extension of that line between its existing terminus and Bayshore Boulevard. • New CPX-Candlestick Express to downtown serving the Candlestick Point site, traveling along Harney Way (with potential stops at Executive Park), before traveling on US-101 toward downtown, terminating at the Transbay Terminal. • New HPX-Hunters Point Shipyard Express to downtown serving the Hunters Point Shipyard site, traveling from the Hunters Point Shipyard Transit Center, along Innes Avenue, with stops at the India Basin and Hunters View areas, before continuing along Evans Avenue to Third Street, eventually entering I-280 northbound at 25th/Indiana. The HPX would continue non-stop to the Transbay Terminal in Downtown San Francisco.	
MM TR-23.1	**MM TR-23.1** Maintain the proposed headways of the 29-Sunset. To address Project impacts to the 29-Sunset, prior to issuance of a grading permit for Development Phase 1, the Project Applicant in cooperation with SFMTA shall conduct a study to evaluate the effectiveness and feasibility of the following improvements which could reduce Project impacts on transit operations along the Gilman Avenue and Paul Avenue corridor, generally between Arelious Walker Drive and Bayshore Boulevard. The study shall create a monitoring program to determine the implementation extent and schedule (as identified below) to maintain the proposed headways of the 29-Sunset. • For the five-block segment of Gilman Avenue between Arelious Walker Drive and Third Street, prohibit on-street parking on westbound Gilman Avenue during the AM and PM peak periods to provide for three westbound travel lanes. During the peak periods convert one of the three westbound travel lanes to transit-only. During off-peak periods, parking would be allowed, and buses would travel in one of the two mixed-flow lanes. The peak period transit lanes would impact 90 parking spaces. • For the same five-block segment of Gilman Avenue between Arelious Walker Drive and Third Street, restripe the eastbound direction to provide two travel lanes, one of which would accommodate on-street parking and one of which would be a mixed-flow travel lane. During the AM and PM peak periods, prohibit on-street parking in the eastbound direction, and operate one of the two eastbound lanes as transit-only lanes. The peak period transit lanes would impact 80 parking spaces. • As an alternative to the two bulleted measures above, convert one of the travel lanes in each direction on Gilman Avenue from Third Street to Griffith Street to transit-only. This would allow for the provision of a 7-foot-wide on-street parking lane, an 11-foot-wide transit-only lane, and a 10-foot-wide mixed-flow lane in each direction on Gilman Avenue. This would preserve on-street parking along the corridor and provide four-block transit-only lanes on Gilman Avenue between Griffith Street and Third Street. Treatment for transit-only lanes can range from striping to physical elevation changes to protect right-of-way from mixed-flow traffic. Subsequent to publication of the Draft EIR, SFMTA and the Project Applicant conducted an	No changes proposed.	*Mitigation measure MM TR-23.1 would bring the transit travel times for the 29 Sunset to levels consistent with the mitigated EIR scenario (as necessitated due revisions of the configuration to Gilman Avenue):* **MM TR-23.1** Maintain the proposed headways of the 29-Sunset. To address project impacts to the 29-Sunset, prior to issuance of a grading permit for Phase I, the Project Applicant in cooperation with SFMTA shall conduct a study to evaluate the effectiveness and feasibility of the following improvements which could reduce Project impacts on transit operations along the Gilman Avenue and Paul Avenue corridor, generally between Arelious Walker Drive and Bayshore Boulevard. The study shall create a monitoring program to determine the implementation extent and schedule (as identified below) to maintain the proposed headways of the 29-Sunset. • ~~For the five-block segment of Gilman Avenue between Arelious Walker Drive and Third Street, prohibit on-street parking on westbound Gilman Avenue during the AM and PM peak periods to provide for three westbound travel lanes. During the peak periods convert one of the three westbound travel lanes to transit-only. During off-peak periods, parking would be allowed, and buses would travel in one of the two mixed-flow lanes. The peak period transit lanes would impact 90 parking spaces.~~ • ~~For the same five-block segment of Gilman Avenue between Arelious Walker Drive and Third Street, restripe the eastbound direction to provide two travel lanes, one of which would accommodate onstreet parking and one of which would be a mixed-flow travel lane. During the AM and PM peak periods, prohibit on-street parking in the eastbound direction, and operate one of the two eastbound lanes as transit-only lanes. The peak period transit lanes would impact 80 parking spaces.~~ • ~~As an alternative to the two bulleted measures above, narrow the existing sidewalks on Gilman~~	No changes proposed.	

TABLE A-1 COMPARISON OF CP-HPS2 PROJECT CHANGES SINCE 2010[1,2,3]

Project Component	*2010 FEIR[4]*	*Addendum 1*	*Addendum 4*	*Addendum 5 (2018 Modified Project Variant)*	*Other Supporting Approval Documents for the 2010 FEIR, Addendum 1, Addendum 4, and/or Addendum 5*
	evaluation of this alternative measure and determined that is a feasible and viable alternative to the two bulleted items above, ● Prohibit on-street parking on the north side of Paul Avenue, between Third Street and Bayshore Boulevard to create two westbound through lanes. Convert one westbound through lane to transit-only in the AM and PM peak periods. The peak period transit-only lane would impact 40 parking spaces. At the intersection of Paul Avenue and Bayshore Avenue, provide transit signal priority treatment (i.e., queue jump) to allow transit vehicles to maneuver into the mixed flow left-hand lane, facilitating a left-turn movement immediately west of Bayshore Boulevard from westbound Paul Avenue to southbound San Bruno. The Project Applicant shall fully fund the costs of implementing the transit priority improvements (either the improvements identified above, or alternative improvements of equal or greater effectiveness and comparable cost) as determined by the study and the monitoring program. Other options to be evaluated in the study could include transit priority treatments on San Bruno Avenue, on the portions where the 29-Sunset travels.		~~Avenue from Third Street to Griffith Street (four blocks) from 5 feet to 12 feet in width. The resulting 12-foot-wide sidewalks would be consistent with the Better Streets Plan guidelines. The reduction in sidewalk width would allow for the provision of a 7-foot-wide on-street parking lane, an 11-foot-wide transit-only lane, and a 10-foot-wide mixed-flow lane in each direction on Gilman Avenue. This would preserve on-street parking along the corridor and provide four-block transit-only lanes on Gilman Avenue between Griffith Street and Third Street. Treatment for transit-only lanes can range from striping to physical elevation changes to protect right-of-way from mixed-flow traffic.~~ ● Prohibit on-street parking on the north side of Paul Avenue, between Third Street and Bayshore Boulevard to create two westbound through lanes. Convert one westbound through lane to transit-only in the AM and PM peak periods. The peak period transit-only lane would impact 40 parking spaces. At the intersection of Paul Avenue and Bayshore Avenue, provide transit signal priority treatment (i.e., queue jump) to allow transit vehicles to maneuver into the mixed flow left-hand lane, facilitating a left-turn movement immediately west of Bayshore Boulevard from westbound Paul Avenue to southbound San Bruno. ● Implement traffic signal priority (TSP), which modifies the timing at signalized intersections to prioritize the movement of transit vehicles, at the intersections of Arelious Walker/Gilman Avenue, San Bruno Avenue/Paul Avenue, and Bayshore Boulevard/Paul Avenue. ● Implement a far-side stop in the eastbound and westbound directions at the intersection of Third Street/Gilman Avenue and a far-side stop in the westbound direction at the intersection of San Bruno/Paul Avenue. ● Implement a peak period, transit-dedicated lane in the westbound direction along Paul Avenue between Third Street Bayshore Boulevard. The transit land would begin on Gilman Avenue and extend through the intersection to Paul Avenue. The Project Applicant shall fully fund the costs of implementing the transit priority improvements (either the improvements identified above, or alternative improvements of equal or greater effectiveness and comparable cost) as determined by the study and the monitoring program. Other options to be evaluated in the study could include transit priority treatments on San Bruno Avenue, on the portions where the 29-Sunset travels.		

TABLE A-1 COMPARISON OF CP-HPS2 PROJECT CHANGES SINCE 2010[1,2,3]

Project Component	*2010 FEIR[4]*	*Addendum 1*	*Addendum 4*	*Addendum 5 (2018 Modified Project Variant)*	*Other Supporting Approval Documents for the 2010 FEIR, Addendum 1, Addendum 4, and/or Addendum 5*
R&D Variant (Variant 1), /Housing/R&D Variant (Variant 2A)/2018 Modified Project Variant Mitigation Measure MM TR-VAR1	**R&D Variant Mitigation Measure:** (a) Under the R&D and Housing/R&D Variants, the Project Applicant would be required to contribute its fair share to striping the southbound approach at Crisp and Palou to provide a dedicated left-turn lane and a shared through/left-turn lane and prohibiting on-street parking on Griffith Street between Palou and Oakdale Avenues. Implementation of this mitigation would reduce impacts from these variants to a less-than-significant level. (b) Under the R&D Variant, the Project Applicant would be required to fund the installation of a traffic signal at the intersection of Innes and Earl when warranted by traffic conditions. Implementation of this mitigation would reduce impacts from this variant to a less-than-significant level.	No changes proposed.	No changes proposed.	**R&D Variant (Variant 1)/Housing/R&D Variant (Variant 2A)/2018 Modified Project Variant Mitigation Measure MM TR-VAR1:** (a) Under the R&D and Housing/R&D Variants, the Project Applicant would be required to contribute its fair share to striping the southbound approach at Crisp and Palou to provide a dedicated left-turn lane and a shared through/right-turn lane and prohibiting on-street parking on Griffith Street between Palou and Oakdale Avenues. Under the 2018 Modified Project Variant, the Project Applicant would be required to contribute its fair share to striping the southbound approach at Crisp and Palou to provide a dedicated right-turn lane and a shared through/left-turn lane and prohibiting on-street parking on Griffith Street between Palou and Oakdale Avenues, and constructing the westbound approach on Crisp Avenue to provide two dedicated left-turn lanes and one shared through/right-turn lane. Implementation of this mitigation would reduce impacts from these variants to a less-than-significant level. (b) Under the R&D Variant (Variant 1) and the 2018 Modified Project Variant, the Project Applicant would be required to fund the installation of a traffic signal at the intersection of Innes and Earl when warranted by traffic conditions. Implementation of this mitigation would reduce impacts from this variant to a less-than-significant level. ——————— *The Board recognizes that these mitigation measures are partially within the jurisdiction of SFMTA and SFDPW. The Board urges SFMTA and SFDPW to assist in implementing these mitigation measures, and finds that SFMTA and SFDPW can and should participate in implementing these mitigation measures.*	
MM NO-2a	**MM NO-2a** Pre-construction Assessment to Minimize Pile Driving Impacts. The Project Applicant shall require its geotechnical engineering contractor to conduct a pre-construction assessment of existing subsurface conditions and the structural integrity of nearby buildings subject to pile driving impacts prior to receiving a building permit. If recommended by the geotechnical engineer, for structures or facilities within 50 feet of pile driving, the Project Applicant shall require groundborne vibration monitoring of nearby structures. Such methods and technologies shall be based on the specific conditions at the construction site such as, but not limited to, the following: ● Pre-pile driving surveying of potentially affected structures. ● Underpinning of foundations of potentially affected structures, as necessary. ● The construction plan shall include a monitoring program to detect ground settlement or lateral movement of structures in the vicinity of an excavation. Monitoring results shall be submitted to DBI. In the event of unacceptable ground movement, as determined by DBI inspections, all pile driving work shall cease and corrective measures shall be implemented. The pile driving program	No changes proposed.	No changes proposed.	**MM NO-2a** Pre-construction Assessment to Minimize Pile Driving and Deep Dynamic Compaction Impacts. The Project Applicant shall require its geotechnical engineering contractor to conduct a pre-construction assessment of existing subsurface conditions and the structural integrity of nearby buildings subject to pile driving and deep dynamic compaction (DDC) impacts prior to receiving a building permit. The building surveys will review existing conditions and confirm whether fractures in building footings or walls existed prior to pile driving and/or DDC activities. If recommended by the geotechnical engineer, for structures or facilities within 50 feet of pile driving, the Project Applicant shall require groundborne vibration monitoring of nearby structures. Such methods and technologies shall be based on the specific conditions at the construction site such as, but not limited to, the following: ● Pre-pile driving surveying of potentially affected structures. ● Underpinning of foundations of potentially affected structures, as necessary. ● The construction plan shall include a monitoring program to detect ground settlement or lateral movement of structures in the vicinity of an excavation.	

