

# SUMMARY

---

## Central SoMa Plan

This environmental impact report (EIR) chapter provides a brief summary of the findings of the EIR regarding the Central SoMa Plan (the Plan) and its potential environmental consequences. The chapter includes a summary of the project description; the environmental analysis, including environmental impacts and mitigation measures identified in this EIR; alternatives to the Plan and their comparative environmental effects; and areas of controversy and issues to be resolved.

This summary should not be relied upon for a thorough understanding of the Plan, its environmental impacts, or mitigation measures. Please refer to Chapter I, Introduction, for a more complete description of the type of environmental analysis contained in this EIR, Chapter II, Project Description, for a more complete description of the proposed project, Chapter IV, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures, for a more complete description of associated impacts and mitigation measures, and Chapter VI, Alternatives, for a more complete description of identified alternatives to the proposed project and the comparative impacts.

## Project Synopsis

The Central SoMa Plan (formerly, Central Corridor Plan) is a comprehensive plan for the area surrounding much of southern portion of the Central Subway transit line, a 1.7-mile extension of the Third Street light rail line that will link the Caltrain Depot at Fourth and King Streets to Chinatown and provide service within the South of Market (SoMa) area. The Plan Area includes roughly 230 acres that comprise 17 city blocks, as well as the streets and thoroughfares that connect SoMa to its adjacent neighborhoods: Downtown, Mission Bay, Rincon Hill, and the Mission District.

The Plan Area is bounded by Second Street on the east, Sixth Street on the west, Townsend Street on the south, and by an irregular border that generally jogs along Folsom, Howard and Stevenson Streets to the north (see **Figure II-1, Central SoMa Plan Area Boundaries**, in Chapter II, Project Description). The project analyzed in the EIR includes street network changes throughout the Plan Area, including specific designs within, and in some cases beyond, the Plan Area for the following streets: Howard, Folsom, Harrison, Bryant, Brannan, Third, and Fourth Streets. In addition, open space improvements would also occur within and outside of the Plan Area.

The Plan envisions Central SoMa becoming a sustainable neighborhood, one in which the needs of the present may be met without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The Plan's sponsor, the City and County of San Francisco (the City), endeavors to address the social, economic, and environmental aspects of sustainability through a planning strategy that accommodates anticipated population and job growth, provides public benefits, and respects and enhances neighborhood character. That strategy has informed the current draft of the Plan, which comprehensively addresses a wide range of topics that include: land use; transportation infrastructure; parks, open space and recreation facilities; ecological

sustainability; historic preservation; urban design and urban form; and financial programs and implementation mechanisms to fund public improvements.

The Plan seeks to encourage and accommodate housing and employment growth by (1) removing land use restrictions to support a greater mix of uses while also emphasizing office uses in portions of the Plan Area; (2) amending height and bulk districts to allow for taller buildings; (3) modifying the system of streets and circulation within and adjacent to the Plan Area to meet the needs and goals of a dense, transit-oriented, mix-use district; and (4) creating new, and improving existing, open spaces.

The Plan also proposes project-level changes to certain individual streets analyzed in this EIR, including Howard, Folsom, Harrison, Bryant, Brannan, Third, and Fourth Streets. Two different options are being analyzed for the couplet of Howard Street and Folsom Street. Under the One-Way Option, both streets would retain a one-way configuration (except Folsom Street east of Second Street which would retain its existing two-way operation). Under the Two-Way Option, both streets would be converted into two-way operation, and some modifications to Harrison Street would also occur as described in more detail in Chapter II, Project Description.

Plan policies have been drafted in conjunction with the land use proposals and call for public realm improvements, including planning for new open spaces; changes to the street and circulation system; policies to preserve neighborhood character and historic structures; and strategies that aim to improve public amenities and make the neighborhood more sustainable. The Plan also includes financial programs to support its public improvements through the implementation of one or more new fees, in addition to taxes or assessments that would be applied to subsequent development projects.

The Plan's eight goals are used as the EIR's project objectives. Additional detail related to these goals is included in Chapter II, Project Description. The eight goals of the Plan are as follows:

1. Increase the capacity for jobs and housing;
2. Maintain the diversity of residents;
3. Facilitate an economically diversified and lively jobs center;
4. Provide safe and convenient transportation that prioritizes walking, bicycling, and transit;
5. Offer an abundance of parks and recreational opportunities;
6. Create an environmentally sustainable and resilient neighborhood;
7. Preserve and celebrate the neighborhood's cultural heritage; and
8. Ensure that new buildings enhance the character of the neighborhood and the city.

Consistent with its goal to increase the capacity for jobs and housing (Goal 1), the Plan includes the objective of increasing the area where space for jobs and housing can be built (Objective 1.1). The Plan would accomplish this by retaining existing zoning that supports capacity for new jobs and housing, and replacing existing zoning that restricts the capacity for office and residential development with zoning that enables office and residential development.

The Plan would result in the following land use zoning changes:

- North of Harrison Street, the Mixed Use, Residential (MUR) use district west of Fifth Street would be converted to Mixed Use General (MUG). The MUR, Western SoMa-Mixed Use General (WS-MUG), and Light Industrial (M-1) use districts east of Fifth Street would be converted to Mixed Use Office (MUO). The existing zoning districts either limit or do not permit office uses, whereas the MUG and MUO zoning designations would allow for greater flexibility in the mix of land uses, including office development as well as new all-commercial buildings in the MUO use district.
- The parcels in the block bounded by Third, Folsom, Hawthorne, and Harrison Streets currently designated C-3-O (Downtown Office) would retain this designation.
- South of Harrison Street, existing use districts would all be converted to MUO or West SoMa Mixed Use Office (WS-MUO), except for parcels currently designated South Park District (SPD) and the West SoMa Service, Arts, Light Industrial (WS-SALI) area west of Fourth Street between Harrison and Bryant Streets, which would retain their current zoning designations. Use districts in this area that would be converted to MUO or WS-MUO include Residential Enclave (RED), Service/Light Industrial (SLI), M-1, and Service Secondary Office (SSO), as well as the area south of Bryant Street currently designated WS-SALI. These existing use districts either limit or restrict office uses or, when office uses are allowed, restrict other uses, such as entertainment or residential uses. Converting these use districts to MUO or WS-MUO would permit a mix of land uses that allow for greater flexibility, as the MUO and WS-MUO districts generally allow office, residential, and most other uses without limitation.

Changes to height limits under the Plan would include the following:

- Within the Plan Area north of Harrison Street, height limits on most parcels would remain between 45 and 85 feet, though there would be several adjustments, both higher and lower, within this range.
- The Plan would substantially increase the height limit for the north side of Harrison Street between Second and Third Streets, from the current range of 85–130 feet to a range of 130–200 feet.
- Other substantial height increases north of Harrison would include the southwest corner of Fourth and Clementina, which would increase from the current range of 55–130 feet to 180 feet; and the southwest corner of Fifth and Howard Streets, which would increase from the current range of 45–85 feet to 180–300 feet.
- South of Harrison Street, proposed amendments to permitted height limits are concentrated on the south side of Harrison Street between Second and Fourth Streets, where current height limits would be increased from 40–85 feet to 130–350 feet.
- Substantial height increases would also be concentrated south of Bryant Street, from east of Fourth Street to Sixth Street. Many sites within this area would increase from the current height limit of 30–85 feet to 130–400 feet.
- Lower height limits would be maintained around South Park, along the west side of Fourth Street between Bryant and Brannan Streets, and along the south side of the I-80 freeway between Fourth and Sixth Streets.

To ensure that the proposed zoning changes foster the development of a neighborhood that is consistent with the Plan's other goals, the Plan contains numerous objectives, policies, and implementation measures that limit and condition development. In particular, these relate to Goal II – Maintain the Diversity of Residents, Goal III – Facilitate an Economically Diversified and Lively Jobs Center, Goal VII – Preserve and Celebrate the

Neighborhood's Cultural Heritage, and Goal VIII – Ensure that New Buildings Enhance the Character of the Neighborhood and the City.

To ensure that removal of protective zoning proposed by the Plan does not result in a loss of Production, Distribution, and Repair (PDR) uses in the Plan Area (Plan Objective 3.3), the Plan would maintain a portion of the current SALI use district. The Plan also contains policies and implementation measures that would limit conversion of PDR space in former industrial districts, require PDR space as part of large commercial developments, and provide incentives to fund, build, and protect PDR uses.

To implement the circulation and streetscape principles in the Plan, this EIR studies proposed changes in the street network to support an attractive pedestrian and cycling environment and to lessen the impact of traffic on transit performance, while accommodating regional and through traffic on a limited number of streets where necessary. Specific proposals have been developed for Folsom, Harrison, Third, Fourth, Bryant, and Brannan Streets, extending as far west as 11th Street (in the case of Howard and Folsom Streets) and east to The Embarcadero (Folsom Street only). The proposals include wider sidewalks, upgraded and/or new transit lanes, cycle tracks and bicycle lanes, and travel lane reductions. Under the two-way option, Howard and Folsom Streets would be converted from one-way traffic to two-way operations.

The Plan also includes proposals to upgrade existing parks and create new open spaces, create a more sustainable and resilient neighborhood, preserve important historical and cultural features, and promote high-quality urban design.

Approval and implementation of the final proposed Plan would require the following actions, among others. (Approving bodies are identified in *italics*.) Specific and detailed actions would be determined as the Plan is developed:

- Amendments to the *General Plan* (various elements and figures) to conform to the concepts of the Central SoMa Plan. *Planning Commission recommendation; Board of Supervisors Approval*;
- Determination of consistency of the proposed *General Plan* amendments and rezoning with the *General Plan* and *Planning Code* Section 101.1 Priority Policies. *Planning Commission*;
- Amendment of the *Planning Code* to conform to the concepts of the Central SoMa Plan. *Planning Commission recommendation; Board of Supervisors Approval*;
- Amendment of the *Planning Code* and Zoning Maps to change mapped use districts and height limits throughout the Plan Area. *Planning Commission recommendation; Board of Supervisors Approval*; and
- Approval of alterations to street rights-of-way, including, for example, the configuration of travel lanes, sidewalk widths, and bicycle lanes, addition of crosswalks, and alley way improvements that are part of the Plan's proposals for the street network and public realm. *San Francisco Transportation Agency; Department of Public Works*.

## Project-Level and Program-Level Analysis

This EIR contains both analysis at a “program-level” pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168 for adoption and implementation of the Plan and “project-level” environmental review for street network changes and open space improvements. A program EIR is appropriate for a project that will involve a series of actions that are (1) related geographically, (2) logical parts in a chain of contemplated actions, (3) connected as part of a

continuing program, and (4) carried out under the same authorizing statute or regulatory authority and have similar environmental impacts that can be mitigated in similar ways (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168).

The EIR's evaluation of the Plan is programmatic. Its assessment of potential environmental impacts is based on the various Plan components that are required for its implementation and would facilitate its goals and objectives. CEQA Guidelines Section 15168 notes that the use of a programmatic EIR "ensures consideration of cumulative impacts that might be slighted in a case-by-case analysis; avoids duplicative reconsideration of basic policy considerations; allows the lead agency to consider broad policy alternatives and program-wide mitigation measures at an early time, when the agency has greater flexibility to deal with basic problems or cumulative impacts; and allows for a reduction in paperwork.

With respect to the proposed open space improvements and street network improvements described in Chapter II, Project Description, these components are, unless otherwise noted, analyzed in this EIR at the project-level due to the sufficiency of detailed information available.

## Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Improvement Measures

This EIR analyzes the potential environmental effects of the Plan, including the street network changes and open space improvements. On April 24, 2013, the Planning Department sent a Notice of Preparation (NOP) to governmental agencies, organizations and persons who may have an interest in the proposed project (Appendix A). The NOP requested that agencies and interested parties comment on environmental issues that should be addressed in the EIR. A scoping meeting was held on May 15, 2013, to explain the environmental review process for the Plan and to provide opportunity to take public comment and concerns related to the Plan's potential environmental impacts. The Planning Department considered the public comments received at the scoping meeting and prepared an Initial Study in order to focus the scope of the EIR by assessing which environmental topics would not result in significant impacts on the environment. The Planning Department published the Initial Study on February 12, 2014 (Appendix B).

The Initial Study found that the Plan would have potentially significant impacts in the areas of land use, aesthetics, cultural and paleontological resources, transportation and circulation, noise, air quality, wind, shadow, utilities, and hydrology and water quality. Accordingly, these topics are evaluated in this EIR. The Initial Study also found that impacts on the remaining environmental topics that are required to be examined under the State CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31 of the *San Francisco Administrative Code* would be less than significant, less than significant with mitigation measures, or would have no impact, and, therefore, need not be considered in the EIR.

**Table S-1, Summary of Impacts of the Plan—Identified in the EIR**, p. S-7, presents a summary of the environmental effects identified in this EIR, along with feasible mitigation measures to avoid or reduce the severity of an impact. In addition, the level of significance both before and after the implementation of any identified mitigation measure is indicated.

The Initial Study identified resource topics that would result in no impact, a less-than-significant impact, or less-than-significant with mitigation. These topics, which are summarized in **Table S-2, Summary of Impacts of the Plan—Identified in the Initial Study**, p. S-43, are not addressed in this EIR.