TABLE A-1 COMPARISON OF CP-HPS2 PROJECT CHANGES SINCE 2010[1,2,3]

Project Component	*2010 FEIR[4]*	*Addendum 1*	*Addendum 4*	*Addendum 5 (2018 Modified Project Variant)*	*Other Supporting Approval Documents for the 2010 FEIR, Addendum 1, Addendum 4, and/or Addendum 5*
	and ground stabilization measures shall be reevaluated and approved by DBI.			Monitoring results shall be submitted to DBI. In the event of unacceptable ground movement, as determined by DBI inspections, all pile driving work shall cease and corrective measures shall be implemented. The pile driving program and ground stabilization measures shall be ~~reevaluated~~ reviewed and approved by ~~DBI~~OCII. For DDC work, the Project Applicant shall prepare and implement a construction plan that includes a monitoring program to detect ground settlement or lateral movement of structures in the vicinity of DDC activity. Structures in the vicinity of DDC work shall be defined as reinforced-concrete, steel, or timber structures within 125 feet, engineered concrete or masonry structures within 150 feet, non-engineered timber and masonry structures within 225 feet, or other structures that are extremely susceptible to vibration damage within 275 feet of DDC activities as determined by the Project Applicant's geotechnical engineer or structural engineer. The DDC program shall be evaluated and approved by DBI and results of the monitoring program shall be submitted to OCII. In the event of unacceptable ground movement, as determined by DBI inspection and review, all DDC work shall cease and corrective measures shall be implemented. A geotechnical engineer approved by OCII shall determine which of the following ground stabilization measures or alternate measures would be necessary to avoid structural impacts related to DDC activities: ● Underpinning of foundations of potentially affected structures, as necessary to avoid structural impacts ● If deemed necessary by the geotechnical engineer, based either on proximity of DDC to a structure and/or on potential for damage to a structure, a cutoff trench shall be installed between the DDC activity and the structure. The cutoff trench should be at least 10 feet deep and 2 feet wide.[7] The trench should be long enough to effectively shield the structure from DDC vibrations.	
MM CP-2a	**MM CP-2a** Mitigation to Minimize Impacts to Archaeological Resources at Candlestick Point. Based on a reasonable presumption that archaeological resources may be present within the Project site, the following measures shall be undertaken to avoid any potentially significant adverse effect from the Project on buried or submerged historical resources. Overview: The Project Applicant shall retain the services of a qualified archaeological consultant having expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archeology. The archaeological consultant shall undertake an archaeological testing program as specified herein. In addition, the archaeological consultant shall be available to conduct an archaeological monitoring and/or data recovery program if required pursuant to this measure. The archaeological consultant's work shall be conducted in accordance with this measure and with the requirements of the Project Archaeological Research Design and Treatment Plan (Archeo-Tec. Archaeological Research Design and Treatment Plan for	No changes proposed.	No changes proposed.	**MM CP-2a** Mitigation to Minimize Impacts to Archaeological Resources at Candlestick Point. Based on a reasonable presumption that archaeological resources may be present within the Project site, the following measures shall be undertaken to avoid any potentially significant adverse effect from the Project on buried or submerged historical resources. Overview: The Project Applicant shall retain the services of a qualified archaeological consultant having expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical ~~archeology~~ archaeology. The archaeological consultant shall ~~undertake an~~ augment the approved archaeological testing program as specified herein. In addition, the archaeological consultant shall be available to conduct an archaeological monitoring and/or data recovery program if required pursuant to this measure. The archaeological consultant's work shall be conducted in accordance with this measure and with the requirements of the Project Archaeological Research Design and Treatment Plan (Archeo-Tec~~.~~,	

[7] ENGEO Incorporated, *Potential Constraints on Implementation of Deep Dynamic Compaction*, December 14, 2017, p. 1.

TABLE A-1 COMPARISON OF CP-HPS2 PROJECT CHANGES SINCE 2010[1,2,3]

Project Component	*2010 FEIR[4]*	*Addendum 1*	*Addendum 4*	*Addendum 5 (2018 Modified Project Variant)*	*Other Supporting Approval Documents for the 2010 FEIR, Addendum 1, Addendum 4, and/or Addendum 5*
	the Bayview Waterfront Project, San Francisco, California, 2009) at the direction of the City's Environmental Review Officer (ERO). In instances of inconsistency between the requirement of the Project Archaeological Research Design and Treatment Plan and of this archaeological mitigation measure, the requirement of this archaeological mitigation measure shall prevail. All plans and reports prepared by the consultant as specified herein shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment, and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Archaeological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction of the Project for up to a maximum of four weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of construction can be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce potential effects on a significant archaeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a)(c) to a less-than-significant level. Archaeological Testing Program: The archaeological consultant shall prepare and submit to the ERO for review and approval an archaeological testing plan (ATP). The archaeological testing program shall be conducted in accordance with the approved ATP. The ATP shall identify the property types of the expected archaeological resource(s) that potentially could be adversely affected by the Project, the testing method to be used, and the locations recommended for testing. The purpose of the archaeological testing program will be to determine to the extent possible the presence or absence of archaeological resources and to identify and to evaluate whether any archaeological resource encountered on the site constitutes an historical resource under CEQA. At the completion of the archaeological testing program, the archaeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings for submittal to the ERO. If, based on the archaeological testing program, the archaeological consultant finds that significant archaeological resources may be present, the ERO (in consultation with the archaeological consultant) shall determine if additional measures are warranted. Additional measures that may be undertaken include, but are not necessarily limited to, additional archaeological testing, archaeological monitoring, and/or an archaeological data recovery program. If the ERO determines that a significant archaeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the Project, the Project Applicant shall either: a. Re-design the Project so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archaeological resource; or b. Implement a data recovery program, unless the ERO determines that the archaeological resource is of greater interpretive than research significance and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible. Archaeological Monitoring Program: If the ERO, in consultation with the archaeological consultant, determines that an Archaeological Monitoring Program (AMP) shall be implemented, the AMP shall include the following provisions, at a minimum: ● The archaeological consultant, Project Applicant, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the AMP prior to			*Archaeological Research Design and Treatment Plan for the Bayview Waterfront Project, San Francisco, California*, 2009) at the direction of the City's Environmental Review Officer (ERO). In instances of inconsistency between the requirement of the Project Archaeological Research Design and Treatment Plan and of this archaeological mitigation measure, the requirement of this archaeological mitigation measure shall prevail. All plans and reports prepared by the consultant as specified herein shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment, and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Archaeological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction of the Project for up to a maximum of four weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of construction can be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce potential effects on a significant archaeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a)(c) to a less-than-significant level. Archaeological Testing Program: The archaeological consultant shall prepare and submit to the ERO for review and approval an addendum to the approved HPS2 archaeological testing plan (ATP). The archaeological testing program shall be conducted in accordance with the approved ATP addendum. The ATP addendum shall identify the property types of the expected archaeological resource(s) that potentially could be adversely affected by ground-disturbing components of the 2018 Modified Project Variant, including ground source geothermal heating and cooling system geothermal boreholes~~,~~; the testing method to be used; and the locations recommended for testing. The purpose of the archaeological testing program will be to determine to the extent possible the presence or absence of archaeological resources and to identify and to evaluate whether any archaeological resource encountered on the site constitutes an historical resource under CEQA. At the completion of the archaeological testing program, the archaeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings for submittal to the ERO. If, based on the archaeological testing program, the archaeological consultant finds that significant archaeological resources may be present, the ERO (in consultation with the archaeological consultant) shall determine if additional measures are warranted. Additional measures that may be undertaken include, but are not necessarily limited to, additional archaeological testing, archaeological monitoring, and/or an archaeological data recovery program. If the ERO determines that a significant archaeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the Project, the Project Applicant shall either: a. Re-design the Project so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archaeological resource; or b. Implement a data recovery program, unless the ERO determines that the archaeological resource is of greater interpretive than research significance and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible.	

TABLE A-1 COMPARISON OF CP-HPS2 PROJECT CHANGES SINCE 2010[1,2,3]