The categories used to designate impact significance are described as follows:

- **No Impact.** A no impact conclusion is reached if there is no potential for impacts or the environmental resource does not occur within the project area or the area of potential effects. For example, there would be no impacts related to displacement of housing if there is no existing housing at the project site. In that case, no adverse changes (or impacts) to the environment are expected.
- **Less-than-Significant Impact.** This determination applies if the impact does not exceed the defined significance criteria or would be eliminated or reduced to a less-than-significant level through compliance with existing local, state, and federal laws and regulations. No mitigation is required for impacts determined to be less than significant.
- **Less-than-Significant-Impact with Mitigation.** This determination applies if the project would result in a significant effect, exceeding the established significance criteria, but feasible mitigation is available that would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.
- **Significant and Unavoidable Impact with Mitigation.** This determination applies if the project would result in an adverse effect that exceeds the established significance criteria, and although feasible mitigation might lessen the impact, the residual effect would remain significant, and, therefore, the impact would be unavoidable.
- **Significant and Unavoidable Impact.** This determination applies if the project would result in an adverse effect that exceeds the established significance criteria, and there is no feasible mitigation available to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the residual impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Existing law provides several regulatory controls that would serve to avoid potential significant impacts; they are summarized here for informational purposes. These measures include prohibition of the use of mirrored glass on buildings to reduce glare, as per City Planning Commission Resolution 9212; limitation of construction-related noise levels, pursuant to the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the *San Francisco Police Code*, 1972); compliance with *Planning Code* Section 139, Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings; compliance with Section 3426 of the *San Francisco Building Code*, Work Practices for Lead-Based Paint on Pre-1979 Buildings and Steel Structures; compliance with Article 22A of the *San Francisco Health Code* (also known as the Maher Ordinance), requiring that project sponsors retain the services of a qualified professional to prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) that meets the requirements of *Health Code* Section 22.A.6; compliance with Article 38 of the *San Francisco Health Code*, requiring new residential construction projects in specific areas identified as having poor air quality to install enhanced ventilation; observance of state and Federal Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) safety requirements related to handling and disposal of other hazardous materials, such as asbestos; compliance with the Construction Dust Control Ordinance; and compliance with Clean Construction Ordinance for City projects. These regulations are required and therefore assumed in the impact analysis. Where the analysis determines that the impact is sufficiently reduced to less-than-significant levels after considering these requirements, that conclusion is made and no mitigation measures are required to further lessen the impact.

TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>A. Land Use and Land Use Planning</b>			
<b>Impact LU-1:</b> Development under the Plan, and proposed open space improvements and street network changes would not physically divide an established community.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>Impact LU-2:</b> Development under the Plan, including proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.  Specifically, the Plan could result in traffic noise along Howard Street (under the two-way option for Howard and Folsom Streets) that exceeds the noise standards in the <i>General Plan's</i> Environmental Protection Element	S	Implement Mitigation Measures NO-1a, Transportation Demand Management, and Mitigation Measure NO-1b, <b>Siting of Noise-Generating Uses</b> , for new development projects.	SUM
<b>Impact C-LU-1:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would contribute considerably to a significant cumulative land use impact.  Specifically, the Plan, under both the one-way and two-way options for Folsom and Howard Streets, could make a considerable contribution to cumulative traffic noise levels which would exceed the noise standards in the <i>General Plan's</i> Environmental Protection Element.	S	Implement <b>M-NO-1a, Transportation Demand Management (TDM)</b> , for new development projects.	SUM

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>B. Aesthetics</b>			
<b>Impact AE-1:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the Plan Area or substantially damage scenic resources.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>Impact AE-2:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would alter public views of the Plan Area from short-, mid-, and long-range vantage points and alter views into the surrounding neighborhoods from within the Plan Area, but would not adversely affect public views or have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>Impact AE-3:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would not create a new source of substantial light or glare in the Plan Area that would adversely affect day or nighttime views or substantially impact other people or properties.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>Impact C-AE-1:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed street network changes and open space improvements, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would alter the visual character and public views of and through SoMa, but would not adversely affect visual character, scenic vistas, or scenic resources or substantially increase light and glare.	LTS	None required.	NA

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation



TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>C. Cultural and Paleontological Resources</b>			
<b>Impact CP-1:</b> Development under the Plan would result in the demolition or substantial alteration of individually identified historic architectural resources and/or contributors to a historic district or conservation district located in the Plan Area, including as-yet unidentified resources, a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.	S	<p><b>Mitigation Measure M-CP-1a: Avoidance or Minimization of Effects on Identified Historical Resources.</b> The project sponsor of a subsequent development project in the Plan Area shall consult with the Planning Department's Preservation staff to determine whether there are feasible means to redesign or otherwise revise the project to avoid significant adverse effects on historic architectural resource(s) (including historic districts), whether previously identified or identified as part of the project's historical resources analysis. If avoidance is not feasible, the project sponsor shall seek feasible means to reduce effects on historic architectural resource(s) to a less-than-significant level, with the significance of the impact to be judged based on whether the proposed project would materially impair the resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b).</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure M-CP-1b: Documentation of Historical Resource(s).</b> Where avoidance of effects to a less-than-significant level is not feasible, as described in M-CP-1a, the project sponsor of a subsequent development project in the Plan Area shall undertake historical documentation prior to the issuance of demolition or site permits. To document the buildings more effectively, the sponsor shall prepare Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS)-level photographs and an accompanying HABS Historical Report, which shall be maintained on-site, as well as in the appropriate repositories, including but not limited to, the San Francisco Planning Department, San Francisco Architectural Heritage, the San Francisco Public Library, and the Northwest Information Center. The contents of the report shall include an architectural description, historical context, and statement of significance, per HABS reporting standards. The documentation shall be undertaken by a qualified professional who meets the standards for history, architectural history, or architecture (as appropriate), as set forth by the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards</i> (36 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 61). HABS documentation shall provide the appropriate level of visual documentation and written narrative based on the importance of the resource (types of visual documentation typically range from producing a sketch plan to developing measured drawings and view camera (4x5) black and white photographs). The appropriate level of HABS documentation and written narrative shall be determined by the Planning Department's Preservation staff. The report shall be reviewed by the Planning Department's Preservation staff for completeness. In certain instances, Department Preservation staff may request HABS-level photography, a historical report, and/or measured architectural drawings of the existing building(s).</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure M-CP-1c: Oral Histories.</b> For projects that would demolish a historical resource or contributor to a historic district for which Planning Department preservation staff determined that such a measure would be effective and feasible, the project sponsor shall undertake an oral history project that</p>	SUM

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN—IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>includes interviews of people such as residents, past owners, or former employees. The project shall be conducted by a professional historian in conformance with the Oral History Association's Principles and Standards (<a href="http://alpha.dickinson.edu/oha/pub_eg.html">http://alpha.dickinson.edu/oha/pub_eg.html</a>). In addition to transcripts of the interviews, the oral history project shall include a narrative project summary report containing an introduction to the project, a methodology description, and brief summaries of each conducted interview. Copies of the completed oral history project shall be submitted to the San Francisco Public Library, Planning Department, or other interested historical institutions.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure M-CP-1d: Interpretive Program.</b> For projects that would demolish a historical resource or contributor to a historic district for which Preservation Planning staff determined that such a measure would be effective and feasible, the project sponsor shall work with Department Preservation staff or other qualified professional to institute an interpretive program on-site that references the property's history and the contribution of the historical resource to the broader neighborhood or historic district. An example of an interpretive program is the creation of historical exhibits, incorporating a display featuring historic photos of the affected resource and a description of its historical significance, in a publicly accessible location on the project site. This may include a website or publically-accessible display. The contents of the interpretative program shall be determined by the Planning Department Preservation staff. The development of the interpretive displays should be overseen by a qualified professional who meets the standards for history, architectural history, or architecture (as appropriate) set forth by the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards</i> (36 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 61). An outline of the format, location and content of the interpretive displays shall be reviewed and approved by the San Francisco Planning Department's Preservation staff prior to issuance of a demolition permit or site permit. The format, location and content of the interpretive displays must be finalized prior to issuance of any Building Permits for the project.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure M-CP-1e: Video Recordation.</b> For projects that would demolish a historical resource or contributor to a historic district for which Preservation Planning staff determined that such a measure would be effective and feasible, the project sponsor shall work with Department Preservation staff or other qualified professional, to undertake video documentation of the affected historical resource and its setting. The documentation shall be conducted by a professional videographer, preferably one with experience recording architectural resources. The documentation shall be narrated by a qualified professional who meets the standards for history, architectural history, or architecture (as appropriate), as set forth by the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards</i> (36 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 61). The documentation shall include as much information as possible—using visuals in combination with narration—about the materials, construction methods, current condition, historic use,</p>	

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

**TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR**

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>and historic context of the historical resource.</p> <p>Archival copies of the video documentation shall be submitted to the Planning Department, and to repositories including but not limited to: the San Francisco Public Library, Northwest Information Center and the California Historical Society. This mitigation measure would supplement the traditional HABS documentation, and would enhance the collection of reference materials that would be available to the public and inform future research.</p> <p>The video documentation shall be reviewed and approved by the San Francisco Planning Department's Preservation staff prior to issuance of a demolition permit or site permit or issuance of any Building Permits for the project.</p>	
<b>Impact CP-2:</b> Neither the proposed open space improvements nor street network changes would adversely affect historic architectural resources in a way that would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>Impact CP-3:</b> Construction activities in the Plan Area would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, through indirect construction damage to historic architectural resources.	S	<p><b>Mitigation Measure M-CP-3a: Protect Historical Resources from Adjacent Construction Activities.</b> The project sponsor of a development project in the Plan Area shall consult with Planning Department Environmental Planning/Preservation staff to determine whether adjacent or nearby buildings constitute historical resources that could be adversely affected by construction-generated vibration. For purposes of this measure, nearby historic buildings shall include those within 100 feet of a construction site for a subsequent development project if pile driving would be used at that site; otherwise, it shall include historic buildings within 25 feet if vibratory and vibration-generating construction equipment, such as jackhammers, drill rigs, bulldozers, and vibratory rollers would be used. If one or more historical resources is identified that could be adversely affected, the project sponsor shall incorporate into construction specifications for the proposed project a requirement that the construction contractor(s) use all feasible means to avoid damage to adjacent and nearby historic buildings. Such methods may include maintaining a safe distance between the construction site and the historic buildings (as identified by the Planning Department Preservation staff), using construction techniques that reduce vibration (such as using concrete saws instead of jackhammers or hoe-rams to open excavation trenches, the use of non-vibratory rollers, and hand excavation), appropriate excavation shoring methods to prevent movement of adjacent structures, and providing adequate security to minimize risks of vandalism and fire. No measures need be applied if no vibratory equipment would be employed or if there are no historic</p>	LTSM

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>buildings within 100 feet of the project site.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure M-CP-3b: Construction Monitoring Program for Historical Resources.</b> For those historical resources identified in Mitigation Measure M-CP-3a, and where heavy equipment would be used on a subsequent development project, the project sponsor of such a project shall undertake a monitoring program to minimize damage to adjacent historic buildings and to ensure that any such damage is documented and repaired. The monitoring program, which shall apply within 100 feet where pile driving would be used and within 25 feet otherwise, shall include the following components. Prior to the start of any ground-disturbing activity, the project sponsor shall engage a historic architect or qualified historic preservation professional to undertake a pre-construction survey of historical resource(s) identified by the San Francisco Planning Department within 125 feet of planned construction to document and photograph the buildings' existing conditions. Based on the construction and condition of the resource(s), the consultant shall also establish a standard maximum vibration level that shall not be exceeded at each building, based on existing condition, character-defining features, soils conditions, and anticipated construction practices (a common standard is 0.2 inch per second, peak particle velocity). To ensure that vibration levels do not exceed the established standard, the project sponsor shall monitor vibration levels at each structure and shall prohibit vibratory construction activities that generate vibration levels in excess of the standard.</p> <p>Should vibration levels be observed in excess of the standard, construction shall be halted and alternative construction techniques put in practice, to the extent feasible. (For example, pre-drilled piles could be substituted for driven piles, if feasible based on soils conditions; smaller, lighter equipment might be able to be used in some cases.) The consultant shall conduct regular periodic inspections of each building during ground-disturbing activity on the project site. Should damage to either building occur, the building(s) shall be remediated to its pre-construction condition at the conclusion of ground-disturbing activity on the site.</p>	
<b>Impact CP-4:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.	S	<p><b>Mitigation Measure M-CP-4a: Project-Specific Preliminary Archeological Assessment.</b> This archeological mitigation measure shall apply to any project involving any soils-disturbing or soils-improving activities including excavation, utilities installation, grading, soils remediation, compaction/chemical grouting to a depth of five (5) feet or greater below ground surface, for which no archeological assessment report has been prepared.</p> <p>Projects to which this mitigation measure applies shall be subject to Preliminary Archeology Review (PAR) by the San Francisco Planning Department archeologist.</p> <p>Based on the PAR, the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) shall determine if there is a potential for</p>	LTSM

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN—IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>effect to an archeological resource, including human remains, and, if so, what further actions are warranted to reduce the potential effect of the project on archeological resources to a less-than-significant level. Such actions may include project redesign to avoid the potential to affect an archeological resource; or further investigations by an archeological consultant, such as preparation of a project-specific Archeological Research Design and Treatment Plan (ARDTP) or the undertaking of an archeological monitoring or testing program based on an archeological monitoring or testing plan. The scope of the ARDTP, archeological testing or archeological monitoring plan shall be determined in consultation with the ERO and consistent with the standards for archeological documentation established by the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) for purposes of compliance with CEQA (OHP Preservation Planning Bulletin No. 5). Avoidance of effect to an archeological resource is always the preferred option.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure M-CP-4b: Procedures for Accidental Discovery of Archeological Resources.</b> This mitigation measure is required for projects that would result in soil disturbance and are not subject to Mitigation Measure M-CP-4a.</p> <p>Should any indication of an archeological resource, including human remains, be encountered during any soils-disturbing activity of the project, the project head foreman and/or project sponsor shall immediately notify the ERO and shall immediately suspend any soils-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the discovery until the ERO has determined what additional measures should be undertaken.</p> <p>If the ERO determines that an archeological resource may be present within the project site, the project sponsor shall retain the services of an archeological consultant from the pool of qualified archeological consultants maintained by the San Francisco Planning Department archeologist. The archeological consultant shall advise the ERO as to whether the discovery is an archeological resource, retains sufficient integrity, and is of potential scientific/historical/cultural significance. If an archeological resource is present, the archeological consultant shall identify and evaluate the archeological resource. The archeological consultant shall make a recommendation as to what action, if any, is warranted. Based on this information, the ERO may require, if warranted, specific additional measures to be implemented by the project sponsor.</p> <p>Measures might include preservation in situ of the archeological resource, an archeological monitoring program, an archeological testing program, or an archeological treatment program. If an archeological treatment program, archeological monitoring program or archeological testing program is required, it shall be consistent with the Planning Department's Environmental Planning (EP) division guidelines for such programs. The ERO may also require that the project sponsor immediately implement a site security program if the archeological resource is at risk from vandalism, looting, or other damaging actions. If</p>	