Project Component	*2010 FEIR[4]*	*Addendum 1*	*Addendum 4*	*Addendum 5 (2018 Modified Project Variant)*	*Other Supporting Approval Documents for the 2010 FEIR, Addendum 1, Addendum 4, and/or Addendum 5*
	the commencement of any Project-related soils disturbing activities. The ERO, in consultation with the archaeological consultant, shall determine what Project activities shall be archaeologically monitored. In most cases, any soils-disturbing activities, such as demolition, foundation removal, excavation, grading, utilities installation, foundation work, driving of piles (foundation, shoring, etc.), and site remediation, shall require archaeological monitoring because of the risk these activities pose to potential archaeological resources and to their depositional context. ● The archaeological consultant shall train all Project construction personnel who could reasonably be expected to encounter archaeological resources of the expected resource(s), how to identify the evidence of the expected resource(s), and the appropriate protocol in the event of apparent discovery of an archaeological resource. ● The archaeological monitor(s) shall be present on the Project site according to a schedule agreed upon by the archaeological consultant and the ERO until the ERO has, in consultation with the archaeological consultant, determined that Project construction activities could have no effects on significant archaeological deposits. ● The archaeological monitor shall record and be authorized to collect soil samples and artifactual/ecofactual material as warranted for analysis. ● If an intact archaeological deposit is encountered, all soil-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit shall cease. The archaeological monitor shall be authorized to temporarily halt demolition/excavation/pile driving/construction activities and equipment until the deposit is evaluated. If, in the case of pile driving activity (foundation, shoring, etc.), the archaeological monitor has cause to believe that the pile driving activity may affect an archaeological resource, the pile driving activity shall be terminated until an appropriate evaluation of the resource has been made in consultation with the ERO. The archaeological consultant shall immediately notify the ERO of any encountered archaeological deposit. The archaeological consultant shall make a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archaeological deposit and present the findings of this assessment to the ERO as expeditiously as possible. ● Whether or not significant archaeological resources are encountered, the archaeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings of the monitoring program to the ERO. <u>Archaeological Data Recovery Program:</u> The archaeological data recovery program shall be conducted in accord with an Archaeological Data Recovery Plan (ADRP). The archaeological consultant, Project Applicant, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the ADRP prior to preparation of a draft ADRP. The archaeological consultant shall submit a draft ADRP to the ERO. The ADRP shall identify how the proposed data recovery program will preserve the significant information the archaeological resource is expected to contain. That is, the ADRP will identify what scientific/historical research questions are applicable to the expected resource, what data			<u>Archaeological Monitoring Program:</u> If the ERO, in consultation with the archaeological consultant, determines that an Archaeological Monitoring Program (AMP) shall be implemented, the AMP shall include the following provisions, at a minimum: ● The archaeological consultant, Project Applicant, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the AMP prior to the commencement of any Project-related soils disturbing activities. The ERO, in consultation with the archaeological consultant, shall determine what Project activities shall be archaeologically monitored. In most cases, any soils- disturbing activities, such as demolition, foundation removal, excavation, grading, utilities installation, foundation work, driving of piles (foundation, shoring, etc.), and site remediation, shall require archaeological monitoring because of the risk these activities pose to potential archaeological resources and to their depositional context. ● The archaeological consultant shall train all Project construction personnel who could reasonably be expected to encounter archaeological resources of the expected resource(s), how to identify the evidence of the expected resource(s), and the appropriate protocol in the event of apparent discovery of an archaeological resource. ● The archaeological monitor(s) shall be present on the Project site according to a schedule agreed upon by the archaeological consultant and the ERO until the ERO has, in consultation with the archaeological consultant, determined that Project construction activities could have no effects on significant archaeological deposits. ● The archaeological monitor shall record and be authorized to collect soil samples and artifactual/ecofactual material as warranted for analysis. ● If an intact archaeological deposit is encountered, all soil-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit shall cease. The archaeological monitor shall be authorized to temporarily halt demolition/excavation/pile driving/construction activities and equipment until the deposit is evaluated. If, in the case of pile driving activity (foundation, shoring, etc.), the archaeological monitor has cause to believe that the pile driving activity may affect an archaeological resource, the pile driving activity shall be terminated until an appropriate evaluation of the resource has been made in consultation with the ERO. The archaeological consultant shall immediately notify the ERO of any encountered archaeological deposit. The archaeological consultant shall make a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archaeological deposit and present the findings of this assessment to the ERO as expeditiously as possible. ● Whether or not significant archaeological resources are encountered, the archaeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings of the monitoring program to the ERO. <u>Archaeological Data Recovery Program:</u> The archaeological data recovery program shall be conducted in accord with an	

TABLE A-1 COMPARISON OF CP-HPS2 PROJECT CHANGES SINCE 2010[1,2,3]

Project Component	*2010 FEIR[4]*	*Addendum 1*	*Addendum 4*	*Addendum 5 (2018 Modified Project Variant)*	*Other Supporting Approval Documents for the 2010 FEIR, Addendum 1, Addendum 4, and/or Addendum 5*
	classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions. Data recovery, in general, should be limited to the portions of the historical property that could be adversely affected by the Project. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be pursued if nondestructive methods are practical. The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements: ● Field Methods and Procedures. Descriptions of proposed field strategies, procedures, and operations. ● Cataloguing and Laboratory Analysis. Description of selected cataloguing system and artifact analysis procedures. ● Discard and Deaccession Policy. Description of and rationale for field and post-field discard and deaccession policies. ● Interpretive Program. Consideration of an on-site/off-site public interpretive program during the course of the archaeological data recovery program. ● Security Measures. Recommended security measures to protect the archaeological resource from vandalism, looting, and other potentially damaging activities. ● Final Report. Description of proposed report format and distribution of results. ● Curation. Description of the procedures and recommendations for the curation of any recovered data having potential research value, identification of appropriate curation facilities, and a summary of the accession policies of the curation facilities. <u>Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects:</u> The treatment of human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soil-disturbing activity shall comply with applicable state and federal laws. This shall include immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the Coroner's determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (PRC Sec. 5097.98). The archaeological consultant, Project Applicant, and MLD shall make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects with appropriate dignity (CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15064.5(d)). The agreement shall take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects. <u>Final Archaeological Resources Report:</u> The archaeological consultant shall submit a Draft Final Archaeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archaeological resource and describes the archaeological and historical research methods employed in the archaeological testing/monitoring/data recovery program(s). Information that may put at risk any archaeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the final report. Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey			Archaeological Data Recovery Plan (ADRP). The archaeological consultant, Project Applicant, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the ADRP prior to preparation of a draft ADRP. The archaeological consultant shall submit a draft ADRP to the ERO. The ADRP shall identify how the proposed data recovery program will preserve the significant information the archaeological resource is expected to contain. That is, the ADRP will identify what scientific/historical research questions are applicable to the expected resource, what data classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions. Data recovery, in general, should be limited to the portions of the historical property that could be adversely affected by the Project. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be pursued if nondestructive methods are practical. The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements: ● Field Methods and Procedures. Descriptions of proposed field strategies, procedures, and operations. ● Cataloguing and Laboratory Analysis. Description of selected cataloguing system and artifact analysis procedures. ● Discard and Deaccession Policy. Description of and rationale for field and post-field discard and deaccession policies. ● Interpretive Program. Consideration of an on-site/off-site public interpretive program during the course of the archaeological data recovery program. ● Security Measures. Recommended security measures to protect the archaeological resource from vandalism, looting, and other potentially damaging activities. ● Final Report. Description of proposed report format and distribution of results. ● Curation. Description of the procedures and recommendations for the curation of any recovered data having potential research value, identification of appropriate curation facilities, and a summary of the accession policies of the curation facilities. <u>Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects:</u> The treatment of human remains and <u>of</u> associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soil<u>s</u>-disturbing activity shall comply with applicable state and federal laws~~. This shall include~~ <u>including</u> immediate notification of the ~~Coroner~~ <u>Office of the Chief Medical Examiner</u> of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the ~~Coroner's~~ <u>Medical Examiner's</u> determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (PRC Sec. 5097.98). <u>The ERO shall also be immediately notified upon discovery of human remains.</u> The archaeological consultant, Project ~~Applicant~~ <u>Sponsor, ERO,</u> and MLD shall <u>have up to but not beyond six days after the discovery to</u> make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of human remains	

TABLE A-1 COMPARISON OF CP-HPS2 PROJECT CHANGES SINCE 2010[1,2,3]

Project Component	*2010 FEIR[4]*	*Addendum 1*	*Addendum 4*	*Addendum 5 (2018 Modified Project Variant)*	*Other Supporting Approval Documents for the 2010 FEIR, Addendum 1, Addendum 4, and/or Addendum 5*
	Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one (1) copy and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Major Environmental Analysis division of the Planning Department shall receive three copies of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest in or the high interpretive value of the resource, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than presented above.			and associated or unassociated funerary objects with appropriate dignity (CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15064.5(d)). The agreement ~~shall~~ should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, ~~custodianship,~~ curation, possession, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects. Nothing in existing state regulations or in this mitigation measure compels the Project Sponsor and the ERO to accept recommendations of an MLD. The archeological consultant shall retain possession of any Native American human remains and associated or unassociated burial objects until completion of any scientific analyses of the human remains or objects as specified in the treatment agreement if such an agreement has been made or, otherwise, as determined by the archeological consultant and the ERO. If no agreement is reached, state regulations shall be followed including the reinternment of the human remains and associated burial objects with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance (PRC Sec. 5097.98). Final Archaeological Resources Report: The archaeological consultant shall submit a Draft Final Archaeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archaeological resource and describes the archaeological and historical research methods employed in the archaeological testing/monitoring/data recovery program(s). Information that may put at risk any archaeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the final report. Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one (1) copy and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Major Environmental Analysis division of the Planning Department shall receive three copies of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest in or the high interpretive value of the resource, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than presented above.	
MM GE-5a	**MM GE-5a** Site-Specific Geotechnical Investigation with Analyses of Liquefaction, Lateral Spreading and/or Settlement. Prior to issuance of building permits for the Project site: ● The Applicant shall submit to the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection (DBI) for review and approval a site-specific, design-level geotechnical investigation prepared by a California Certified Engineering Geologist (CEG) or California Registered Geotechnical Engineer (GE), as well as project plans prepared in compliance with the requirements of the San Francisco Building Code (SFBC), the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act, and requirements contained in CGS Special Publication 117A "Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California." In addition, all engineering	No changes proposed.	No changes proposed.	**MM GE-5a** Site-Specific Geotechnical Investigation with Analyses of Liquefaction, Lateral Spreading and/or Settlement. Prior to issuance of building permits for the Project site: ● The Applicant shall submit to the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection (DBI) for review and approval a site-specific, design-level geotechnical investigation prepared by a California Certified Engineering Geologist (CEG) or California Registered Geotechnical Engineer (GE), as well as project plans prepared in compliance with the requirements of the San Francisco Building Code (SFBC), the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act, and requirements contained in CGS Special Publication 117A "Guidelines for	

TABLE A-1 COMPARISON OF CP-HPS2 PROJECT CHANGES SINCE 2010[1,2,3]

Project Component	*2010 FEIR[4]*	*Addendum 1*	*Addendum 4*	*Addendum 5 (2018 Modified Project Variant)*	*Other Supporting Approval Documents for the 2010 FEIR, Addendum 1, Addendum 4, and/or Addendum 5*
	practices, and analyses of structural design shall be consistent with SFBC standards to ensure seismic stability, including reduction of potential liquefaction hazards. ● DBI shall employ a third-party CEG and California Registered Professional Engineer (Civil) (PE) to form a Geotechnical Peer Review Committee (GPRC), consisting of DBI and these third-party reviewers. The GPRC shall review the site-specific geotechnical investigations and the site-specific structural, foundation, infrastructure, and other relevant plans to ensure that these plans incorporate all necessary geotechnical mitigation measures. No permits shall be issued by DBI until the GPRC has approved the geotechnical investigation and the Project plans, including the factual determinations and the proposed engineering designs and construction methods. ● All Project structural designs shall incorporate and conform to the requirements in the site-specific geotechnical investigations. ● The site-specific Project plans shall incorporate the mitigation measures contained in the approved site-specific geotechnical reports to reduce liquefaction hazards. The engineering design techniques to reduce liquefaction hazards shall include proven methods generally accepted by California Certified Engineering Geologists, subject to DBI and GPRC review and approval, including, but not necessarily limited to: ○ Structural Measures ■ Construction of deep foundations, which transfer loads to competent strata beneath the zone susceptible to liquefaction, for critical utilities and shallow foundations ■ Structural mat foundations to distribute concentrated load to prevent damage to structures ○ Ground Improvement Measures ■ Additional over-excavation and replacement of unstable soil with engineering-compacted fill ■ Dynamic compaction, such as Deep Dynamic Compaction (DDC) or Rapid Impact Compaction (RIC), to densify loose soils below the groundwater table ■ Vibro-compaction, sometimes referred to as vibro-floatation, to densify loose soils below the groundwater table ■ Stone columns to provide pore pressure dissipation pathways for soil, compact loose soil between columns, and provide additional bearing support beneath foundations ■ Soil-cement columns to densify loose soils and provide additional bearing support beneath foundations ● The Project CEG or GE shall be responsible for ensuring compliance with these requirements.			Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California." In addition, all engineering practices, and analyses of structural design shall be consistent with SFBC standards to ensure seismic stability, including reduction of potential liquefaction hazards. ● DBI shall employ a third-party CEG and California Registered Professional Engineer (Civil) (PE) to form a Geotechnical Peer Review Committee (GPRC), consisting of DBI and these third-party reviewers. The GPRC shall review the site-specific geotechnical investigations and the site-specific structural, foundation, infrastructure, and other relevant plans to ensure that these plans incorporate all necessary geotechnical mitigation measures. No permits shall be issued by DBI until the GPRC has approved the geotechnical investigation and the Project plans, including the factual determinations and the proposed engineering designs and construction methods. ● All Project structural designs shall incorporate and conform to the requirements in the site-specific geotechnical investigations. ● The site-specific Project plans shall incorporate the mitigation measures contained in the approved site-specific geotechnical reports to reduce liquefaction hazards. The engineering design techniques to reduce liquefaction hazards shall include proven methods generally accepted by California Certified Engineering Geologists, subject to DBI and GPRC review and approval, including, but not necessarily limited to: <u>Structural Measures</u> ● Construction of deep foundations, which transfer loads to competent strata beneath the zone susceptible to liquefaction, for shallow foundations ● Structural mat foundations to distribute concentrated load to prevent damage to structures <u>Ground Improvement Measures</u> ● Additional over-excavation and replacement of unstable soil with engineering-compacted fill ● Dynamic compaction, such as Deep Dynamic Compaction (DDC) or Rapid Impact Compaction (RIC), to densify loose soils below the groundwater table ● Vibro-compaction, sometimes referred to as vibro-floatation, to densify loose soils below the groundwater table ● Stone columns to provide pore pressure dissipation pathways for soil, compact loose soil between columns, and provide additional bearing support beneath foundations ● Soil-cement columns to densify loose soils and provide additional bearing support beneath foundations ● <u>Deep displacement grout columns to densify loose soil and provide additional bearing support beneath foundations</u> ● The Project CEG or GE shall be responsible for ensuring compliance with these requirements.	

TABLE A-1 COMPARISON OF CP-HPS2 PROJECT CHANGES SINCE 2010[1,2,3]

Project Component	*2010 FEIR[4]*	*Addendum 1*	*Addendum 4*	*Addendum 5 (2018 Modified Project Variant)*	*Other Supporting Approval Documents for the 2010 FEIR, Addendum 1, Addendum 4, and/or Addendum 5*
MM HY-6a.1	**MM HY-6a.1** Regulatory Stormwater Requirements. The Project Applicant shall comply with requirements of the Municipal Stormwater General Permit and associated City SWMP, appropriate performance standards established in the Green Building Ordinance, and performance standards established by the SFPUC in the San Francisco Stormwater Design Guidelines. The Draft San Francisco Stormwater Design Guidelines have been developed to satisfy the Municipal Stormwater General Permit requirements for new development and redevelopment projects in areas served by separate storm sewers, and are expected to be adopted by December 2009. The Project Applicant shall comply with requirements of the Draft San Francisco Stormwater Design Guidelines. Upon adoption of the Final Stormwater Design Guidelines, the Project shall comply with the Final San Francisco Stormwater Design Guidelines unless discretionary permits have been approved. Per the Draft San Francisco Stormwater Design Guidelines, the Project Applicant shall submit a SCP to the SFPUC, as part of the development application submitted for approval. The SCP shall demonstrate how the following measures would be incorporated into the Project: ● Low impact development site design principles (e.g., preserving natural drainage channels, treating stormwater runoff at its source rather than in downstream centralized controls) ● Source control BMPs in the form of design standards and structural features for the following areas, as applicable: ○ Commercial areas ○ Restaurants ○ Retail gasoline outlets ○ Automotive repair shops ○ Parking lots ● Source control BMPs for landscaped areas shall be documented in the form of a Landscape Management Plan that relies on Integrated Pest Management[8] and also includes pesticide and fertilizer application guidelines. ● Treatment control measures (e.g., bioretention, porous pavement, vegetated swales) targeting the Project-specific COCs: sediment, pathogens, metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus compounds), oxygen-demanding substances, organic compounds (e.g., PCBs, pesticides), oil and grease, and trash and debris. The SCP shall demonstrate that the Project has the land area available to support the proposed BMP facilities sized per the required water quality design storm. Volume-based BMPs shall be sized to treat runoff resulting from 0.75 inches of rainfall (LEED® SS6.2), and flow-based BMPs shall be sized to treat runoff resulting from a rainfall intensity of 0.2 inches per hour. Treatment trains shall be used where feasible.	No changes proposed.	No changes proposed.	**MM HY-6a.1** Regulatory Stormwater Requirements. The Project Applicant shall comply with requirements of the Municipal Stormwater General Permit and associated City SWMP, appropriate performance standards established in the Green Building Ordinance, and performance standards established by the SFPUC in the San Francisco Stormwater Management Requirements and Design Guidelines (SMR). The ~~Draft San Francisco Stormwater Design Guidelines have been developed to satisfy the Municipal Stormwater General Permit requirements for new development and redevelopment projects in areas served by separate storm sewers, and are expected to be adopted by December 2009~~ SMR includes regulatory requirements for post-construction stormwater management controls for new and redevelopment projects and helps design teams implement these stormwater controls. The Project Applicant shall comply with requirements of the ~~Draft San Francisco Stormwater Design Guidelines~~ SMR. ~~Upon adoption of the Final Stormwater Design Guidelines, the Project shall comply with the Final San Francisco Stormwater Design Guidelines unless discretionary permits have been approved.~~ Per the ~~Draft San Francisco Stormwater Design Guidelines~~ SMR, the Project Applicant shall submit a Stormwater Control Plan (SCP) to the SFPUC, as part of the development application submitted for approval. The SCP shall demonstrate how the following measures would be incorporated into the Project: ● Low impact development site design principles (e.g., preserving natural drainage channels, treating stormwater runoff at its source rather than in downstream centralized controls) ● Source control BMPs in the form of design standards and structural features for the following areas, as applicable: ○ Commercial areas ○ Restaurants ○ Retail gasoline outlets ○ Automotive repair shops ○ Parking lots ● Source control BMPs for landscaped areas shall be documented in the form of a Landscape Management Plan that relies on Integrated Pest Management[9] and also includes pesticide and fertilizer application guidelines. ● Treatment control measures (e.g., bioretention, porous pavement, vegetated swales) targeting the Project-specific COCs: sediment, pathogens, metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus compounds), oxygen-demanding substances, organic compounds (e.g.,	

[8] IPM is a strategy that focuses on long-term prevention or suppression of pest problems (i.e., insects, diseases and weeds) through a combination of techniques including: using pest-resistant plants; biological controls; cultural practices; habitat modification; and the judicious use of pesticides according to treatment thresholds, when monitoring indicates pesticides are needed because pest populations exceed established thresholds.

[9] IPM is a strategy that focuses on long-term prevention or suppression of pest problems (i.e., insects, diseases and weeds) through a combination of techniques including: using pest-resistant plants; biological controls; cultural practices; habitat modification; and the judicious use of pesticides according to treatment thresholds, when monitoring indicates pesticides are needed because pest populations exceed established thresholds.

TABLE A-1 COMPARISON OF CP-HPS2 PROJECT CHANGES SINCE 2010[1,2,3]

Project Component	*2010 FEIR[4]*	*Addendum 1*	*Addendum 4*	*Addendum 5 (2018 Modified Project Variant)*	*Other Supporting Approval Documents for the 2010 FEIR, Addendum 1, Addendum 4, and/or Addendum 5*
	Additional requirements: ● LEED® SS6.2: BMPs used to treat runoff shall be designed to remove 80 percent of the average annual post-development total suspended solids loads. BMPs are considered to meet these criteria if they are designed in accordance with SFPUC requirements. ● The SCP shall include an Operations and Maintenance Plan that demonstrates how the treatment control BMPs would be maintained in the long term, what entities would be responsible for BMP maintenance within the public and private rights-of-way, funding mechanisms, and what mechanisms would be used to formalize maintenance and access agreements. ● The Project Applicant shall also prepare a Stormwater Drainage Master Plan (SDMP) for approval by the SFPUC. The SDMP shall include plans for the storm drain infrastructure and plans for stormwater management controls (e.g., vegetated swales, dry wells). The storm drain infrastructure shall illustrate conveyance of the 5-year storm event in a separate storm drain piped system, and conveyance of the 100-year storm event in the street and drainage channel rights-of-way.			PCBs, pesticides), oil and grease, and trash and debris. The SCP shall demonstrate that the Project has the land area available to support the proposed BMP facilities sized per the required water quality design storm. Volume-based BMPs shall be sized to treat runoff resulting from 0.75 inch of rainfall ~~(LEED® SS6.2)~~, and flow-based BMPs shall be sized to treat runoff resulting from a rainfall intensity of 0.2~~5~~4 inch per hour. Treatment trains shall be used where feasible. Additional requirements: ● ~~LEED® SS6.2: BMPs used to treat runoff shall be designed to remove 80 percent of the average annual post-development total suspended solids loads. BMPs are considered to meet these criteria if they are designed in accordance with SFPUC requirements.~~ ● The SCP shall include an Operations and Maintenance Plan that demonstrates how the treatment control BMPs would be maintained in the long term, what entities would be responsible for BMP maintenance within the public and private rights-of-way, funding mechanisms, and what mechanisms would be used to formalize maintenance and access agreements. ● The Project Applicant shall also prepare a Stormwater Drainage Master Plan (SDMP) for approval by the SFPUC. The SDMP shall include plans for the storm drain infrastructure and plans for stormwater management controls (e.g., vegetated swales, dry wells). The storm drain infrastructure shall illustrate conveyance of the 5-year storm event in a separate storm drain piped system, and conveyance of the 100-year storm event in the street and drainage channel rights-of-way.	
MM HY-12a.1	**MM HY-12a.1** Finished Grade Elevations Above Base Flood Elevation. The Project site shall be graded such that finished floor elevations are 3.5 feet above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE), and streets and pads are 3 feet above BFE to allow for future sea level rise, thereby elevating all housing and structures above the existing and potential future flood hazard area. If the FIRM for San Francisco is not finalized prior to implementation of the Project, the Project Applicant shall work with the City Surveyor to revise the City's Interim Floodplain Map. If the FIRM for San Francisco is finalized prior to implementation of the Project, the Project Applicant shall request that the Office of the City Administrator (Floodplain Manager) request a Letter of Map Revision based on Fill (LOMR-F) from FEMA that places the Project outside SFHA and requires that the FIRM is updated by FEMA to reflect revised regulatory floodplain designations.	No changes proposed.	No changes proposed.	**MM HY-12a.1** Finished Grade Elevations Above Base Flood Elevation. The Project site shall be graded such that finished floor elevations are a minimum of ~~3~~5.5 feet above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE)~~, and streets and pads are 3 feet above BFE~~ to ~~allow for~~ accommodate worst-case, future sea level rise projections for the end of the century, thereby elevating all housing and structures above the existing and potential future flood hazard area. If the FIRM for San Francisco is not finalized prior to implementation of the Project, the Project Applicant shall work with the City Surveyor or other applicable City department to revise the City's Interim Floodplain Map, as needed. If the FIRM for San Francisco is finalized prior to implementation of the Project, the Project Applicant shall request that the Office of the City Administrator (Floodplain Manager) request a Letter of Map Revision based on Fill (LOMR-F) from FEMA that places the Project outside a SFHA and requires that the FIRM is updated by FEMA to reflect revised regulatory floodplain designations.	