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>human remains are found all applicable state laws will be followed as outlined in Impact CP-7 and an archeological treatment program would be implemented in consultation with appropriate descendant groups and approved by the ERO.</p> <p>The project archeological consultant shall submit a Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archeological resource and describes the archeological and historical research methods employed in the archeological monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the final report.</p> <p>Copies of the Draft FARR shall be sent to the ERO for review and approval. Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one copy and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Environmental Planning Division of the San Francisco Planning Department shall receive one bound copy, one unbound copy, and one unlocked, searchable PDF copy on a CD of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest or interpretive value, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution from that presented above.</p>	
<b>Impact CP-5:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21084.3.	S	<p><b>Mitigation Measure M-CP-5: Project-Specific Tribal Cultural Resource Assessment.</b> This tribal cultural resource mitigation measure shall apply to any project involving any soils-disturbing or soils-improving activities including excavation, utilities installation, grading, soils remediation, compaction/chemical grouting to a depth of five (5) feet or greater below ground surface.</p> <p>Projects to which this mitigation measure applies shall be reviewed for the potential to affect a tribal cultural resource in tandem with Preliminary Archeology Review (PAR) of the project by the San Francisco Planning Department archeologist. For projects requiring a Mitigated Negative Declaration or Environmental Impact Report, the Department “Notification Regarding Tribal Cultural Resources and CEQA” shall be distributed to the Department tribal distribution list. Consultation with California Native American tribes regarding the potential of the project to affect a tribal cultural resource will occur at the request of any notified tribe. For all projects subject to this mitigation measure, if staff determines that the proposed project may have a potential significant adverse effect on a tribal cultural resource, then the following shall be required as determined warranted by the ERO.</p> <p>If staff determines that preservation-in-place of the tribal cultural resource is both feasible and effective, based on information provided by the applicant regarding feasibility and other available information,</p>	LTSM

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

**TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR**

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		then the project archeological consultant shall prepare an archeological resource preservation plan (ARPP). Implementation of the approved ARPP by the archeological consultant shall be required when feasible. If staff determines that preservation-in-place of the TCR is not a sufficient or feasible option, then the project sponsor shall implement an interpretive program of the TCR in coordination with affiliated Native American tribal representatives. An interpretive plan produced in coordination with affiliated Native American tribal representatives, at a minimum, and approved by the ERO shall be required to guide the interpretive program. The plan shall identify proposed locations for installations or displays, the proposed content and materials of those displays or installation, the producers or artists of the displays or installation, and a long-term maintenance program. The interpretive program may include artist installations, preferably by local Native American artists, oral histories with local Native Americans, artifacts displays and interpretation, and educational panels or other informational displays.	
<b>Impact CP-6:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>Impact CP-7:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would not disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>Impact C-CP-1:</b> Development under the Plan, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, could result in demolition and/or alteration of historical resources, thereby contributing considerably to significant cumulative historical resources impacts.	S	Implement <b>Mitigation Measures M-CP-1a, Avoidance or Minimization of Effects on Historical Resources, M-CP-1b, Documentation of Historical Resource(s); M-CP-1c, Oral Histories; M-CP-1d, Interpretive Program; and M-CP-1e, Video Recordation.</b>	SUM

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

**TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR**

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>Impact C-CP-2:</b> The proposed open space improvements and street network changes within the Plan Area, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to significant cumulative historical resources impacts.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>Impact C-CP-3:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 or a tribal cultural resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21084.3. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)	S	Implement <b>Mitigation Measures M-CP-4a, Project-Specific Preliminary Archeological Assessment; M-CP-4b, Procedures for Accidental Discovery of Archeological Resources; and M-CP-5: Project-Specific Tribal Cultural Resource Assessment.</b>	LTSM
<b>Impact C-CP-4:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature, and would not disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	LTS	None required	NA
<b>D. Transportation and Circulation</b>			
<b>Impact TR-1:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and the street network changes, would not cause substantial additional VMT or substantially increase automobile travel.	LTS	None required.	NA

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation



TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>Impact TR-2:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and the street network changes, would not result in traffic hazards.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>Impact TR-3:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would result in a substantial increase in transit demand that would not be accommodated by local transit capacity, and would cause a substantial increase in delays resulting in adverse impacts on local and regional transit routes.	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Mitigation Measure M-TR-3a: Transit Enhancements.</b> The following are City actions that would reduce local and regional transit impacts associated with implementation of the Central SoMa Plan and proposed street network changes.</li> <li>• <i>Enhanced Transit Funding.</i> To accommodate project transit demand, the City shall ensure that sufficient operating and capital funding is secured, including through the following measures:</li> <li>• Establish fee-based sources of revenue such as parking benefit districts.</li> <li>• Establish a congestion-charge scheme for downtown San Francisco, with all or a portion of the revenue collected going to support improved local and regional transit service on routes that serve Downtown and the Central SoMa Plan Area.</li> <li>• Seek grant funding for specific capital improvements from regional, State and federal sources.</li> <li>• <i>Transit Corridor Improvement Review.</i> During the design phase, the SFMTA shall review each street network project that contains portions of Muni transit routes where significant transit delay impacts have been identified (routes 8 Bayshore, 8AX Bayshore Express, 8BX Bayshore Express, 10 Townsend, 14 Mission, 14R Mission Rapid, 27 Bryant, 30 Stockton, 45 Union-Stockton, and 47 Van Ness). Through this review, SFMTA shall incorporate feasible street network design modifications that would meet the performance criteria of maintaining accessible transit service, enhancing transit service times, and offsetting transit delay. Such features could include, but shall not be limited to, transit-only lanes, transit signal priority, queue jumps, stop consolidation, limited or express service, corner or sidewalk bulbs, and transit boarding islands, as determined by the SFMTA, to enhance transit service times and offset transit delay. Any subsequent changes to the street network designs shall be subject to a similar review process.</li> <li>• <i>Transit Accessibility.</i> To enhance transit accessibility, the Planning Department and the SFMTA shall establish a coordinated planning process to link land use planning and development in Central SoMa to transit and other alternative transportation mode planning. This shall be achieved through some or all of the following measures:</li> <li>• Implement recommendations of the <i>Better Streets Plan</i> that are designed to make the pedestrian environment safer and more comfortable for walk trips throughout the day, especially in areas where</li> </ul>	SUM

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>sidewalks and other realms of the pedestrian environment are notably unattractive and intimidating for pedestrians and discourage walking as a primary means of circulation. This includes traffic calming strategies in areas with fast-moving, one-way traffic, long blocks, narrow sidewalks and tow-away lanes, as may be found in much of the Central SoMa area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement building design features that promote primary access to buildings from transit stops and pedestrian areas, and discourage the location of primary access points to buildings through parking lots and other auto-oriented entryways.</li> <li>• Develop Central SoMa transportation implementation programs that manage and direct resources brought in through pricing programs and development-based fee assessments, as outlined above, to further the multimodal implementation and maintenance of these transportation improvements.</li> <li>• <i>Muni Storage and Maintenance.</i> To ensure that Muni is able to service additional transit vehicles needed to serve increased demand generated by development in Central SoMa, the SFMTA shall provide maintenance and storage facilities. In 2013, the SFMTA prepared a <i>Real Estate and Facilities Vision for the 21st Century</i> report.<sup>1</sup> The document provides a vision for addressing Muni's storage and maintenance needs, particularly in light of substantial growth in fleet as well as changes in the fleet composition.</li> <li>• <b>Mitigation Measure M-TR-3b: Boarding Improvements.</b> The SFMTA shall implement boarding improvements such as low floor buses and pre-payment that would reduce the boarding times to mitigate the impacts on transit travel times on routes where Plan ridership increases are greatest, such as the 8 Bayshore, 8AX/8BX Bayshore Expresses, 10 Townsend, 14 Mission, 14R Mission Rapid, 27 Bryant, 30 Stockton, 45 Union-Stockton, and 47 Van Ness routes. These boarding improvements, which would reduce delay associated with passengers boarding and alighting, shall be made in combination with <b>Mitigation Measures M-TR-3c, Upgrade Transit-only Lanes on Third Street, M-TR-3d, Signalization and Intersection Restriping at Townsend/Fifth Streets, and M-TR-3e, Implement Tow-away Lanes on Fifth Street</b>, which would serve to reduce delay associated with traffic congestion along the transit route.</li> <li>• <b>Mitigation Measure M-TR-3c: Signalization and Intersection Restriping at Townsend/Fifth Streets.</b> The SFMTA shall design and construct a new traffic signal at the intersection of</li> </ul>	

<sup>1</sup> SFMTA, *Real Estate and Facilities Vision for the 21st Century*, January 2013. Available at <http://archives.sfmta.com/cms/cmta/documents/1-29-13VisionReport.pdf>, accessed December 31, 2015.

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Townsend/Fifth Streets, and reconfigure the Townsend Street eastbound approach to provide one dedicated left-turn lane (with an exclusive left turn phase) adjacent to a through lane. This reconfiguration would require restriping of the two existing travel lanes at the eastbound approach to this intersection.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure M-TR-3d: Implement Tow-away Transit-only Lanes on Fifth Street.</b> The SFMTA shall implement a northbound tow-away transit-only lane on Fifth Street between Townsend and Bryant Streets during the p.m. peak period to mitigate the impacts on transit travel times on the 47 Van Ness. This peak period transit-only lane can be implemented by restricting on-street parking (about 30 parking spaces) on the east side of Fifth Street between Townsend and Bryant Streets during the 3:00 to 7:00 p.m. peak period.</p>	
<b>Impact TR-4:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would not result in pedestrian safety hazards nor result in a substantial overcrowding on sidewalks or at corner locations, but would result in overcrowding at crosswalks.	S	<p><b>Mitigation Measure M-TR-4: Upgrade Central SoMa Area Crosswalks.</b> Consistent with the proposed provisions of the Plan to establish a minimum width of crosswalks of 15 feet, and up to 40 feet where future pedestrian volumes warrant, as feasible, the SFMTA shall widen and restripe the crosswalks to the continental design, consistent with the <i>Better Streets Plan</i>.<sup>2</sup></p> <p>With either the Howard/Folsom One-Way Option or Howard/Folsom Two-Way Option street network changes, the SFMTA shall monitor crosswalk operations for deteriorated conditions (i.e., crosswalk operating conditions of LOS E or LOS F, or observations of substantial crosswalk overcrowding), and, as feasible, widen the following crosswalks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the intersection of Third/Mission, widen the east and west crosswalks to 20 feet.</li> <li>• At the intersection of Fourth/Mission, widen the east crosswalk to 40 feet, and widen the west crosswalk to 35 feet.</li> <li>• At the intersection of Fourth/Townsend, widen the west crosswalk to 30 feet.</li> </ul>	SUM

<sup>2</sup> Crosswalks with a continental design have parallel markings that are the most visible to drivers. Use of continental design for crosswalk marking also improves crosswalk detection for people with low vision and cognitive impairments. Available at [http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle\\_pedestrian/publications/sidewalk2/sidewalks208.cfm](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/publications/sidewalk2/sidewalks208.cfm), accessed October 2, 2014.

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

**TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR**

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>Impact TR-5:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would not result in potentially hazardous conditions for bicyclists, or otherwise substantially interfere with bicycle accessibility.	LTS	<p><b>Improvement Measure I-TR-5a: Cycle Track Public Education Campaign.</b> To further reduce potential conflicts between bicyclists and pedestrians, transit and other vehicles, the SFMTA could develop and implement a cycle track public education campaign to develop safety awareness by providing information to the public through outreach channels such as media campaigns, brochures, and websites. This campaign would be in addition to the existing SFMTA bicycle safety outreach, specifically geared to Central SoMa and cycle tracks. Elements of the education campaign could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarifying rules of the road for cycle tracks.</li> <li>• Improving pedestrian awareness about where to wait and how to cross the cycle track (i.e., on the sidewalk or buffer zone, rather than in the cycle track or adjacent to parked vehicles).</li> <li>• Providing bicycle-safety education for neighborhood schools (e.g., the Bessie Carmichael School), and neighborhood groups within Central SoMa.</li> <li>• Ensuring that the San Francisco Police Department officers are initially and repeatedly educated on traffic law as it applies to bicyclists and motorists.</li> <li>• Providing safety compliance education for bicyclists coupled with increased enforcement for violations by bicyclists.</li> </ul> <p>The public education campaign could include a website, as well as instruction videos with information for cyclists, motorists, and pedestrians. To the extent possible, the public education campaign could be coordinated with the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition efforts.</p> <p><b>Improvement Measure I-TR-5b: Cycle Track Post-Implementation Surveys.</b> Following implementation of the cycle tracks on Howard, Folsom, Brannan, Third and Fourth Streets, the SFMTA could conduct motorist, pedestrian, bicycle, and business surveys to understand how the cycle tracks are performing, and to make adjustments to the design and supplemental public education campaign. In addition to the user surveys, the post-implementation assessment could include before/after photos, bicyclist ridership and traffic volume counts, video analysis of behavior of bicyclists, pedestrians, and drivers, assessment of vehicle queuing, and compliance with new signs/signals. The information would be used as input for subsequent design and implementation of cycle tracks on other streets in San Francisco, as well as documenting the effectiveness of the cycle track.</p> <p><b>Mitigation:</b> None required.</p>	NA