TABLE A-1 COMPARISON OF CP-HPS2 PROJECT CHANGES SINCE 2010[1,2,3]

Project Component	*2010 FEIR[4]*	*Addendum 1*	*Addendum 4*	*Addendum 5 (2018 Modified Project Variant)*	*Other Supporting Approval Documents for the 2010 FEIR, Addendum 1, Addendum 4, and/or Addendum 5*
MM HY-12a.2	**MM HY-12a.2** Shoreline Improvements for Future Sea-Level Rise. Shoreline and public access improvements shall be designed to allow future increases in elevation along the shoreline edge to keep up with higher sea level rise values, should they occur. Design elements shall include providing adequate setbacks to allow for future elevation increases of at least 3 feet from the existing elevation along the shoreline. Before the first Small Lot Final Map is approved, the Project Applicant must petition the appropriate governing body to form (or annex into if appropriate) and administer a special assessment district or other funding mechanism to finance and construct future improvements necessary to ensure that the shoreline, public facilities, and public access improvements will be protected should sea level rise exceed 16 inches at the perimeter of the Project. Prior to the sale of the first residential unit within the Project, the legislative body shall have acted upon the petition to include the property within the district boundary. The newly formed district shall also administer a Monitoring and Adaptive Management Plan to monitor sea level and implement and maintain the protective improvements.	No changes proposed.	No changes proposed.	**MM HY-12a.2** Shoreline Improvements for Future Sea-Level Rise**.** Shoreline and public access improvements shall be designed to allow for future ~~increases in elevation~~ sea level rise above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) that includes wave run-up (often called Total Water Level [TWL]) along the shoreline. In addition, adequate horizontal setback shall be provided to allow future increases in elevation along the shoreline edge to keep up with higher sea level rise values, should they occur. Design elements shall include providing adequate setbacks to allow for future elevation increases ~~of at least 3 feet from the existing elevation along the shoreline~~ in response to up to 5.5 feet of sea level rise above the TWL, which is projected as the worst-case estimate at the end of the century. Before the first Small Lot Final Map is approved, the Project Applicant must petition the appropriate governing body to form (or annex into if appropriate) and administer a special assessment district or other funding mechanism to finance and construct future improvements necessary to ensure that the shoreline protection system, storm drain system, public facilities, and public access improvements will be protected should sea level rise exceed ~~16 inches at the perimeter of the Project~~ 2 feet. Prior to the sale of the first residential unit within the Project, the legislative body shall have acted upon the petition to include the property within the district boundary. The newly formed district shall also administer a Monitoring and Adaptive Management Plan to monitor sea level and implement and maintain the protective improvements.	
MM HY-14	**MM HY-14** Shoreline Improvements to Reduce Flood Risk. To reduce the flood impacts of failure of existing shoreline structures, the Project Applicant shall implement shoreline improvements for flood control protection, as identified in the Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Development Project Proposed Shoreline Improvements report.[10] Where feasible, elements of living shorelines shall be incorporated into the shoreline protection improvement measures.	No changes proposed.	No changes proposed.	**MM HY-14** Shoreline Improvements to Reduce Flood Risk. To reduce the flood impacts of failure of existing shoreline structures, the Project Applicant shall implement shoreline improvements for flood control protection, as identified in the Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Development Project Proposed Shoreline Improvements report.~~.~~[11] (or updated Shoreline Improvements Reports). Where feasible, elements of living shorelines shall be incorporated into the shoreline protection improvement measures.	

[10] Moffatt & Nichols, 2009, Candlestick Point / Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Proposed Shoreline Improvements, prepared for Lennar Urban, September, 2009.
[11] Moffatt & Nichols, 2009, Candlestick Point / Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Proposed Shoreline Improvements, prepared for Lennar Urban, September, 2009.

TABLE A-1 COMPARISON OF CP-HPS2 PROJECT CHANGES SINCE 2010[1,2,3]

Project Component	*2010 FEIR[4]*	*Addendum 1*	*Addendum 4*	*Addendum 5 (2018 Modified Project Variant)*	*Other Supporting Approval Documents for the 2010 FEIR, Addendum 1, Addendum 4, and/or Addendum 5*
MM BI-19b	**MM BI-19b.1** Work Windows to Reduce Maintenance Dredging Impacts to Fish during Operation of the Marina. According to the Long-Term Management Strategy (LTMS), dredging Projects that occur during the designated work windows do not need to consult with NMFS under the federal *Endangered Species Act* (FESA).[12] The window in which dredging is allowed for the protection of steelhead in the central Bay is June 1 to November 30. The spawning season for the Pacific herring is March 1 to November 30.[13] Therefore, the window that shall be applied to minimize impacts to sensitive fish species (during which dredging activities cannot occur) is March 1 to November 30.	No changes proposed.	No changes proposed.	**MM BI-19b.1** Work Windows to Reduce Maintenance Dredging Impacts to Fish during Operation of the Marina. According to the Long-Term Management Strategy (LTMS), dredging Projects that occur during the designated work windows do not need to consult with NMFS under the federal *Endangered Species Act* (FESA).[14] The window in which dredging is allowed for the protection of steelhead in the central Bay is June 1 to November 30. The spawning season for the Pacific herring is ~~March 1 to November 30~~ December 1 to February 28.[15] Therefore, the window that shall be applied to minimize impacts to sensitive fish species (during which dredging activities cannot occur) is ~~March~~ June 1 to November 30.	
MM BI-20a.1	**MM BI-20a.1** Lighting Measures to Reduce Impacts to Birds. During design of any building greater than 100 feet tall, the Project Applicant and architect shall consult with a qualified biologist experienced with bird strikes and building/lighting design issues (as approved by the City/Agency) to identify lighting-related measures to minimize the effects of the building's lighting on birds. Such measures, which may include the following and/or other measures, will be incorporated into the building's design and operation. ● Use strobe or flashing lights in place of continuously burning lights for obstruction lighting. Use flashing white lights rather than continuous light, red light, or rotating beams. ● Install shields onto light sources not necessary for air traffic to direct light towards the ground. ● Extinguish all exterior lighting (i.e., rooftop floods, perimeter spots) not required for public safety. ● When interior or exterior lights must be left on at night, the developer and/or operator of the buildings shall examine and adopt alternatives to bright, all-night, floor-wide lighting, which may include: ○ Installing motion-sensitive lighting. ○ Using desk lamps and task lighting. ○ Reprogramming timers. ○ Use of lower-intensity lighting. ● Windows or window treatments that reduce transmission of light out of the building will be implemented to the extent feasible. ● Educational materials will be provided to building occupants encouraging them to minimize light transmission from windows, especially during peak spring and fall migratory periods, by turning off unnecessary lighting and/or closing drapes and blinds at night.	No changes proposed.	No changes proposed.	**MM BI-20a.1** Lighting Measures to Reduce Impacts to Birds. During building design ~~of any building greater than 100 feet tall~~, the Project Applicant and architect shall consult with a qualified biologist experienced with bird strikes and building/lighting design issues (as approved by the City/Agency) to identify lighting-related measures to minimize the effects of the building's lighting on birds. Such measures, which may include the following and/or other measures, will be incorporated into the building's design and operation. ● Where lighting is necessary on rooftops, u~~U~~se strobe or flashing lights in place of continuously burning lights for obstruction lighting. Use flashing white lights rather than continuous light, red light, or rotating beams. ● Install shields onto light sources not necessary for air traffic to direct light towards the ground and away from areas that provide high-quality bird habitat. ● Extinguish all exterior lighting (i.e., rooftop floods, perimeter spots) not required for public safety. ● No uplighting will be installed. ● When interior or exterior lights must be left on at night, the developer and/or operator of the buildings shall examine and adopt alternatives to bright, all-night, floor-wide lighting, which may include: ○ Installing motion-sensitive lighting. ○ Using desk lamps and task lighting. ○ Reprogramming timers. ○ Use of lower-intensity lighting. ● Windows or window treatments that reduce transmission of light out of the building will be implemented to the extent feasible. ● Educational materials will be provided to building occupants encouraging them to minimize light	

[12] US Army Corps of Engineers, US Environmental Protection Agency, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Implementation Commission, and San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board. Long-term Management Strategy for the Placement of Dredge Material in the San Francisco Bay, Management Plan 2001.
[13] US Army Corps of Engineers, US Environmental Protection Agency, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Implementation Commission, and San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board. Long-term Management Strategy for the Placement of Dredge Material in the San Francisco Bay, Management Plan 2001; Appendix F.
[14] US Army Corps of Engineers, US Environmental Protection Agency, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Implementation Commission, and San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board. Long-term Management Strategy for the Placement of Dredge Material in the San Francisco Bay, Management Plan 2001.
[15] US Army Corps of Engineers, US Environmental Protection Agency, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Implementation Commission, and San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board. Long-term Management Strategy for the Placement of Dredge Material in the San Francisco Bay, Management Plan 2001; Appendix F.