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>Impact TR-6:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would result in a reduction in on-street commercial loading supply such that the loading demand during the peak hour of loading activities would not be accommodated within on-street loading supply, would impact existing passenger loading/unloading zones, and may create hazardous conditions or significant delay that may affect transit, other vehicles, bicycles, or pedestrians.	S	<p><b>Mitigation Measure M-TR-6a: Driveway and Loading Operations Plan (DLOP).</b> Sponsors of development projects that provide more than 100,000 square feet of residential or commercial uses shall prepare a DLOP, and submit the plan for review and approval by the Planning Department and the SFMTA in order to reduce potential conflicts between driveway operations, including loading activities, and pedestrians, bicycles and vehicles, and to maximize reliance of on-site loading spaces to accommodate new loading demand.</p> <p>Prior to preparing the DLOP, the project sponsor shall meet with the Planning Department and the SFMTA to review the proposed number, location, and design of the on-site loading spaces, as well as the projected loading demand. In the event that the number of on-site loading spaces does not accommodate the projected loading demand for the proposed development, the project sponsor shall pursue with the SFMTA conversion of nearby on-street parking spaces to commercial loading spaces, if determined feasible by the SFMTA.</p> <p>The DLOP shall be revised to reflect changes in accepted technology or operation protocols, or changes in conditions, as deemed necessary by the Planning Department and the SFMTA. The DLOP shall include the following components, as appropriate to the type of development and adjacent street characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Loading Dock Management.</i> To ensure that off-street loading facilities are efficiently used, and that trucks that are longer than can be safely accommodated are not permitted to use a building's loading dock, the project sponsor of a development project in the Plan Area shall develop a plan for management of the building's loading dock and shall ensure that tenants in the building are informed of limitations and conditions on loading schedules and truck size. The management plan could include strategies such as the use of an attendant to direct and guide trucks, installing a "Full" sign at the garage/loading dock driveway, limiting activity during peak hours, installation of audible and/or visual warning devices, and other features. Additionally, as part of the project application process, the project sponsor shall consult with the SFMTA concerning the design of loading and parking facilities.</li> <li>• <i>Garage/Loading Dock Attendant.</i> If warranted by project-specific conditions, the project sponsor of a development project in the Plan Area shall ensure that building management employs attendant(s) for the project's parking garage and/or loading dock, as applicable. The attendant would be stationed as determined by the project-specific review analysis, typically at the project's driveway to direct vehicles entering and exiting the building and avoid any safety-related conflicts with pedestrians on the sidewalk during the a.m. and p.m. peak periods of traffic, bicycle, and pedestrian activity, with extended hours as dictated by traffic, bicycle and pedestrian conditions and by activity in the project garage and loading dock. Each project shall also install audible and/or visible warning devices, or</li> </ul>	SUM

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>comparably effective warning devices as approved by the Planning Department and/or the SFMTA, to alert pedestrians of the outbound vehicles from the parking garage and/or loading dock, as applicable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Large Truck Access.</i> The loading dock attendant shall dictate the maximum size of truck that can be accommodated at the on-site loading area. In order to accommodate any large trucks (i.e., generally longer than 40 feet) that may require occasional access to the site (e.g., large move-in trucks that need occasional access to both residential and commercial developments), the DLOP shall include procedures as to the location of on-street accommodation, time of day restrictions for accommodating larger vehicles, and procedures to reserve available curbside space on adjacent streets from the SFMTA.</li> <li>• <i>Trash/Recycling/Compost Collection Design and Management.</i> When designs for buildings are being developed, the project sponsor or representative shall meet with the appropriate representative from Recology (or other trash collection firm) to determine the location and type of trash/recycling/compost bins, frequency of collections, and procedures for collection activities, including the location of Recology trucks during collection. The location of the trash/recycling/compost storage room(s) for each building shall be indicated on the building plans prior to submittal of plans to the Building Department. Procedures for collection shall ensure that the collection bins are not placed within any sidewalk, bicycle facility, parking lane or travel lane adjacent to the project site at any time.</li> </ul> <p><b>Mitigation Measure M-TR-6b: Accommodation of On-Street Commercial Loading Spaces and Passenger Loading/Unloading Zones.</b> The SFMTA shall develop detailed plans for each segment of the proposed street network changes that identify existing on-street commercial loading spaces and passenger loading/unloading zones, and then identify how demand within the existing loading facilities could be accommodated with the proposed street network changes. The detailed design shall also consider on-street loading supply needs for new development, as well as driveway access to loading facilities within existing and future buildings along the affected segments. The detailed design for each segment shall be prepared within a reasonable time frame of physical implementation to ensure that future land use conditions are reflected.</p> <p>As part of detailed design for each affected street the SFMTA shall conduct the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Document the existing commercial loading spaces and passenger loading/unloading zones at the time of detailed design.</li> <li>2. Conduct loading demand surveys/observation at appropriate times of day for each type of loading activity, to determine the actual demand associated with the on-street spaces and the need to replace or augment the on-street commercial loading spaces.</li> </ol>	

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN— IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>3. Identify replacement commercial loading spaces and passenger loading/unloading spaces. Commercial loading spaces should be prioritized over parking spaces, and, to the extent feasible, the replacement commercial loading spaces shall be of similar length on the same block and side of the street. Where commercial loading spaces would be permanently removed, install new commercial loading spaces within 250 feet on adjacent side streets if feasible.</p> <p>4. At each location where passenger loading/unloading zones would be eliminated, contact the permit holder to determine adequacy of alternate locations and/or need for the passenger loading/unloading space. In some locations, such as schools and hotels, passenger loading/unloading activities could be accommodated within commercial loading spaces, with time of day restrictions.</p> <p>5. Conduct business surveys and review detailed plans with merchant associations or other local stakeholders to determine need for commercial loading spaces.</p> <p>6. Develop and implement a public education campaign regarding the street network changes, reduction or elimination of on-street parking spaces, location of replacement commercial loading spaces, and any time-of-day restrictions. On streets where on-street parking would be completely eliminated, provide information regarding commercial loading space supply on adjacent streets. In addition, provide information regarding <i>California Vehicle Code</i> §22500 and <i>San Francisco Transportation Code</i> §7.2.70 that loading activities (either truck or passenger loading/unloading) should not occur while stopped in any crosswalk, bicycle lane or travel lane.</p> <p>The SFMTA and the Planning Department shall develop protocols for ongoing assessment of commercial loading needs on the affected streets, and for review of new development projects along the affected street segments to identify needed changes to the street network design (e.g., when a new driveway to a development site is required), or need for additional on-street commercial loading spaces.</p> <p>In addition, the SFMTA shall explore the potential to develop and implement an off-hour delivery program to shift delivery windows for commercial deliveries to times when conflicts are less likely to occur. Such a program could be implemented as a pilot project, similar to the pilot project conducted in New York City in 2009–2010.<sup>3</sup> Most commercial loading spaces in Central SoMa are metered, and the off-hour delivery program can include pricing to reduce the amount of time vehicles park, stand or stop at the curb, so that spaces turn over for more users, and double parking is minimized.</p>	

<sup>3</sup> New York City Off-Hour Delivery Program. Available at <http://www.nyc.gov/html/dot/html/motorist/offhoursdelivery.shtml>, accessed August 16, 2016.

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

**TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR**

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>Impact TR-7:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and the street network changes, would not result in a substantial parking deficit that would create hazardous conditions or significant delays affecting transit, bicycles, or pedestrians, and where particular characteristics of the Plan demonstrably render use of other modes infeasible.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>Impact TR-8:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, could result in significant impacts on emergency vehicle access	S	<p><b>Mitigation Measure M-TR-8: Emergency Vehicle Access Consultation.</b> During the design phase of each street network project, SFMTA shall consult with emergency service providers, including the San Francisco Fire Department and the San Francisco Police Department. Through the consultation process, the street network design shall be modified as needed to maintain emergency vehicle access. SFMTA shall identify design modifications through this process, as needed to meet the following performance criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No physical barriers shall be introduced that would preclude emergency vehicle access.</li> </ul> <p>Street design modifications should achieve the goals of the project without precluding emergency vehicle access. Design modifications selected by SFMTA, as needed to meet the performance criteria, shall be incorporated into the final design of each street network project and could include, but shall not be limited to: mountable concrete buffers, mountable curbs and corner or sidewalk bulbs, modification of corner or sidewalk bulbs and curb locations to accommodate turning emergency vehicles, and emergency vehicle signal priority. Any subsequent changes to the streetscape designs shall be subject to a similar consultation process.</p>	LTSM

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation



TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN—IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>Impact TR-9:</b> Construction activities associated with development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would result in substantial interference with pedestrian, bicycle, or vehicle circulation and accessibility to adjoining areas, and would result in potentially hazardous conditions.	S	<p><b>Mitigation Measure M-TR-9: Construction Management Plan and Construction Coordination.</b></p> <p><i>Construction Management Plan</i>—For projects within the Plan Area, the project sponsor shall develop and, upon review and approval by the SFMTA and Public Works, implement a Construction Management Plan, addressing transportation-related circulation, access, staging and hours of delivery. The Construction Management Plan would disseminate appropriate information to contractors and affected agencies with respect to coordinating construction activities to minimize overall disruption and ensure that overall circulation in the project area is maintained to the extent possible, with particular focus on ensuring transit, pedestrian, and bicycle connectivity. The Construction Management Plan would supplement and expand, rather than modify or supersede, and manual, regulations, or provisions set forth by the SFMTA, Public Works, or other City departments and agencies, and the California Department of Transportation.</p> <p>If construction of the proposed project is determined to overlap with nearby adjacent project(s) as to result in transportation-related impacts, the project sponsor or its contractor(s) shall consult with various City departments such as the SFMTA and Public Works through ISCOTT, and other interdepartmental meetings as deemed necessary by the SFMTA, Public Works, and the Planning Department, to develop a Coordinated Construction Management Plan. The Coordinated Construction Management Plan that shall address construction-related vehicle routing, detours, and maintaining transit, bicycle, vehicle, and pedestrian movements in the vicinity of the construction area for the duration of the construction period overlap. Key coordination meetings shall be held jointly between project sponsors and contractors of other projects for which the City departments determine construction impacts could overlap.</p> <p>The Construction Management Plan and, if required, the Coordinated Construction Management Plan, shall include, but not be limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Restricted Construction Truck Access Hours</i>—Limit construction truck movements to the hours between 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., or other times if approved by the SFMTA, to minimize disruption to vehicular traffic, including transit during the a.m. and p.m. peak periods.</li> <li>• <i>Construction Truck Routing Plans</i>—Identify optimal truck routes between the regional facilities and the project site, taking into consideration truck routes of other development projects and any construction activities affecting the roadway network.</li> <li>• <i>Coordination of Temporary Lane and Sidewalk Closures</i>—The project sponsor shall coordinate travel lane closures with other projects requesting concurrent lane and sidewalk closures through the ISCOTT and interdepartmental meetings process above, to minimize the extent and duration of requested lane and sidewalk closures. Travel lane closures shall be minimized especially along transit and</li> </ul>	SUM

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN— IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>bicycle routes, so as to limit the impacts to transit service and bicycle circulation and safety.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Maintenance of Transit, Vehicle, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Access</i>—The project sponsor/construction contractor(s) shall meet with Public Works, SFMTA, the Fire Department, Muni Operations and other City agencies to coordinate feasible measures to include in the Coordinated Construction Management Plan to maintain access for transit, vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians. This shall include an assessment of the need for temporary transit stop relocations or other measures to reduce potential traffic, bicycle, and transit disruption and pedestrian circulation effects during construction of the project.</li> <li>• <i>Carpool, Bicycle, Walk and Transit Access for Construction Workers</i>—The construction contractor shall include methods to encourage carpooling, bicycling, walk and transit access to the project site by construction workers (such as providing transit subsidies to construction workers, providing secure bicycle parking spaces, participating in free-to-employee ride matching program from <a href="http://www.511.org">www.511.org</a>, participating in emergency ride home program through the City of San Francisco (<a href="http://www.sferh.org">www.sferh.org</a>), and providing transit information to construction workers).</li> <li>• <i>Construction Worker Parking Plan</i>—The location of construction worker parking shall be identified as well as the person(s) responsible for monitoring the implementation of the proposed parking plan. The use of on-street parking to accommodate construction worker parking shall be discouraged. All construction bid documents shall include a requirement for the construction contractor to identify the proposed location of construction worker parking. If on-site, the location, number of parking spaces, and area where vehicles would enter and exit the site shall be required. If off-site parking is proposed to accommodate construction workers, the location of the off-site facility, number of parking spaces retained, and description of how workers would travel between off-site facility and project site shall be required.</li> <li>• <i>Project Construction Updates for Adjacent Businesses and Residents</i>—To minimize construction impacts on access for nearby institutions and businesses, the project sponsor shall provide nearby residences and adjacent businesses with regularly-updated information regarding project construction, including construction activities, peak construction vehicle activities (e.g., concrete pours), travel lane closures, and lane closures. At regular intervals to be defined in the Construction Management Plan and, if necessary, in the Coordinated Construction Management Plan, a regular email notice shall be distributed by the project sponsor that shall provide current construction information of interest to neighbors, as well as contact information for specific construction inquiries or concerns.</li> </ul>	

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

**TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Mitigation and Improvement Measures</b>	<b>Level of Significance After Mitigation</b>
<b>Impact C-TR-1:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and the street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would not result in significant impacts related to VMT.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>Impact C-TR-2:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and the street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would not result in significant impacts related to traffic hazards.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>Impact C-TR-3:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would contribute considerably to significant cumulative transit impacts on local and regional transit providers.	S	Implement <b>Mitigation Measures M-TR-3a, Transit Enhancements; M-TR-3b, Boarding Improvements; M-TR-3c, Signalization and Intersection Restriping at Townsend/Fifth Streets; and M-TR-3d, Implement Tow-away Transit-only Lanes on Fifth Street.</b>	SUM
<b>Impact C-TR-4:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would contribute considerably to significant cumulative pedestrian impacts.	S	Implement <b>Mitigation Measure M-TR-4, Upgrade Central SoMa Crosswalks.</b>	SUM