TABLE A-1 COMPARISON OF CP-HPS2 PROJECT CHANGES SINCE 2010[1,2,3]

Project Component	*2010 FEIR[4]*	*Addendum 1*	*Addendum 4*	*Addendum 5 (2018 Modified Project Variant)*	*Other Supporting Approval Documents for the 2010 FEIR, Addendum 1, Addendum 4, and/or Addendum 5*
	● A report of the lighting alternatives considered and adopted shall be provided to the City/Agency for review and approval prior to construction. The City/Agency shall ensure that lighting-related measures to reduce the risk of bird collisions have been incorporated into the design of such buildings to the extent practicable.			transmission from windows, especially during peak spring and fall migratory periods, by turning off unnecessary lighting and/or closing drapes and blinds at night. ● A report of the lighting alternatives considered and adopted shall be provided to the City/Agency for review and approval prior to construction. The City/Agency shall ensure that lighting-related measures to reduce the risk of bird collisions have been incorporated into the design of such buildings to the extent practicable.	
MM BI-20a.2	**MM BI-20a.2** Building Design Measures to Minimize Bird Strike Risk. During design of any building greater than 100 feet tall, the Project Applicant and architect will consult with a qualified biologist experienced with bird strikes and building/lighting design issues (as approved by the City/Agency) to identify measures related to the external appearance of the building to minimize the risk of bird strikes. Such measures, which may include the following and/or other measures, will be incorporated into the building's design. ● Use non-reflective tinted glass. ● Use window films to make windows visible to birds from the outside. ● Use external surfaces/designs that "break up" reflective surfaces. ● Place bird attractants, such as bird feeders and baths, at least 3 feet and preferably 30 feet or more from windows in order to reduce collision mortality. A report of the design measures considered and adopted shall be provided to the City/Agency for review and approval prior to construction. The City/Agency shall ensure that building design-related measures to reduce the risk of bird collisions have been incorporated to the extent practicable.	No changes proposed.	No changes proposed.	**MM BI-20a.2** Building Design Measures to Minimize Bird Strike Risk. During design of any building ~~greater than 100 feet tall~~ within 300 feet of a potential "urban bird refuge" (an open space 2 acres and larger dominated by vegetation, including vegetated landscaping, forest, meadows, grassland, or wetlands, or open water) or any structure containing free-standing glass walls, wind barriers, skywalks, balconies, and greenhouses on rooftops that have unbroken glazed segments 24 square feet and larger in size, the Project Applicant and architect will consult with a qualified biologist experienced with bird strikes and building/lighting design issues (as approved by the City/Agency) to identify measures related to the external appearance of the building/structure to minimize the risk of bird strikes. Such measures, which may include the following and/or other measures, will be incorporated into the building's design. ● Minimize the use of glass, particularly within the portion of the building between ground level and 60 feet above the ground. ● Use non-reflective tinted glass. ● Use window films to make windows visible to birds from the outside. ● Use external surfaces/designs that "break up" reflective surfaces. These patterns should include vertical elements at least 0.25 inch wide at a maximum spacing of 4 inches or horizontal elements at least 0.125 inch wide at a maximum spacing of 2 inches. ● Place bird attractants, such as bird feeders and baths, at least 3 feet and preferably 30 feet or more from windows in order to reduce collision mortality. A report of the design measures considered and adopted shall be provided to the City/Agency for review and approval prior to construction. If, in the opinion of a qualified biologist, modification or waiver of these bird-safe design measures would not result in substantial increases in bird collision risk, the report should include the justification for such an opinion, for consideration by the City/Agency. The City/Agency shall ensure that building design-related measures to reduce the risk of bird collisions have been incorporated to the extent practicable.	

TABLE A-1 COMPARISON OF CP-HPS2 PROJECT CHANGES SINCE 2010[1,2,3]

Project Component	*2010 FEIR[4]*	*Addendum 1*	*Addendum 4*	*Addendum 5 (2018 Modified Project Variant)*	*Other Supporting Approval Documents for the 2010 FEIR, Addendum 1, Addendum 4, and/or Addendum 5*
MM RE-2	**MM RE-2** Phasing of parkland with respect to residential and/or employment generating uses. Development of the Project and associated parkland shall generally proceed in four phases, as illustrated by Figure II-16 (Proposed Site Preparation Schedule) of Chapter II (Project Description) of this EIR. To ensure that within each phase parks and population increase substantially concurrently, development shall be scheduled such that adequate parkland is constructed and operational when residential and employment-generating uses are occupied. The following standards shall be met: ● No project development shall be granted a temporary certificate of occupancy if the City determines that the new population associated with that development would result in a parkland-to-population ratio within the Project site lower than 5.5 acres per 1,000 residents/population, as calculated by the Agency. For the purposes of this mitigation measure, in order for a park to be considered in the parkland-to-population ratio, the Agency must determine that within 12 months of the issuance of the temporary certificate of occupancy, it will be fully constructed and operational, and, if applicable, operation and maintenance funding will be provided to the Agency.	No changes proposed.	No changes proposed.	**MM RE-2** Phasing of parkland with respect to residential and/or employment generating uses. Development of the Project and associated parkland shall ~~proceed in four phases, as illustrated by Figure II-16 (Proposed Site Preparation Schedule) of Chapter II (Project Description) of this EIR. To~~ ensure that within each phase or sub-phase, parks and population increase substantially concurrently~~,~~ and development shall be scheduled such that adequate parkland is constructed and operational when residential and employment-generating uses are occupied. The following standards shall be met: ● No project development shall be granted a temporary certificate of occupancy if the City determines that the new population associated with that development would result in a parkland-to-population ratio within the Project site lower than 5.5 acres per 1,000 residents/population, as calculated by the Agency. ● For the purposes of this mitigation measure, in order for a park to be considered in the parkland-to-population ratio, the Agency must determine that within 12 months of the issuance of the temporary certificate of occupancy, it will be fully constructed and operational, and, if applicable, operation and maintenance funding will be provided to the Agency.	
MM UT-2	**MM UT-2** Auxiliary Water Supply System. Prior to issuance of occupancy permits, as part of the Infrastructure Plan to be approved, the Project Applicant shall construct an Auxiliary Water Supply System (AWSS) loop within Candlestick Point to connect to the City's planned extension of the off-site system off-site on Gilman Street from Ingalls Street to Candlestick Point. The Project Applicant shall construct an additional AWSS loop on HPS Phase II to connect to the existing system at Earl Street and Innes Avenue and at Palou and Griffith Avenues, with looped service along Spear Avenue/Crisp Road.	*Revision to MM UT-2 would reflect a different piping layout and the addition of two Portable Water Supply Systems, as follows:* **MM UT-2** Auxiliary Water Supply System. Prior to issuance of occupancy permits, as part of the Infrastructure Plan to be approved, the Project Applicant shall construct an Auxiliary Water Supply System (AWSS) ~~loop~~ within Candlestick Point to connect to the City's planned extension of the offsite system off-site on Gilman Street from Ingalls Street to Candlestick Point. The Project Applicant shall construct an additional AWSS ~~loop~~ on HPS Phase II to connect to the existing system at Earl Street and Innes Avenue and at Palou and Griffith Avenues, with ~~looped~~ service along Spear Avenue/Crisp Road.	No changes proposed.	**MM UT-2** Auxiliary Water Supply System. Prior to issuance of occupancy permits, as part of the Infrastructure Plan to be approved, the Project Applicant shall construct an Auxiliary Water Supply System (AWSS) within Candlestick Point to connect to the City's planned extension of the off-site system on Gilman Street from Ingalls Street to Candlestick Point. The Project Applicant shall construct an additional AWSS on HPS Phase II to connect to the existing system ~~at Earl Street and Innes Avenue and~~ at Palou and Griffith Avenues, with service along Spear Avenue/Crisp Road.	
MM GC-2	**MM GC-2** Exceed the 2008 Standards for Title 24 Part 6 energy efficiency standards for homes and businesses would by at least 15 percent.	No changes proposed.	No changes proposed.	**MM GC-2** ~~Exceed the 2008~~ Comply with the 2016 Standards for Title 24 Part 6 energy efficiency standards for homes and businesses ~~would by at least 15 percent~~.	

Table A-2: Comparison of 2018 Modified Project Variant to 2010 Project

	2010 FEIR PROJECT			2018 MODIFIED PROJECT VARIANT			2010-18 NET CHANGE		
	Candlestick	**Hunters Point Phase II**	**Total**	**Candlestick**	**Hunters Point Phase II**	**Total**	**Candlestick**	**Hunters Point Phase II**	**Total**
NONRESIDENTIAL LAND USE									
Artist Studio	0 SF	255,000 SF	**255,000** SF	0 SF	255,000 SF	**255,000** SF	0 SF	0 SF	**0** SF
Community Use	50,000 SF	50,000 SF	**100,000** SF	50,000 SF	50,000 SF	**100,000** SF	0 SF	0 SF	**0** SF
Arena	75,000 SF	0 SF	**75,000** SF	75,000 SF	0 SF	**75,000** SF	0 SF	0 SF	**0** SF
	10,000 SEATS	0 SEATS	**10,000** SEATS	10,000 SEATS	0 SEATS	**10,000** SEATS	0 SEATS	0 SEATS	**0** SEATS
Hotel	150,000 SF	0 SF	**150,000** SF	150,000 SF	120,000 SF	**270,000** SF	0 SF	120,000 SF	**120,000** SF
	220 ROOMS	0 ROOMS	**220** ROOMS	220 ROOMS	175 ROOMS	**395** ROOMS	0 ROOMS	175 ROOMS	**175** ROOMS
Institution	0 SF	0 SF	**0** SF	0 SF	410,000 SF	**410,000** SF	0 SF	410,000 SF	**410,000** SF
Elementary School/Junior High School	0 SF	0 SF	**0** SF	0 SF	345,000 SF	**345,000** SF	0 SF	345,000 SF	**345,000** SF
	0 ± STUDENTS	0 ± STUDENTS	**0** ± STUDENTS	0 ± STUDENTS	1,000 ± STUDENTS	**1,000** ± STUDENTS[b]	0 ± STUDENTS	1,000 ± STUDENTS	**1,000** ± STUDENTS
High School/Post-Secondary	0 SF	0 SF	**0** SF	0 SF	65,000 SF	**65,000** SF	0 SF	65,000 SF	**65,000** SF
	0 ± STUDENTS	0 ± STUDENTS	**0** ± STUDENTS	0 ± STUDENTS	1,000 ± STUDENTS	**1,000** ± STUDENTS[c]	0 ± STUDENTS	1,000 ± STUDENTS	**1,000** ± STUDENTS
Stadium	0 SF	1,860,000 SF	**1,860,000** SF	0 SF	0 SF	**0** SF	0 SF	-1,860,000 SF	**-1,860,000** SF
	0 SEATS	69,000 SEATS	**69,000** SEATS	0 SEATS	0 SEATS	**0** SEATS	0 SEATS	-69,000 SEATS	**-69,000** SEATS
R&D/Office	150,000 SF	2,500,000 SF	**2,650,000** SF	150,000 SF	4,265,000 SF	**4,415,000** SF[d,e]	0 SF	1,765,000 SF	**1,765,000** SF
Regional Retail	635,000 SF	0 SF	**635,000** SF	635,000 SF	100,000 SF	**735,000** SF[f]	0 SF	100,000 SF	**100,000** SF
Neighborhood Retail	125,000 SF	125,000 SF	**250,000** SF	125,000 SF	226,000 SF	**351,000** SF	0 SF	101,000 SF	**101,000** SF
Maker Space	0 SF	0 SF	**0** SF	0 SF	75,000 SF	**75,000** SF	0 SF	75,000 SF	**75,000** SF
GSF Total	**1,185,000** SF	**4,790,000** SF	**5,975,000** SF	**1,185,000** SF	**5,501,000** SF	**6,686,000** SF	**0** SF	**711,000** SF	**711,000** SF
RESIDENTIAL	**7,850** UNITS	**2,650** UNITS	**10,500** UNITS	**7,218** UNITS	**3,454** UNITS	**10,672** UNITS[g]	**-632** UNITS	**804** UNITS	**172** UNITS
CAR PARKING									
Residential (Structured) Parking	7,850 SPACES	2,650 SPACES	**10,500** SPACES	7,218 SPACES	3,454 SPACES	**10,672** SPACES	-632 SPACES	804 SPACES	**172** SPACES
Commercial (Structured) Parking	2,346 SPACES	4,028 SPACES	**6,374** SPACES	2,736 SPACES	7,152 SPACES	**9,888** SPACES	390 SPACES	3,124 SPACES	**3,514** SPACES
Parking Total	**10,196** SPACES	**6,678** SPACES	**16,874** SPACES	**9,954** SPACES	**10,606** SPACES	**20,560** SPACES	**-242** SPACES	**3,928** SPACES	**3,686** SPACES
± On-street Parking	1,360 SPACES	683 SPACES	**2,043** SPACES	1,360 SPACES	1,487 SPACES	**2,847** SPACES[h]	0 SPACES	804 SPACES	**804** SPACES
Dedicated Stadium Parking	0 SPACES	12,665 SPACES	**12,665** SPACES	0 SPACES	0 SPACES	**0** SPACES	0 SPACES	-12,665 SPACES	**-12,665** SPACES
MARINA	**0** SLIPS	**300** SLIPS	**300** SLIPS	**0** SLIPS	**300** SLIPS	**300** SLIPS	**0** SLIPS	**0** SLIPS	**0** SLIPS
WATER TAXI	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**YES**	**YES**	**NO**	**YES**	**YES**
New Parks	8.1 AC	140.0 AC	148.1 AC	9.0 AC	173.9 AC	182.9 AC	0.9 AC	33.9 AC	34.8 AC
New Sports Fields & Active Urban Recreation	0.0 AC	91.6 AC	91.6 AC	0.0 AC	58.1 AC	58.1 AC	0.0 AC	-33.5 AC	-33.5 AC
New State Recreation Area	5.7 AC	0.0 AC	5.7 AC	5.8 AC	0.0 AC	5.8 AC	0.1 AC	0.0 AC	0.1 AC
Existing State Recreation Area	91.0 AC	0.0 AC	91.0 AC	90.9 AC	0.0 AC	90.9 AC	-0.1 AC	0.0 AC	-0.1 AC
PARKS & OPEN SPACE	**104.8** AC	**231.6** AC	**336.4** AC	**105.7** AC	**232.0** AC	**337.7** AC	**0.9** AC	**0.4** AC	**1.3** AC
Other Parks[i]	**7.1** AC	**12.7** AC	**19.8** AC	**7.1** AC	**17.3** AC	**24.4** AC	**0.0** AC	**4.6** AC	**4.6** AC