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

**TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Mitigation and Improvement Measures</b>	<b>Level of Significance After Mitigation</b>
<b>Impact C-TR-5:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and the street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would not result in cumulative bicycle impacts.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>Impact C-TR-6:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would contribute considerably to significant cumulative loading impacts.	S	Implement <b>Mitigation Measure M-TR-6a, Driveway and Loading Operations Plan</b> , and <b>Mitigation Measure M-TR-6b, Accommodation of On-Street Commercial Loading Spaces and Passenger Loading/Unloading Zones</b> .	SUM
<b>Impact C-TR-7:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and the street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would not result in cumulative parking impacts.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>Impact C-TR-8:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, could contribute considerably to significant cumulative emergency vehicle access impacts.	S	Implement <b>Mitigation Measure M-TR-8, Emergency Vehicle Access Consultation</b> .	LTSM

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>Impact C-TR-9:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and the street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would not result in significant cumulative construction-related transportation impacts.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>E. Noise and Vibration</b>			
<b>Impact NO-1:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed street network changes, would generate noise that would result in exposure of persons to noise levels in excess of standards in the <i>San Francisco General Plan</i> or Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the <i>Police Code</i> ), and would result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise above existing levels.	S	<b>Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a: Transportation Demand Management for New Development Projects.</b> To reduce vehicle noise from subsequent development projects in the Plan Area, the project sponsor and subsequent property owners shall develop and implement a TDM Plan as part of project approval. The scope and number of TDM measures included in the TDM Plan shall be in accordance with Planning Department's TDM Program Standards for the type of development proposed, and accompanying appendices. <sup>4</sup> The TDM Program Standards and accompanying appendices are expected to be refined as planning for the proposed TDM Ordinance continues. Each subsequent development project's TDM Plan shall conform to the most recent version of the TDM Program Standards and accompanying appendices available at the time of the project Approval Action, as defined in Section 31.04(h) of the <i>San Francisco Administrative Code</i> . The Planning Department shall review and approve the TDM Plan, as well as any subsequent revisions to the TDM Plan. The TDM Plan shall target a reduction in the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) rate (i.e., VMT per capita), monitor and evaluate project performance (actual VMT), and adjust TDM measures over time to attempt to meet VMT target reduction. This measure is applicable to all projects within the Plan Area that do not otherwise qualify for an exemption under Article 19 of the CEQA Guidelines. This measure may be superseded if a comparable TDM Ordinance is adopted that applies to projects in the Plan Area. The TDM Plan shall be developed by the project sponsor for each particular development project, and shall aim to achieve the maximum VMT rate reduction feasible. The TDM Plan shall be developed in consultation with the Planning Department and rely generally on implementation of measures listed in <i>Updating Transportation Impacts Analysis in the CEQA Guidelines</i>	SUM

<sup>4</sup> San Francisco Planning Department, *Draft TDM Program Standards*, July 2016, and accompanying appendices. The most up-to-date *Draft TDM Program Standards* and accompanying appendices are available online at: <http://sf-planning.org/tdm-materials-and-resources>. Accessed on September 19, 2016.

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>document published by California Office of Planning and Research on August 6, 2014, or whatever document supersedes it, and the Planning Department TDM Program Standards and accompanying appendices in effect at the time of the Project Approval Action. The TDM program may include, but is not limited to the types of measures, which are summarized below for explanatory example purposes. Actual development project TDM measures shall be applied from the TDM Program Standards and accompanying appendices, which describe the scope and applicability of candidate measures in detail:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Active Transportation: Provision of streetscape improvements to encourage walking, secure bicycle parking, shower and locker facilities for cyclists, subsidized bike share memberships for project occupants, bicycle repair and maintenance services, and other bicycle-related services</li> <li>2. Car-Share: Provision of car-share parking spaces and subsidized memberships for project occupants</li> <li>3. Delivery: Provision of amenities and services to support delivery of goods to project occupants</li> <li>4. Family-Oriented Measures: Provision of on-site childcare and other amenities to support the use of sustainable transportation modes by families</li> <li>5. High-Occupancy Vehicles: Provision of carpooling/vanpooling incentives and shuttle bus service</li> <li>6. Information: Provision of multimodal wayfinding signage, transportation information displays, and tailored transportation marketing services</li> <li>7. Land Use: Provision of on-site affordable housing and healthy food retail services in underserved areas</li> <li>8. Parking: Provision of unbundled parking, short-term daily parking provision, parking cash out offers, and reduced off-street parking supply.</li> </ol> <p><b>Mitigation Measure M-NO-1b: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses.</b> To reduce potential conflicts between existing sensitive receptors and new noise-generating uses, for new development including PDR, Places of Entertainment, or other uses that would potentially generate noise levels substantially in excess of ambient noise (either short-term during the nighttime hours, or as a 24-hour average), the Planning Department shall require the preparation of a noise analysis that includes, at a minimum, a site survey to identify potential noise-sensitive uses within 900 feet of, and that have a direct line-of-sight to, the project site, and including at least one 24-hour noise measurement (with maximum noise level readings taken so as to be able to accurately describe maximum levels reached during nighttime hours), prior to the first project approval action. The analysis shall be prepared by persons qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering and shall demonstrate with reasonable certainty that the proposed use would not adversely affect nearby noise-sensitive uses, and that there are no particular circumstances about the proposed</p>	

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN— IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		project site that appear to warrant heightened concern about noise levels that would be generated by the proposed use. Should such concerns be present, the Department may require the completion of a detailed noise assessment by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering prior to the first project approval action, and the incorporation of noise reduction measures as recommended by the noise assessment.	
<b>Impact NO-2:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed street network changes and open space improvements, would result in construction activities in the Plan Area that could expose persons to substantial temporary or periodic increases in noise levels substantially in excess of ambient levels.	S	<p><b>Mitigation Measure M-NO-2a: General Construction Noise Control Measures.</b> To ensure that project noise from construction activities is reduced to the maximum extent feasible, the project sponsor of a development project in the Plan Area that is within 100 feet of noise-sensitive receptors shall undertake the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Require the general contractor to ensure that equipment and trucks used for project construction utilize the best available noise control techniques (e.g., improved mufflers, equipment redesign, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures and acoustically-attenuating shields or shrouds), wherever feasible.</li> <li>Require the general contractor to locate stationary noise sources (such as compressors) as far from adjacent or nearby sensitive receptors as possible, to muffle such noise sources, and to construct barriers around such sources and/or the construction site, which could reduce construction noise by as much as 5 dBA. To further reduce noise, the contractor shall locate stationary equipment in pit areas or excavated areas, if feasible.</li> <li>Require the general contractor to use impact tools (e.g., jack hammers, pavement breakers, and rock drills) that are hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools. Where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust shall be used, along with external noise jackets on the tools, which could reduce noise levels by as much as 10 dBA.</li> <li>Include noise control requirements in specifications provided to construction contractors. Such requirements could include, but are not limited to, performing all work in a manner that minimizes noise to the extent feasible; use of equipment with effective mufflers; undertaking the most noisy activities during times of least disturbance to surrounding residents and occupants, as feasible; and selecting haul routes that avoid residential buildings to the extent that such routes are otherwise feasible.</li> <li>Prior to the issuance of each building permit, along with the submission of construction documents, submit to the Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection (DBI) a list of measures that shall be implemented and that shall respond to and track complaints pertaining to construction</li> </ul>	SUM

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>noise. These measures shall include (1) a procedure and phone numbers for notifying DBI and the Police Department (during regular construction hours and off-hours); (2) a sign posted on-site describing noise complaint procedures and a complaint hotline number that shall be answered at all times during construction; (3) designation of an on-site construction complaint and enforcement manager for the project; and (4) notification of neighboring residents and non-residential building managers within 300 feet of the project construction area at least 30 days in advance of extreme noise generating activities (defined as activities generating anticipated noise levels of 80 dBA or greater without noise controls, which is the standard in the <i>Police Code</i>) about the estimated duration of the activity.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure M-NO-2b: Noise and Vibration Control Measures during Pile Driving.</b> For individual projects that require pile driving, a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures shall be prepared under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant. These attenuation measures shall be included in construction of the project and shall include as many of the following control strategies, and any other effective strategies, as feasible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project sponsor of a development project in the Plan Area shall require the construction contractor to erect temporary plywood or similar solid noise barriers along the boundaries of the project site to shield potential sensitive receptors and reduce noise levels;</li> <li>• The project sponsor of a development project in the Plan Area shall require the construction contractor to implement “quiet” pile-driving technology (such as pre-drilling of piles, sonic pile drivers, and the use of more than one pile driver to shorten the total pile driving duration), where feasible, with consideration of geotechnical and structural requirements and soil conditions (including limiting vibration levels to the FTA’s 0.5 inches per second, PPV to minimize architectural damage to adjacent structures);</li> <li>• The project sponsor of a development project in the Plan Area shall require the construction contractor to monitor the effectiveness of noise attenuation measures by taking noise measurements, at a distance of 100 feet, at least once per day during pile-driving; and</li> <li>• The project sponsor of a development project in the Plan Area shall require that the construction contractor limit pile driving activity to result in the least disturbance to neighboring uses.</li> </ul>	

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation



**TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR**

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>Impact NO-3:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed street network changes, would result in construction activities that could expose persons to temporary increases in vibration substantially in excess of ambient levels.	S	Implement <b>Mitigation Measures M-NO-2b, Noise and Vibration Control Measures during Pile Driving, M-CP-3a, Protect Historical Resources from Adjacent Construction Activities, and M-CP-3b, Construction Monitoring Program for Historical Resources.</b>	LTSM
<b>Impact C-NO-1:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed street network changes and open space improvements, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would result in cumulative noise impacts.	S	Implement <b>Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a, Transportation Demand Management for New Development Projects and Mitigation Measure M-NO-1b, Siting of Noise-Generating Uses.</b>	SUM
<b>F. Air Quality</b>			
<b>Impact AQ-1:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and proposed street network changes, would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the <i>2010 Clean Air Plan</i> .	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>Impact AQ-2:</b> The Plan would not violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard.	LTS	None required.	NA

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

**TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR**

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>Impact AQ-3:</b> Operation of subsequent individual development projects in the Plan Area and street network changes, but not proposed open space improvements, would violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, and/or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard.	S	<p>Implement <b>Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a, Transportation Demand Management (TDM) for Development Projects.</b> (see Noise Impact NO-1a in this Summary Table)</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3a: Education for Residential and Commercial Tenants Concerning Low-VOC Consumer Products.</b> Prior to receipt of any building permit and every five years thereafter, the project sponsor shall develop electronic correspondence to be distributed by email or posted on-site annually to tenants of the project that encourages the purchase of consumer products and paints that are better for the environment and generate less VOC emissions. The correspondence shall encourage environmentally preferable purchasing and shall include contact information and links to SF Approved.<sup>5</sup></p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3b: Reduce Operational Emissions.</b> Proposed projects that would exceed the criteria air pollutant thresholds in this EIR shall implement the additional measures, as applicable and feasible, to reduce operational criteria air pollutant emissions. Such measures may include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For any proposed refrigerated warehouses or large (greater than 20,000 square feet) grocery retailers, provide electrical hook-ups for diesel trucks with Transportation Refrigeration Units at the loading docks.</li> <li>• Use low- and super-compliant VOC architectural coatings in maintaining buildings. “Low-VOC” refers to paints that meet the more stringent regulatory limits in South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1113; however, many manufacturers have reformulated to levels well below these limits. These are referred to as “Super-Compliant” architectural coatings.</li> <li>• Implement <b>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-5a, Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Generators and Fire Pumps.</b></li> <li>• Other measures that are shown to effectively reduce criteria air pollutant emissions onsite or offsite if emissions reductions are realized within the SFBAAB. Measures to reduce emissions onsite are preferable to offsite emissions reductions.</li> </ul>	SUM

<sup>5</sup> SF Approved (sfapproved.org) is administrated by the San Francisco Department of Environment staff, who identifies products and services that are safer and better for the environment (e.g., those that are listed as “Required” or “Suggested”).

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>Impact AQ-4:</b> Development under the Plan, but not the proposed street network changes and open space improvements, would result in construction activities that could violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard.	S	<p><b>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4a: Construction Emissions Analysis.</b> Subsequent development projects that do not meet the applicable screening levels or that the Planning Department otherwise determines could exceed one or more significance thresholds for criteria air pollutants shall undergo an analysis of the project's construction emissions. If no significance thresholds are exceeded, no further mitigation is required. If one or more significance thresholds are exceeded, Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4b would be applicable to the project.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4b: Construction Emissions Minimization Plan.</b> If required based on the analysis described in Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4a or as required in Impact AQ-6 the project sponsor shall submit a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan (Plan) to the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) for review and approval by an Environmental Planning Air Quality Specialist. The Plan shall be designed to reduce air pollutant emissions to the greatest degree practicable.</p> <p>The Plan shall detail project compliance with the following requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All off-road equipment greater than 25 horsepower and operating for more than 20 total hours over the entire duration of construction activities shall meet the following requirements: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Where access to alternative sources of power is available, portable diesel engines shall be prohibited;</li> <li>b) All off-road equipment shall have: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Engines that meet or exceed either U.S. Environmental Protection Agency or California Air Resources Board Tier 2 off-road emission standards (or Tier 3 off-road emissions standards if NO<sub>x</sub> emissions exceed applicable thresholds), <i>and</i></li> <li>ii. Engines that are retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy (VDECS)<sup>6</sup>, <i>and</i></li> <li>iii. Engines shall be fueled with renewable diesel (at least 99 percent renewable diesel or R99).</li> </ol> </li> <li>c) Exceptions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Exceptions to 1(a) may be granted if the project sponsor has submitted information providing evidence to the satisfaction of the ERO that an alternative source of power is limited or infeasible at the project site and that the requirements of this exception provision apply.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ol>	LTSM

<sup>6</sup> Equipment with engines meeting Tier 4 Interim or Tier 4 Final emission standards automatically meet this requirement, therefore VDECS would not be required.

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

**TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR**

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation									
		<p>Under this circumstance, the sponsor shall submit documentation of compliance with 1(b) for onsite power generation.</p> <p>ii. Exceptions to 1(b)(ii) may be granted if the project sponsor has submitted information providing evidence to the satisfaction of the ERO that a particular piece of off-road equipment with an ARB Level 3 VDECS (1) is technically not feasible, (2) would not produce desired emissions reductions due to expected operating modes, (3) installing the control device would create a safety hazard or impaired visibility for the operator, or (4) there is a compelling emergency need to use off-road equipment that are not retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 VDECS and the sponsor has submitted documentation to the ERO that the requirements of this exception provision apply. If granted an exception to 1(b)(ii), the project sponsor shall comply with the requirements of 1(c)(iii).</p> <p>iii. If an exception is granted pursuant to 1(c)(ii), the project sponsor shall provide the next-cleanest piece of off-road equipment as provided by the step down schedule in Table M-AQ-4:</p> <p><b>TABLE M-AQ-4B      OFF-ROAD EQUIPMENT COMPLIANCE STEP-DOWN SCHEDULE*</b></p> <table><tr><th>Compliance Alternative</th><th>Engine Emission Standard</th><th>Emissions Control</th></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>Tier 2**</td><td>ARB Level 2 VDECS</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>Tier 2</td><td>ARB Level 1 VDECS</td></tr></table> <p>*    How to use the table. If the requirements of 1(b) cannot be met, then the project sponsor would need to meet Compliance Alternative 1. Should the project sponsor not be able to supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 1, then Compliance Alternative 2 would need to be met.</p> <p>**    Tier 3 off road emissions standards are required if NO<sub>x</sub> emissions exceed applicable thresholds.</p> <p>iv. Exceptions to 1(b)(iii) may be granted if the project sponsor has submitted information providing evidence to the satisfaction of the ERO that a renewable diesel is not commercially available in the SFBAAB. If an exception is granted pursuant to this section, the project sponsor shall provide another type of alternative fuel, such as biodiesel (B20 or higher).</p> <p>2. The project sponsor shall require the idling time for off-road and on-road equipment be limited to no more than two minutes, except as provided in exceptions to the applicable State regulations</p>	Compliance Alternative	Engine Emission Standard	Emissions Control	1	Tier 2**	ARB Level 2 VDECS	2	Tier 2	ARB Level 1 VDECS	
Compliance Alternative	Engine Emission Standard	Emissions Control										
1	Tier 2**	ARB Level 2 VDECS										
2	Tier 2	ARB Level 1 VDECS										

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>regarding idling for off-road and on-road equipment. Legible and visible signs shall be posted in multiple languages (English, Spanish, Chinese) in designated queuing areas and at the construction site to remind operators of the two minute idling limit.</p> <p>3. The project sponsor shall require that construction operators properly maintain and tune equipment in accordance with manufacturer specifications.</p> <p>4. The Plan shall include estimates of the construction timeline by phase with a description of each piece of off-road equipment required for every construction phase. Off-road equipment descriptions and information may include, but is not limited to, equipment type, equipment manufacturer, equipment identification number, engine model year, engine certification (Tier rating), horsepower, engine serial number, and expected fuel usage and hours of operation. For the VDECS installed: technology type, serial number, make, model, manufacturer, ARB verification number level, and installation date and hour meter reading on installation date. For off-road equipment not using renewable diesel, reporting shall indicate the type of alternative fuel being used.</p> <p>5. The Plan shall be kept on-site and available for review by any persons requesting it and a legible sign shall be posted at the perimeter of the construction site indicating to the public the basic requirements of the Plan and a way to request a copy of the Plan. The project sponsor shall provide copies of Plan as requested.</p> <p>6. <i>Reporting.</i> Quarterly reports shall be submitted to the ERO indicating the construction phase and off-road equipment information used during each phase including the information required in Paragraph 4, above. In addition, for off-road equipment not using renewable diesel, reporting shall indicate the type of alternative fuel being used.</p> <p>Within six months of the completion of construction activities, the project sponsor shall submit to the ERO a final report summarizing construction activities. The final report shall indicate the start and end dates and duration of each construction phase. For each phase, the report shall include detailed information required in Paragraph 4. In addition, for off-road equipment not using renewable diesel, reporting shall indicate the type of alternative fuel being used.</p> <p>7. <i>Certification Statement and On-site Requirements.</i> Prior to the commencement of construction activities, the project sponsor shall certify (1) compliance with the Plan, and (2) all applicable requirements of the Plan have been incorporated into contract specifications.</p>	

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN— IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>Impact AQ-5:</b> Development under the Plan, including proposed street network changes, would result in operational emissions of fine particulate matter (PM <sub>2.5</sub> ) and toxic air contaminants that would result in exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	S	<p>Implement <b>Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a, Transportation Demand Management (TDM) for Development Projects.</b> (see Noise Impact NO-1a in this Summary Table)</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-5a: Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Generators and Fire Pumps.</b> All diesel generators and fire pumps shall have engines that (1) meet Tier 4 Final or Tier 4 Interim emission standards, or (2) meet Tier 2 emission standards and are equipped with a California Air Resources Board Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy. All diesel generators and fire pumps shall be fueled with renewable diesel, R99, if commercially available. For each new diesel backup generator or fire pump permit submitted for the project, including any associated generator pads, engine and filter specifications shall be submitted to the San Francisco Planning Department for review and approval prior to issuance of a permit for the generator or fire pump from the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection. Once operational, all diesel backup generators and Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy shall be maintained in good working order in perpetuity and any future replacement of the diesel backup generators, fire pumps, and Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy filters shall be required to be consistent with these emissions specifications. The operator of the facility shall maintain records of the testing schedule for each diesel backup generator and fire pump for the life of that diesel backup generator and fire pump and provide this information for review to the Planning Department within three months of requesting such information.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-5b: Siting of Uses that Emit Particulate Matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>), Diesel Particulate Matter, or Other Toxic Air Contaminants.</b> To minimize potential exposure of sensitive receptors to diesel particulate matter or substantial levels of toxic air contaminants as part of everyday operations from stationary or area sources (other than the sources listed in M-AQ-5a), the San Francisco Planning Department shall require, during the environmental review process of such projects, but not later than the first project approval action, the preparation of an analysis by a qualified air quality specialist that includes, at a minimum, a site survey to identify residential or other sensitive receptors within 1,000 feet of the project site. For purposes of this measure, sensitive receptors are considered to include housing units; child care centers; schools (high school age and below); and inpatient health care facilities, including nursing or retirement homes and similar establishments. The assessment shall also include an estimate of emissions of toxic air contaminants from the source and shall identify all feasible measures to reduce emissions. These measures shall be incorporated into the project prior to the first approval action.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-5c: Update Air Pollution Exposure Zone for San Francisco Health Code Article 38.</b> The Department of Public Health is required to update the Air Pollution Exposure Zone Map</p>	SUM

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		in <i>San Francisco Health Code</i> Article 38 at least every five years. The Planning Department shall coordinate with the Department of Public Health to update the Air Pollution Exposure Zone taking into account updated health risk methodologies and traffic generated by the Central SoMa Plan. <b>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-5d: Land Use Buffers around Active Loading Docks.</b> Locate sensitive receptors as far away as feasible from truck activity areas including loading docks and delivery areas.	
<b>Impact AQ-6:</b> Development under the Plan, including proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would result in construction activities that could expose sensitive receptors to substantial levels of fine particulate matter (PM <sub>2.5</sub> ) and toxic air contaminants generated by construction equipment.	S	<b>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-6a: Construction Emissions Minimization Plan.</b> All projects within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone and newly added Air Pollutant Exposure Zone lots identified in Figure IV.F-2 shall comply with M-AQ-4b, Construction Emissions Minimization Plan. <b>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-6b: Implement Clean Construction Requirements.</b> Construction of street network changes and open space improvements adjacent to newly added air pollution exposure zone lots identified in Figure IV.F-2 shall comply with the Clean Construction requirements for projects located within the APEZ.	LTSM
<b>Impact AQ-7:</b> Implementation of the Plan would not expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>Impact C-AQ-1:</b> Development under the Plan, including proposed street network changes, but not open space improvements, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, under cumulative 2040 conditions, would contribute considerably to criteria air pollutant impacts.	S	Implement <b>Mitigation Measures M-NO-1a, Transportation Demand Management (TDM) for Development Projects</b> , in Section IV.E, Noise and Vibration, and <b>M-AQ-3a, Education for Residential and Commercial Tenants Concerning Low-VOC Consumer Products</b> , <b>M-AQ-3b, Reduce Operational Emissions</b> , and <b>M-AQ-5a, Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Generators and Fire Pumps</b> ; <b>M-AQ-4a, Construction Emissions Minimization</b> ; and <b>M-AQ-4b, Construction Emissions Reduction Plan</b> .	SUM

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN—IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>Impact C-AQ-2:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed street network changes, but not open space improvements, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would result in exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial levels of fine particulate matter (PM <sub>2.5</sub> ) and toxic air contaminants under 2040 cumulative conditions.	S	<p>Implement <b>Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a, Transportation Demand Management (TDM) for Development Projects.</b> (see Noise Impact NO-1a in this Summary Table)</p> <p>Implement <b>Mitigation Measures M-AQ-4b, Construction Emissions Minimization Plan, M-AQ-5a, Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Generators and Fire Pumps, M-AQ-5b, Siting of Uses that Emit Particulate Matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>), Diesel Particulate Matter, or Other Toxic Air Contaminants, M-AQ-5c, Update Air Pollution Exposure Zone for San Francisco Health Code Article 38, and Mitigation Measure M-AQ-6b, Implement Clean Construction Requirements.</b> As discussed above, the Department of Public Health is required to update the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone map at least every five years in accordance with <i>San Francisco Health Code</i> Article 38. The updated mapping would capture parcels that could be added to the APEZ as a result of future traffic. Mitigation Measures M-AQ-4b, M-AQ-5a, and M-AQ-6b would apply to the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone of <i>San Francisco Health Code</i> Article 38 in effect at the time subsequent development projects are proposed.</p>	SUM
<b>G. Wind</b>			
<b>Impact WI-1:</b> Subsequent future development anticipated under the Plan could alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas.	S	<p><b>Mitigation Measure M-WI-1: Wind Hazard Criterion for the Plan Area.</b> In portions of the Central SoMa Plan area outside the C-3 Use Districts, projects proposed at a roof height greater than 85 feet shall be evaluated by a qualified wind expert as to their potential to result in a new wind hazard exceedance or aggravate an existing pedestrian-level wind hazard exceedance (defined as the one-hour wind hazard criterion of 26 miles per hour equivalent wind speed). If the qualified expert determines that wind-tunnel testing is required due to the potential for a new or worsened wind hazard exceedance, the project shall adhere to the following standards for reduction of ground-level wind speeds in areas of substantial pedestrian use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New buildings and additions to existing buildings shall be shaped (e.g., include setbacks, or other building design techniques), or other wind baffling measures shall be implemented, so that the development would result in the following with respect to the one-hour wind hazard criterion of 26 miles per hour equivalent wind speed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ No net increase, compared to existing conditions, in the overall number of hours during which the wind hazard criterion is exceeded (the number of exceedance locations may change, allowing for both new exceedances and elimination of existing exceedances, as long as there is no net increase in the number of exceedance locations), based on wind-tunnel testing of a representative number of locations proximate to the project site; OR</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	SUM

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation



**TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR**

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any increase in the overall number of hours during which the wind hazard criterion is exceeded shall be evaluated in the context of the overall wind effects of anticipated development that is in accordance with the Plan. Such an evaluation shall be undertaken if the project contribution to the wind hazard exceedance at one or more locations relatively distant from the individual project site is minimal and if anticipated future Plan area development would substantively affect the wind conditions at those locations. The project and foreseeable development shall ensure that there is no increase in the overall number of hours during which the wind hazard criterion is exceeded.</li> <li>New buildings and additions to existing buildings that cannot meet the one-hour wind hazard criterion of 26 miles per hour equivalent wind speed performance standard of this measure based on the above analyses, shall minimize to the degree feasible the overall number of hours during which the wind hazard criterion is exceeded.</li> </ul>	
<b>Impact C-WI-1:</b> Development under the Plan, combined with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in cumulative significant impacts related to wind.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>H. Shadow</b>			
<b>Impact SH-1:</b> Development under the Plan would not create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects existing outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>Impact C-SH-1:</b> Implementation of the Plan, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact on shadow conditions.	LTS	None required.	NA

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

**TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR**

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation and Improvement Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>I. Hydrology and Water Quality (Combined Sewer System and Sea Level Rise)</b>			
<b>Impact HY-6:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would not exacerbate future flood hazards in a manner that could expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>Impact C-HY-2:</b> Operation of individual development projects through implementation of the Plan, in combination with past, present, and foreseeable future development in San Francisco, would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the Southeast Treatment Plant (SEP); violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements; otherwise substantially degrade water quality; or result in an increase in the frequency of combined sewer discharges from the City's combined sewer system.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>Impact C-HY-3:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not exacerbate future flood hazards that could expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death.	LTS	None required.	NA

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

**TABLE S-2 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE INITIAL STUDY**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<b>Land Use and Land Use Planning</b>			
None.			
<b>Aesthetics</b>			
None.			
<b>Population and Housing</b>			
<b>PH-1:</b> Development under the Plan and proposed street network changes would not induce substantial population growth, either directly or indirectly.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>PH-2:</b> Development under the Plan and proposed street network changes would not generate housing demand beyond projected housing forecasts.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>PH-3:</b> Development under the Plan and proposed street network changes would not displace a large number of housing units or people or necessitate the construction of replacement housing outside of the Plan Area.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>C-PH-1:</b> Development under the Plan and proposed street network changes would not make a considerable contribution to any cumulative impact on population or housing.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>Cultural Resources</b>			
None.			
<b>Transportation and Circulation</b>			
None.			
<b>Noise</b>			
None.			