SOURCE: 2010 Project Data: Table II-3 & Table II-6 of the FEIR.

[a] All infrastructure is excluded from the development program's square footage, with the exception of any associated office space, which is included in the R&D/Office category.

[b] Includes 400 high school students living on campus

[c] Includes 600 high school students and 400 college students. Half the high school students would be on site at any one time. One-third of the college students would be on site at any one time.

[d] The 2010 FEIR indicates that R&D uses are defined to include research and development, office, and light-industrial uses. Under the 2018 Modified Project Variant land use program, in CP, 150,000 sf of uses are designated as office uses, while in HPS2, 4,265,000 sf of uses are designated as R&D uses.

[e] Converts R&D/Office gsf to Institution at HPS2.

[f] Includes 71,000 square feet of approved (but not constructed) commercial space from HPS1.

[g] Includes 172 approved (but not constructed) housing units from HPS1, increasing the overall unit count for CPHPS2 from 10,500 to 10,672.

[h] On-street parking is in addition to structured parking.

[i] Specific acreages for Other Parks were not provided in the 2010 FEIR. In addition, Other Parks are included for information purposes only; they are not included in the final calculation of parks and open space.

Table A-3: Comparison of 2018 Modified Project Variant to 2010 R&D Variant (Variant 1)

	2010 R&D VARIANT (VARIANT 1)			2018 MODIFIED PROJECT VARIANT			2010-18 NET CHANGE		
	Candlestick	**Hunters Point Phase II**	**Total**	**Candlestick**	**Hunters Point Phase II**	**Total**	**Candlestick**	**Hunters Point Phase II**	**Total**
NONRESIDENTIAL LAND USE									
Artist Studio	0 SF	255,000 SF	**255,000** SF	0 SF	255,000 SF	**255,000** SF	0 SF	0 SF	**0** SF
Community Use	50,000 SF	50,000 SF	**100,000** SF	50,000 SF	50,000 SF	**100,000** SF	0 SF	0 SF	**0** SF
Arena	75,000 SF	0 SF	**75,000** SF	75,000 SF	0 SF	**75,000** SF	0 SF	0 SF	**0** SF
	10,000 SEATS	0 SEATS	**10,000** SEATS	10,000 SEATS	0 SEATS	**10,000** SEATS	0 SEATS	0 SEATS	**0** SEATS
Hotel	150,000 SF	0 SF	**150,000** SF	150,000 SF	120,000 SF	**270,000** SF	0 SF	120,000 SF	**120,000** SF
	220 ROOMS	0 ROOMS	**220** ROOMS	220 ROOMS	175 ROOMS	**395** ROOMS	0 ROOMS	175 ROOMS	**175** ROOMS
Institution	0 SF	0 SF	**0** SF	0 SF	410,000 SF	**410,000** SF	0 SF	410,000 SF	**410,000** SF
Elementary School/Junior High School	0 SF	0 SF	**0** SF	0 SF	345,000 SF	**345,000** SF	0 SF	345,000 SF	**345,000** SF
	0 ± STUDENTS	0 ± STUDENTS	**0** ± STUDENTS	0 ± STUDENTS	1,000 ± STUDENTS	**1,000** ± STUDENTS[b]	0 ± STUDENTS	1,000 ± STUDENTS	**1,000** ± STUDENTS
High School/Post-Secondary	0 SF	0 SF	**0** SF	0 SF	65,000 SF	**65,000** SF	0 SF	65,000 SF	**65,000** SF
	0 ± STUDENTS	0 ± STUDENTS	**0** ± STUDENTS	0 ± STUDENTS	1,000 ± STUDENTS	**1,000** ± STUDENTS[c]	0 ± STUDENTS	1,000 ± STUDENTS	**1,000** ± STUDENTS
Stadium	0 SF	0 SF	**0** SF	0 SF	0 SF	**0** SF	0 SF	0 SF	**0** SF
	0 SEATS	0 SEATS	**0** SEATS	0 SEATS	0 SEATS	**0** SEATS	0 SEATS	0 SEATS	**0** SEATS
R&D/Office	150,000 SF	5,000,000 SF	**5,150,000** SF	150,000 SF	4,265,000 SF	**4,415,000** SF[d,e]	0 SF	-735,000 SF	**-735,000** SF
Regional Retail	635,000 SF	0 SF	**635,000** SF	635,000 SF	100,000 SF	**735,000** SF[f]	0 SF	100,000 SF	**100,000** SF
Neighborhood Retail	125,000 SF	125,000 SF	**250,000** SF	125,000 SF	226,000 SF	**351,000** SF	0 SF	101,000 SF	**101,000** SF
Maker Space	0 SF	0 SF	**0** SF	0 SF	75,000 SF	**75,000** SF	0 SF	75,000 SF	**75,000** SF
GSF Total	**1,185,000** SF	**5,430,000** SF	**6,615,000** SF	**1,185,000** SF	**5,501,000** SF	**6,686,000** SF	**0** SF	**71,000** SF	**71,000** SF
RESIDENTIAL	**7,850** UNITS	**2,650** UNITS	**10,500** UNITS	**7,218** UNITS	**3,454** UNITS	**10,672** UNITS[g]	**-632** UNITS	**804** UNITS	**172** UNITS
CAR PARKING									
Residential (Structured) Parking	7,850 SPACES	2,650 SPACES	**10,500** SPACES	7,218 SPACES	3,454 SPACES	**10,672** SPACES	-632 SPACES	804 SPACES	**172** SPACES
Commercial (Structured) Parking	2,346 SPACES	7,028 SPACES	**9,374** SPACES	2,736 SPACES	7,152 SPACES	**9,888** SPACES	390 SPACES	124 SPACES	**514** SPACES
Parking Total	**10,196** SPACES	**9,678** SPACES	**19,874** SPACES	**9,954** SPACES	**10,606** SPACES	**20,560** SPACES	**-242** SPACES	**928** SPACES	**686** SPACES
± On-street Parking	1,360 SPACES	1,678 SPACES	**3,038** SPACES	1,360 SPACES	1,487 SPACES	**2,847** SPACES[h]	0 SPACES	-191 SPACES	**-191** SPACES
Dedicated Stadium Parking	0 SPACES	0 SPACES	**0** SPACES	0 SPACES	0 SPACES	**0** SPACES	0 SPACES	0 SPACES	**0** SPACES
MARINA	**0** SLIPS	**300** SLIPS	**300** SLIPS	**0** SLIPS	**300** SLIPS	**300** SLIPS	**0** SLIPS	**0** SLIPS	**0** SLIPS
WATER TAXI	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**YES**	**YES**	**NO**	**YES**	**YES**
New Parks	8.1 AC	152.4 AC	160.5 AC	9.0 AC	173.9 AC	182.9 AC	0.9 AC	21.5 AC	22.4 AC
New Sports Fields & Active Urban Recreation	0.0 AC	69.8 AC	69.8 AC	0.0 AC	58.1 AC	58.1 AC	0.0 AC	-11.7 AC	-11.7 AC
New State Recreation Area	5.7 AC	0.0 AC	5.7 AC	5.8 AC	0.0 AC	5.8 AC	0.1 AC	0.0 AC	0.1 AC
Existing State Recreation Area	91.0 AC	0.0 AC	91.0 AC	90.9 AC	0.0 AC	90.9 AC	-0.1 AC	0.0 AC	-0.1 AC
PARKS & OPEN SPACE	**104.8** AC	**222.2** AC	**327.0** AC	**105.7** AC	**232.0** AC	**337.7** AC	**0.9** AC	**9.8** AC	**10.7** AC
Other Parks[i]	**7.1** AC	**12.7** AC	**19.8** AC	**7.1** AC	**17.3** AC	**24.4** AC	**0.0** AC	**4.6** AC	**4.6** AC

SOURCE: 2010 Project Data: Table IV-3 & Table II-5 of the FEIR.

[a] All infrastructure is excluded from the development program's square footage, with the exception of any associated office space, which is included in the R&D/Office category.

[b] Includes 400 high school students living on campus

[c] Includes 600 high school students and 400 college students. Half the high school students would be on site at any one time. One-third of the college students would be on site at any one time.

[d] The 2010 FEIR indicates that R&D uses are defined to include research and development, office, and light-industrial uses. Under the 2018 Modified Project Variant land use program, in CP, 150,000 sf of uses are designated as office uses, while in HPS2, 4,265,000 sf of uses are designated as R&D uses.

[e] Converts R&D/Office gsf to Institution at HPS2.

[f] Includes 71,000 square feet of approved (but not constructed) commercial space from HPS1.

[g] Includes 172 approved (but not constructed) housing units from HPS1, increasing the overall unit count for CPHPS2 from 10,500 to 10,672.

[h] On-street parking is in addition to structured parking.

[i] Specific acreages for Other Parks were not provided in the 2010 FEIR. In addition, Other Parks are included for information purposes only; they are not included in the final calculation of parks and open space.

Table A-4: Comparison of 2018 Modified Project Variant to 2010 Housing/R&D Variant (Variant 2A)

	2010 HOUSING/R&D VARIANT 2A			2018 MODIFIED PROJECT VARIANT			2010-18 NET CHANGE		
	Candlestick	**Hunters Point Phase II**	**Total**	**Candlestick**	**Hunters Point Phase II**	**Total**	**Candlestick**	**Hunters Point Phase II**	**Total**
NONRESIDENTIAL LAND USE									
Artist Studio	0 SF	255,000 SF	**255,000** SF	0 SF	255,000 SF	**255,000** SF	0 SF	0 SF	**0** SF
Community Use	50,000 SF	50,000 SF	**100,000** SF	50,000 SF	50,000 SF	**100,000** SF	0 SF	0 SF	**0** SF
Arena	75,000 SF	0 SF	**75,000** SF	75,000 SF	0 SF	**75,000** SF	0 SF	0 SF	**0** SF
	10,000 SEATS	0 SEATS	**10,000** SEATS	10,000 SEATS	0 SEATS	**10,000** SEATS	0 SEATS	0 SEATS	**0** SEATS
Hotel	150,000 SF	0 SF	**150,000** SF	150,000 SF	120,000 SF	**270,000** SF	0 SF	120,000 SF	**120,000** SF
	220 ROOMS	0 ROOMS	**220** ROOMS	220 ROOMS	175 ROOMS	**395** ROOMS	0 ROOMS	175 ROOMS	**175** ROOMS
Institution	0 SF	0 SF	**0** SF	0 SF	410,000 SF	**410,000** SF	0 SF	410,000 SF	**410,000** SF
Elementary School/Junior High School	0 SF	0 SF	**0** SF	0 SF	345,000 SF	**345,000** SF	0 SF	345,000 SF	**345,000** SF
	0 ± STUDENTS	0 ± STUDENTS	**0** ± STUDENTS	0 ± STUDENTS	1,000 ± STUDENTS	**1,000** ± STUDENTS[b]	0 ± STUDENTS	1,000 ± STUDENTS	**1,000** ± STUDENTS
High School/Post-Secondary	0 SF	0 SF	**0** SF	0 SF	65,000 SF	**65,000** SF	0 SF	65,000 SF	**65,000** SF
	0 ± STUDENTS	0 ± STUDENTS	**0** ± STUDENTS	0 ± STUDENTS	1,000 ± STUDENTS	**1,000** ± STUDENTS[c]	0 ± STUDENTS	1,000 ± STUDENTS	**1,000** ± STUDENTS
Stadium	0 SF	0 SF	**0** SF	0 SF	0 SF	**0** SF	0 SF	0 SF	**0** SF
	0 SEATS	0 SEATS	**0** SEATS	0 SEATS	0 SEATS	**0** SEATS	0 SEATS	0 SEATS	**0** SEATS
R&D/Office	150,000 SF	3,000,000 SF	**3,150,000** SF	150,000 SF	4,265,000 SF	**4,415,000** SF[d,e]	0 SF	1,265,000 SF	**1,265,000** SF
Regional Retail	635,000 SF	0 SF	**635,000** SF	635,000 SF	100,000 SF	**735,000** SF[f]	0 SF	100,000 SF	**100,000** SF
Neighborhood Retail	125,000 SF	125,000 SF	**250,000** SF	125,000 SF	226,000 SF	**351,000** SF[e]	0 SF	101,000 SF	**101,000** SF
Maker Space	0 SF	0 SF	**0** SF	0 SF	75,000 SF	**75,000** SF	0 SF	75,000 SF	**75,000** SF
GSF Total	**1,185,000**	**3,430,000** SF	**4,615,000** SF	**1,185,000** SF	**5,501,000** SF	**6,686,000** SF	**0** SF	**2,071,000** SF	**2,071,000** SF
RESIDENTIAL	**6,225** UNITS	**4,275** UNITS	**10,500** UNITS	**7,218** UNITS	**3,454** UNITS	**10,672** UNITS[g]	**993** UNITS	**-821** UNITS	**172** UNITS
CAR PARKING									
Residential (Structured) Parking	6,225 SPACES	4,275 SPACES	**10,500** SPACES	7,218 SPACES	3,454 SPACES	**10,672** SPACES	993 SPACES	-821 SPACES	**172** SPACES
Commercial (Structured) Parking	2,346 SPACES	4,428 SPACES	**6,774** SPACES	2,736 SPACES	7,152 SPACES	**9,888** SPACES	390 SPACES	2,724 SPACES	**3,114** SPACES
Parking Total	**8,571** SPACES	**8,703** SPACES	**17,274** SPACES	**9,954** SPACES	**10,606** SPACES	**20,560** SPACES	**1,383** SPACES	**1,903** SPACES	**3,286** SPACES
± On-street Parking	1,360 SPACES	1,428 SPACES	**2,788** SPACES	1,360 SPACES	1,487 SPACES	**2,847** SPACES[h]	0 SPACES	59 SPACES	**59** SPACES
Dedicated Stadium Parking	0 SPACES	0 SPACES	**0** SPACES	0 SPACES	0 SPACES	**0** SPACES	0 SPACES	0 SPACES	**0** SPACES
MARINA	**0** SLIPS	**300** SLIPS	**300** SLIPS	**0** SLIPS	**300** SLIPS	**300** SLIPS	**0** SLIPS	**0** SLIPS	**0** SLIPS
WATER TAXI	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**YES**	**YES**	**NO**	**YES**	**YES**
New Parks	8.1 AC	150.9 AC	159.0 AC	9.0 AC	173.9 AC	182.9 AC	0.9 AC	23.0 AC	23.9 AC
New Sports Fields & Active Urban Recreation	0.0 AC	70.9 AC	70.9 AC	0.0 AC	58.1 AC	58.1 AC	0.0 AC	-12.8 AC	-12.8 AC
New State Recreation Area	5.7 AC	0.0 AC	5.7 AC	5.8 AC	0.0 AC	5.8 AC	0.1 AC	0.0 AC	0.1 AC
Existing State Recreation Area	91.0 AC	0.0 AC	91.0 AC	90.9 AC	0.0 AC	90.9 AC	-0.1 AC	0.0 AC	-0.1 AC
PARKS & OPEN SPACE	**104.8** AC	**221.8** AC	**326.6** AC	**105.7** AC	**232.0** AC	**337.7** AC	**0.9** AC	**10.2** AC	**11.1** AC
Other Parks[i]	**7.1** AC	**12.7** AC	**19.8** AC	**7.1** AC	**17.3** AC	**24.4** AC	**0.0** AC	**4.6** AC	**4.6** AC

SOURCE: 2010 Project Data: Table IV-19a & Table IV-21a of the FEIR.

[a] All infrastructure is excluded from the development program's square footage, with the exception of any associated office space, which is included in the R&D/Office category.

[b] Includes 400 high school students living on campus

[c] Includes 600 high school students and 400 college students. Half the high school students would be on site at any one time. One-third of the college students would be on site at any one time.

[d] The 2010 FEIR indicates that R&D uses are defined to include research and development, office, and light-industrial uses. Under the 2018 Modified Project Variant land use program, in CP, 150,000 sf of uses are designated as office uses, while in HPS2, 4,265,000 sf of uses are designated as R&D uses.

[e] Converts R&D/Office gsf to Institution at HPS2.

[f] Includes 71,000 square feet of approved (but not constructed) commercial space from HPS1.

[g] Includes 172 approved (but not constructed) housing units from HPS1, increasing the overall unit count for CPHPS2 from 10,500 to 10,672.

[h] On-street parking is in addition to structured parking.

[i] Specific acreages for Other Parks were not provided in the 2010 FEIR. In addition, Other Parks are included for information purposes only; they are not included in the final calculation of parks and open space.

Table A-5: Comparison of 2018 Modified Project Variant to 2010 Project, R&D Variant (Variant 1), and Housing/R&D Variant (Variant 2A) (Parks and Open Space)

	2010 PROJECT	2010 R&D VARIANT (VARIANT 1)	2010 HOUSING/R&D VARIANT (VARIANT 2A)	2018 MODIFIED PROJECT VARIANT
Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II (HPS2)				
NEW PARKS				
Grassland Ecology Park	82.1	82.7	83.4	106.8
Heritage Park	15.6	15.6	15.6	15.5
Hunters Point Mini Park	0.0	0.0	0.7	0
Hunters Point Neighborhood Park	0.0	0.0	0.9	0
Hunters Point Park Blocks	0.0	4.5	0.0	0
Hunters Point South Park	0.0	0.0	2.0	0
Hunters Point Wedge Park	0.0	2.8	3.1	0
Northside Park	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8
R&D Plaza	0.0	2.1	0.0	0
Shipyard Hillside Open Space	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4
Water Room/Dry Dock 4	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.3
Waterfront Promenade	29.5	31.9	32.4	29.1
Subtotal	**140.0**	**152.4**	**150.9**	**173.9**
NEW SPORTS FIELDS & ACTIVE URBAN RECREATION				
Maintenance Yard	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.5
Multi-Use Lawn/Fields	25.2	22.4	25.2	20.5
Sports Field Complex	59.7	40.7	39.0	28.7
Waterfront Recreation & Event Pier	6.7	6.7	6.7	3.4
Subtotal	**91.6**	**69.8**	**70.9**	**58.1**
HPS2 POSH Total	**231.6**	**222.2**	**221.8**	**232.0**
OTHER PARKS				
Green Room	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.1
Gunning Crane Pier Habitats	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.2
Shipyard Hillside Open Space	2.6	2.6	2.6	0.0
Horne Boulevard Park	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.0
Subtotal	**12.7**	**12.7**	**12.7**	**17.3**
HPS2 Total	**244.3**	**234.9**	**234.5**	**249.3**
Candlestick Point				
NEW PARKS				
Alice Griffith Neighborhood Park	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4
Bayview Gardens/Wedge Park	2.5	2.5	2.5	3.7
Candlestick Point Neighborhood Park	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1
Mini Wedge Park	1.1	1.1	1.1	0.8
Subtotal	**8.1**	**8.1**	**8.1**	**9.0**
STATE PARK LAND				
Bayview Gardens North	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.5
Grasslands South	10.3	10.3	10.3	10.3
The Heart of the Park (Includes new State Park)	15.4	15.4	15.4	15.4
Last Port (includes new State Park)	14.6	14.6	14.6	14.6
The Last Rubble	24.5	24.5	24.5	24.5
The Neck (includes new State Park)	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
The Point	6.1	6.1	6.1	6.1
Wind Meadow	11.4	11.4	11.4	11.4
Subtotal	**96.7**	**96.7**	**96.7**	**96.7**
CP POSH Total	**104.8**	**104.8**	**104.8**	**105.7**
OTHER PARKS				
Bayview Hillside Open Space	2.9	2.9	2.9	3.5
Earl Boulevard Park	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.0
Jamestown Walker Slope	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.6
Subtotal	**7.1**	**7.1**	**7.1**	**7.1**
CP Total	**111.9**	**111.9**	**111.9**	**112.8**
CP-HPS2 TOTAL	**356.2**	**346.8**	**346.4**	**362.1**
NEW PARKS	148.1	160.5	159.0	182.9
NEW SPORTS FIELDS & ACTIVE URBAN RECREATION	91.6	69.8	70.9	58.1
STATE PARK LAND	96.7	96.7	96.7	96.7
	336.4	327.0	326.6	337.7
OTHER PARKS	19.8	19.8	19.8	24.4