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

**TABLE S-2 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE INITIAL STUDY**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<b>Air Quality</b>			
None.			
<b>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</b>			
<b>C-GG-1:</b> The Plan and development pursuant to the Plan would generate greenhouse gas emissions, but not at levels that would result in a significant impact on the environment or conflict with the City's GHG reduction strategy, <i>Plan Bay Area</i> , or AB 32, and would not result in cumulatively considerable GHG emissions.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>C-GG-2:</b> The proposed street network changes and open space improvements would generate greenhouse gas emissions during construction, but not at levels that would result in a significant impact on the environment, and the proposed changes would be consistent with the City's GHG Reduction Strategy, <i>Plan Bay Area</i> , and the AB 32 Scoping Plan. The proposed street network changes and open spaces therefore would not result in cumulatively considerable GHG emissions.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>Wind and Shadow</b>			
None.			

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

**TABLE S-2 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE INITIAL STUDY**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<b>Recreation and Public Space</b>			
<b>RE-1:</b> Development under the Plan, and the proposed street network changes would result in an increase in the use of existing parks and recreational facilities, but would not result in substantial deterioration or physical degradation of such facilities, and would result in the expansion of recreational facilities and enhance existing recreational resources.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>C-RE-1:</b> Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes, in combination with other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable projects would not result in a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on recreational resources.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>Utilities and Service Systems</b>			
<b>UT-1:</b> Development under the Plan and proposed street network changes would not require or result in the construction of substantial new water treatment facilities and the City would have sufficient water supply available from existing entitlements.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>UT-2:</b> Development under the Plan could require or result in the expansion or construction of new wastewater treatment or stormwater facilities, exceed capacity of the wastewater treatment provider when combined with other commitments, or exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.	LTS for impacts from street network changes and open space improvements. See Table S-1 for impacts from subsequent development projects.	None required for the proposed street network changes or open space improvements. See Table S-1 for impacts from subsequent development projects.	NA for street network changes and open space improvements. See Table S-1 for conclusions regarding impacts from development projects.

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

**TABLE S-2 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE INITIAL STUDY**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<b>UT-3:</b> Development under the Plan and proposed street network changes would continue to be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate solid waste generated by subsequent development in the Plan Area and would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>C-UT-1:</b> Development under the Plan and proposed street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, could contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact on wastewater facilities, but would not contribute to cumulative impacts on other utilities and services.	LTS for water supply and landfill capacity. See Table S-1 for impacts to wastewater facilities.	None required for water supply and landfill capacity See Table S-1 for impacts to wastewater facilities.	NA for water supply and landfill capacity. See Table S-1 for impacts to wastewater facilities
<b>Public Services</b>			
<b>PS-1:</b> Development under the Plan and proposed street network changes would not increase the demand for police service or fire protection service such that new or physically altered facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, would be required in order to maintain acceptable levels of service.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>PS-2:</b> Development under the Plan and proposed street network changes would not directly or indirectly generate school students and increase enrollment in public schools such that new or physically altered facilities would be required.	LTS	None required.	NA

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

**TABLE S-2 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE INITIAL STUDY**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<b>C-PS-1:</b> Development under the Plan and proposed street network changes, combined with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not result in a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on police, fire, and school district services such that new or physically altered facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, would be required in order to maintain acceptable levels of service.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>Biological Resources</b>			
<b>BI-1:</b> Development under to the Plan and the proposed street network changes has the potential to adversely affect special-status species and to interfere with the movement of wildlife species.	S	<b>M-BI-1: Pre-Construction Bat Surveys:</b> Conditions of approval for building permits issued for construction within the Plan Area shall include a requirement for pre-construction special-status bat surveys when large trees are to be removed or underutilized or vacant buildings are to be demolished. If active day or night roosts are found, a qualified biologist (i.e., a biologist holding a CDFW collection permit and a Memorandum of Understanding with the CDFW allowing the biologist to handle and collect bats) shall take actions to make such roosts unsuitable habitat prior to tree removal or building demolition. A no disturbance buffer shall be created around active bat roosts being used for maternity or hibernation purposes at a distance to be determined in consultation with CDFG. Bat roosts initiated during construction are presumed to be unaffected, and no buffer would necessary.	LTSM
<b>BI-2:</b> Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes could interfere with the movement of migratory or native resident bird species.	LTS	<b>Mitigation:</b> None required. <b>Improvement Measures:</b> <b>I-BI-2: Night Lighting Minimization.</b> In compliance with the voluntary San Francisco Lights Out Program, the Planning Department could encourage buildings developed pursuant to the draft Plan to implement bird-safe building operations to prevent and minimize bird strike impacts, including but not	NA

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

**TABLE S-2 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE INITIAL STUDY**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>limited to the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce building lighting from exterior sources by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Minimizing the amount and visual impact of perimeter lighting and façade up-lighting and avoid up-lighting of rooftop antennae and other tall equipment, as well as of any decorative features;</li> <li>◦ Installing motion-sensor lighting;</li> <li>◦ Utilizing minimum wattage fixtures to achieve required lighting levels.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Reduce building lighting from interior sources by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Dimming lights in lobbies, perimeter circulation areas, and atria;</li> <li>◦ Turning off all unnecessary lighting by 11:00 p.m. through sunrise, especially during peak migration periods (mid-March to early June and late August through late October);</li> <li>◦ Utilizing automatic controls (motion sensors, photo-sensors, etc.) to shut off lights in the evening when no one is present;</li> <li>◦ Encouraging the use of localized task lighting to reduce the need for more extensive overhead lighting;</li> <li>◦ Scheduling nightly maintenance to conclude by 11:00 p.m.;</li> <li>◦ Educating building users about the dangers of night lighting to birds.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<b>BI-3:</b> Development under to the Plan and the proposed street network changes, would not substantially interfere with the movement of fish or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.	LTS	None required.	NA

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation



**TABLE S-2 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE INITIAL STUDY**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<b>BI-4:</b> Development under the Plan and proposed street network changes would not conflict with the City's local tree ordinance.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>C-BI-1:</b> Development under the Plan and proposed street network changes, in combination with other past, present or reasonably foreseeable projects, would not result in a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on biological resources.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>Geology, Soils, and Seismicity</b>			
<b>GE-1:</b> Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, seismic groundshaking, seismically induced ground failure, or landslides.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>GE-2:</b> Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes would not result in substantial erosion or loss of top soil.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>GE-3:</b> Neither development under the Plan nor the proposed street network changes would be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that could become unstable as a result of the project.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>GE-4:</b> Neither development under the Plan nor the proposed street network changes would create substantial risks to life or property as a result of location on expansive soils.	LTS	None required.	NA

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

**TABLE S-2 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE INITIAL STUDY**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<b>C-GE-1:</b> Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts related to geologic hazards.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>Hydrology and Water Quality</b>			
<b>HY-1:</b> Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes could violate water quality standards or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.	LTS with respect to construction-related stormwater discharges, construction dewatering, and long-term dewatering. See Table S-1 for impacts to the combined sewer system.	None required with respect to construction-related stormwater discharges, construction dewatering, and long-term dewatering. See Table S-1 for impacts to the combined sewer system.	NA for construction-related stormwater discharges, construction dewatering, and long-term dewatering. See Table S-1 for impacts to the combined sewer system.
<b>HY-2:</b> Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>HY-3:</b> Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the area in a manner that would result in substantial erosion, siltation, or flooding on- or off-site.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>HY-4:</b> Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes would not contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.	LTS	None required.	NA

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

**TABLE S-2 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE INITIAL STUDY**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<b>HY-5:</b> Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes would not expose people, housing, or structures, to substantial risk of loss due to existing flooding risks and would not redirect or impede flood flows.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>HY-6:</b> Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes could expose people, housing, or structures, to substantial risk of loss due to future flooding from sea level rise and would not redirect or impede flood flows.	See Table S-1	See Table S-1	See Table S-1
<b>HY-7:</b> Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.	NI	None required.	NA
<b>C-HY-1:</b> Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the site vicinity, could result in a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on hydrology and water quality.	LTS with respect to erosion, stormwater discharges to the combined sewer system, alteration of drainage patterns, storm sewer system capacity; NI with respect to tsunami or seiche risk.  See Table S-1 for impacts regarding wastewater treatment requirements, water quality standards, waste discharge requirements; water quality, and combined sewer discharges.	LTS with respect to erosion, stormwater discharges to the combined sewer system, alteration of drainage patterns, storm sewer system capacity; NI with respect to tsunami or seiche risk.  See Table S-1 for impacts regarding wastewater treatment requirements, water quality standards, waste discharge requirements; water quality, and combined sewer discharges.	NA with respect to erosion, stormwater discharges to the combined sewer system, alteration of drainage patterns, storm sewer system capacity; NA with respect to tsunami or seiche risk.  See Table S-1 for impacts regarding wastewater treatment requirements, water quality standards, waste discharge requirements; water quality, and combined sewer discharges.

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

TABLE S-2 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE INITIAL STUDY

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<b>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>			
<b>HZ-1:</b> Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes would not create a significant hazard through routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>HZ-2:</b> Development under the Plan and construction of the proposed street network changes could occur on site(s) identified on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to <i>Government Code</i> Section 65962.5. Excavation could also require the handling of potentially contaminated soil and groundwater, potentially exposing workers and the public to hazardous materials, or resulting in a release into the environment during construction.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>HZ-3:</b> Demolition and renovation of buildings as part of individual development projects implemented pursuant to the Plan could potentially expose workers and the public to hazardous building materials including asbestos-containing materials, lead-based paint, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP), and mercury, or result in a release of these materials into the environment during construction.	S	<b>M-HZ-3: Hazardous Building Materials Abatement.</b> The project sponsor of any development project in the Plan Area shall ensure that any building planned for demolition or renovation is surveyed for hazardous building materials including, electrical equipment containing polychlorinated biphenyl (PCBs), fluorescent light ballasts containing PCBs or bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP), and fluorescent light tubes containing mercury vapors. These materials shall be removed and properly disposed of prior to the start of demolition or renovation. Light ballasts that are proposed to be removed during renovation shall be evaluated for the presence of PCBs and in the case where the presence of PCBs in the light ballast cannot be verified, they shall be assumed to contain PCBs, and handled and disposed of as such, according to applicable laws and regulations. Any other hazardous building materials identified either before or during demolition or renovation shall be abated according to federal, State, and local laws and regulations.	LTSM

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

**TABLE S-2 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE INITIAL STUDY**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<b>HZ-4:</b> Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes would not result in adverse effects related to hazardous emissions or handling of acutely hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of an existing school.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>HZ-5:</b> Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>HZ-6:</b> Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>C-HZ-1:</b> Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the site vicinity, would not result in a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts related to hazardous materials.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>Mineral and Energy Resources</b>			
<b>ME-1:</b> Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource or locally-important mineral resource recovery.	NI	None required.	NA
<b>ME-2:</b> Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes would not result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use these in a wasteful manner.	LTS	None required.	NA

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

**TABLE S-2 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PLAN — IDENTIFIED IN THE INITIAL STUDY**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Improvement/Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<b>C-ME-1:</b> Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes, in combination with other past, present or reasonably foreseeable projects would result in less-than significant impacts to mineral and energy resources.	LTS	None required.	NA
<b>Agriculture Resources</b>			
<b>AF-1:</b> Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes would not (a) convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance; (b) conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract; (c) conflict with existing zoning for or cause rezoning of forest land or timberland; (d) result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use; or (e) involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use.	NI	None required.	NA
<b>C-AF-1:</b> Development under the Plan and the proposed street network changes, in combination with other past, present or reasonably foreseeable projects would not result in impacts to agricultural and forest resources.	NI	None required.	NA

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

NA = Not Applicable

S = Significant

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

## Summary of Project Alternatives

This EIR provides five project alternatives to the Plan, as further described in Chapter VI, Alternatives:

- No Project Alternative;
- Reduced Heights Alternative;
- Modified TODCO Plan;
- Land Use Variant; and
- Land Use Plan Only Alternative.

### No Project Alternative

This alternative assumes that development within the Plan Area would proceed consistent with existing land use controls, including the Western SoMa and East SoMa Area Plans and existing use and height and bulk districts. The No Project Alternative would not include implementation of the Plan's proposed street network changes, nor would the open spaces or open space improvements set forth in the Plan be expected to be implemented. Although both the East SoMa Plan and the Western SoMa Plan call for increasing the amount of open space in their respective plan areas, neither adopted area plan identifies specific park sites or open space improvements to facilitate these plans' respective policy objectives. Therefore, no specific open space or street network improvements are assumed under the No Project Alternative other than efforts currently under way or recently completed. Individual development projects under the No Project Alternative are assumed to meet Better Streets Plan requirements.

The growth projections for the No Project Alternative include the addition by 2040 in the Plan Area of approximately 9,200 households and 16,300 residents (about 36 percent less than the 25,500 households anticipated with implementation of the Plan) and approximately 27,200 jobs (57 percent less than the 63,600 jobs anticipated with the Plan). These assumptions reflect allowable development under existing zoning, allocated with respect to use according to historical development patterns in and around the Plan Area. Total floor area developed for the No Project Alternative (17.7 million square feet) would be about 44 percent less than with implementation of the Plan (31.7 million square feet).

The No Project Alternative assumes that growth in the Plan Area and the city would occur with or without implementation of the Plan, but that, absent implementation of the Plan, a smaller percentage of citywide growth would occur within the Plan Area.

### Reduced Heights Alternative

The Reduced Heights Alternative would result in implementation of the same land use districts and General Plan amendments as under the Plan, but this alternative would permit lower heights in some areas, compared to the Plan. The Reduced Heights Alternative would permit fewer tall buildings south of the elevated Interstate 80 freeway than would be allowable under the Plan. Both the Reduced Heights Alternative and the Plan would increase height limits along much of Fourth, Harrison, and Bryant Streets from 65 feet to 85 feet.

However, the Reduced Heights Alternative would allow for four towers of 160 feet or more in height south of the freeway, whereas the Plan would allow up to 10 such towers in this area. Also, on the south side of Harrison Street between Second and Fourth Streets, the Reduced Heights Alternative would allow future buildings at heights no greater than 130 feet, whereas the Plan would allow for four towers 160 feet tall and greater. The maximum height allowed under this alternative would be 320 feet (at the corner of Fourth and Townsend Streets). The Reduced Heights Alternative would include the same street network changes and open spaces improvements that are proposed under the Plan.

This alternative assumes the same sites would be developed as under the Plan, although at a lower intensity, resulting in marginally less development than that assumed under the Plan. Growth projections for the Reduced Heights Alternative estimate an increase of 12,400 households and approximately 55,800 jobs, reflecting 14 percent fewer households and 12 percent fewer jobs than the Plan. Total floor area developed under the Reduced Heights Alternative would be about 13 percent less than with implementation of Plan.

## Modified TODCO Plan

The TODCO Group, a South of Market affordable housing and community development non-profit organization, released its “Central SOMA Community Plan” (TODCO Plan) in May 2013. TODCO revised its plan in October 2016. For purposes of this EIR, a modification to the TODCO Plan’s proposed height limits in major development sites was made, and so this alternative is referred to as the Modified TODCO Plan.

The Modified TODCO Plan is based on an assumption that office development in San Francisco would proceed over the next 20 years at an average rate of about 750,000 square feet per year, or a total of 15 million square feet. Of the total of 15 million square feet, the Modified TODCO Plan proposes that up to about five million square feet be accommodated in the southern portion of the Plan Area (from the north side of Harrison Street south), with the remainder foreseen to be developed in the Financial District, including the Transit Center District east of the Plan Area and the existing C-3 use districts northeast of the Plan Area; Mission Bay and the Central Waterfront, including Pier 70 and the Seawall Lot 337/Pier 48 site where large mixed-use developments are proposed; and, to a lesser extent, in the Civic Center/Mid-Market area. Thus, assuming these other neighborhoods could accommodate this level of growth, the Modified TODCO Plan envisions that the Plan Area would accommodate less growth in office employment, but citywide office job growth would likely be comparable to city and regional forecasts.

The Modified TODCO Plan proposes this division of office space as a means of taking advantage of the under-construction Central Subway. The Modified TODCO Plan also seeks to avoid concentrating as much office development in the Plan Area as is proposed under the Plan, and rather, spreading out the total future office development over the next 20 years along the Central Subway corridor, resulting in approximately two-thirds (i.e., 10 million square feet) of total future office development occurring outside the Plan Area. This is intended as a means of minimizing the loss of older, relatively smaller commercial buildings that provide relatively more affordable office-type space for new small businesses, including technology startups, which cannot afford newer space that provides more amenities. Such buildings, according to the Modified TODCO Plan, “are vital to SOMA’s character and the city’s economy.”<sup>7</sup> To preserve such older, mid-size buildings, the

---

<sup>7</sup> TODCO Plan, p. 35.



Modified TODCO Plan proposes a prohibition on lot mergers of parcels smaller than 0.5 acre, unless no existing building with a floor area ratio greater than 1.5 would be demolished. Growth projections for the Modified TODCO Alternative estimate an increase of 12,700 households and approximately 56,700 jobs, reflecting 12 percent fewer households and 11 percent fewer jobs than the Plan.

It is assumed the Modified TODCO Plan would include the same street network changes that are proposed under the Plan.

## Land Use Variant

The Land Use Variant is a variant of the Plan that would not permit residential uses in the WS-SALI and WS-MUO use districts in the area roughly bounded by Bryant, Townsend, Fourth and Sixth Streets. Although this area would be zoned MUO as proposed under the Plan, the prohibition on new housing adopted as part of the Western SoMa Plan would remain in effect. The intention of the Land Use Variant is to minimize potential land use conflicts in this approximately four-block area between new housing and existing and future commercial and entertainment uses. The Land Use Variant would be overlaid upon the Plan, and this alternative would allow for development at the same heights and same locations as under the Plan; only the above-described land use changes would be different within the approximately four-block area covered by the Land Use Variant. All other aspects of the Land Use Variant would be the same as under the Plan, including the street network changes proposed under the Plan.

This alternative would allow 1.8 million square feet less residential development, and 0.59 million square feet more commercial development than the Plan, for a net decrease of 1.2 million square feet development compared to the Plan. Growth projections for the Land Use Variant estimate an increase of 12,900 households and approximately 66,200 jobs, reflecting 10 percent fewer households and four percent more jobs than the Plan.

## Land Use Plan Only Alternative

The Land Use Plan Only Alternative assumes the same policies and *Planning Code* and *General Plan* amendments would be implemented as with the Plan, except that this alternative would exclude implementation of the Plan's proposed street network changes. As such, development assumptions for this alternative would be the same as those for the Plan, including the addition, by 2040 in the Plan Area, of approximately 14,400 households, 25,500 residents and approximately 63,600 jobs. Total floor area developed by 2040 in the Plan Area under this alternative would also be the same as the Plan, at 31.7 million square feet.

## Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives

**Table S-3, Comparison of the Environmental Impacts of the Plan to the Impacts of Alternatives**, presents the impacts of the Plan and summarizes the environmental impacts of the alternatives compared to those of the Plan. Generally speaking, the differences between the alternatives and the Plan are because the alternatives would result in less total development potential than under the Plan (as is the case for Alternatives 1 to 4) or because the alternatives do not include the proposed street network changes (as is the case for Alternatives 1 and 5).

**TABLE S-3 COMPARISON OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PLAN TO THE IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVES**

<b>Impacts</b>	<b>Central SoMa Plan</b>	<b>Alternative 1: No Project Alternative</b>	<b>Alternative 2: Reduced Heights Alternative</b>	<b>Alternative 3: Modified TODCO Plan</b>	<b>Alternative 4: Land Use Variant</b>	<b>Alternative 5: Land Use Plan Only Alternative</b>
<b>Description</b>	The Central SoMa Plan is a comprehensive plan for a 230-acre, 17-city-block area in SoMa. The Plan seeks to encourage and accommodate housing and employment growth within the Plan Area by (1) removing land use restrictions to support a greater mix of uses while also emphasizing office uses in portions of the Plan Area; (2) amending existing height and bulk districts; (3) modifying the system of streets and circulation within and adjacent to the Plan Area to meet the needs and goals of a dense, transit-oriented, mixed-use district; and (4) creating new, and improving existing, open spaces. This Plan would result in an increase of 14,400 households, 63,600 jobs, and 31.7 million total floor area in the Plan Area.	The No Project Alternative is the maintenance of the existing zoning and height and bulk controls in the Plan Area, and no adoption of the Plan. The No Project Alternative would also not include the street network changes or open space improvements proposed under the Plan. This alternative would have approximately 36 percent fewer households, and 57 percent fewer jobs, and 44 percent less total floor area than the Plan.	The Reduced Heights Alternative would have the same land use districts as the Plan, but would permit fewer tall buildings than would be allowable under the Plan. This alternative would include the same street network changes and open spaces improvements that are proposed under the Plan. This alternative would have approximately 14 percent fewer households, 12 percent fewer jobs, and 13 percent less total floor area than the Plan.	As compared to the Plan, the Modified TODCO Plan would have the following differences in use districts within the Plan Area: less new MUO, retain more existing WS-MUO and SALI, and retain all of the existing RED. The Modified TODCO Plan also proposes certain additional PDR/Arts protections compared to the Plan. The Modified TODCO Plan proposes no height limit increases above the existing height limits, except for certain major development sites. This alternative would include the same street network changes proposed under the Plan. This alternative would have approximately 12 percent fewer households, 11 percent fewer jobs, and 11 percent less total floor area than the Plan.	The Land Use Variant would be the same as the Plan, except that it would not permit residential uses in the WS-SALI and WS-MUO use districts in the area roughly bounded by Bryant, Townsend, Fourth, and Sixth Streets. This alternative would include the same street network changes and open spaces improvements that are proposed under the Plan. This alternative would have approximately 10 percent fewer households, 4 percent more jobs, and 3 percent less total floor area than the Plan.	The Land Use Plan Only Alternative would be the same as the Plan, except that it would not include the Plan's proposed street network changes. Otherwise, the land use development assumptions, including for households, jobs, and total floor area, would be the same as the Plan.
<b>Ability to Meet Project Sponsor's Objectives</b>	All	Some	Most	Most	Most	Most

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

TABLE S-3 COMPARISON OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PLAN TO THE IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVES

Impacts	Central SoMa Plan	Alternative 1: No Project Alternative	Alternative 2: Reduced Heights Alternative	Alternative 3: Modified TODCO Plan	Alternative 4: Land Use Variant	Alternative 5: Land Use Plan Only Alternative
<b>A. Land Use</b>						
<b>Physical Division of Community</b>	<b>Impact LU-1:</b> Development under the Plan, and proposed open space improvements and the proposed street network changes would not physically divide an established community. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)
<b>Conflict with Land Use Plans</b>	<b>Impact LU-2:</b> Development under the Plan, including proposed open space improvements and the proposed street network changes, would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. (SUM)  Specifically, the Plan could result in traffic noise along Howard Street (under the two-way option for Howard and Folsom Streets) that exceeds the noise standards in the <i>General Plan's</i> Environmental Protection Element.	Less than proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Less than proposed Plan. (LTS)

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

TABLE S-3 COMPARISON OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PLAN TO THE IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVES

Impacts	Central SoMa Plan	Alternative 1: No Project Alternative	Alternative 2: Reduced Heights Alternative	Alternative 3: Modified TODCO Plan	Alternative 4: Land Use Variant	Alternative 5: Land Use Plan Only Alternative
<b>Cumulative Land Use</b>	<b>Impact C-LU-1:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would contribute considerably to a significant cumulative land use impact. <b>(SUM)</b> Specifically, the Plan, under both the one-way and two-way options for Folsom and Howard Streets, could make a considerable contribution to cumulative traffic noise levels which would exceed the noise standards in the <i>General Plan's</i> Environmental Protection Element.	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)
<b>B. Aesthetics</b>						
<b>Visual Character</b>	<b>Impact AE-1:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the Plan Area or substantially damage scenic resources. <b>(LTS)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

**TABLE S-3 COMPARISON OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PLAN TO THE IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVES**

<b>Impacts</b>	<b>Central SoMa Plan</b>	<b>Alternative 1: No Project Alternative</b>	<b>Alternative 2: Reduced Heights Alternative</b>	<b>Alternative 3: Modified TODCO Plan</b>	<b>Alternative 4: Land Use Variant</b>	<b>Alternative 5: Land Use Plan Only Alternative</b>
<b>Views/Scenic Vista</b>	<b>Impact AE-2:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would alter the public views of the Plan Area from short-, mid-, and long-range vantage points and alter views into the surrounding neighborhoods from within the Plan Area, but would not adversely affect public views or have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas. <b>(LTS)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)
<b>Light and Glare</b>	<b>Impact AE-3:</b> Development under the plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would not create a new source of substantial light or glare in the Plan Area that would adversely affect day or nighttime views or substantially impact other people or properties. <b>(LTS)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)
<b>Cumulative Aesthetics</b>	<b>Impact C-AE-1:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed street network changes and open space improvements, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would alter the visual character and public views of and through SoMa, but would not adversely affect visual character, scenic vistas, or scenic resources or substantially increase light and glare. <b>(LTS)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

**TABLE S-3 COMPARISON OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PLAN TO THE IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVES**

<b>Impacts</b>	<b>Central SoMa Plan</b>	<b>Alternative 1: No Project Alternative</b>	<b>Alternative 2: Reduced Heights Alternative</b>	<b>Alternative 3: Modified TODCO Plan</b>	<b>Alternative 4: Land Use Variant</b>	<b>Alternative 5: Land Use Plan Only Alternative</b>
<b>C. Cultural Resources</b>						
<b>Historical Resources</b>	<b>Impact CP-1:</b> Development under the Plan, would result in the demolition or substantial alteration of individually identified historic architectural resources and/or contributors to historic district or conservation district located in the Plan Area, including as-yet unidentified resources, a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. <b>(SUM)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (SUM)
<b>Historical Resources</b>	<b>Impact CP-2:</b> Neither the proposed open space improvements nor street network changes would adversely affect historic architectural resources in a way that would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. <b>(LTS)</b>	No impact. (NI)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)
<b>Historical Resources</b>	<b>Impact CP-3:</b> Construction activities in the Plan Area would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 through indirect construction damage to historic architectural resources. <b>(LTSM)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTSM)

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

**TABLE S-3 COMPARISON OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PLAN TO THE IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVES**

<b>Impacts</b>	<b>Central SoMa Plan</b>	<b>Alternative 1: No Project Alternative</b>	<b>Alternative 2: Reduced Heights Alternative</b>	<b>Alternative 3: Modified TODCO Plan</b>	<b>Alternative 4: Land Use Variant</b>	<b>Alternative 5: Land Use Plan Only Alternative</b>
<b>Archeological Resources</b>	<b>Impact CP-4:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. <b>(LTSM)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTSM)
<b>Tribal Cultural Resources</b>	<b>Impact CP-5:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21084.3. <b>(LTSM)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTSM)
<b>Paleontological Resources</b>	<b>Impact CP-6:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature. <b>(LTS)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)
<b>Human Remains</b>	<b>Impact CP-7:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would not disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. <b>(LTS)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

**TABLE S-3 COMPARISON OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PLAN TO THE IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVES**

<b>Impacts</b>	<b>Central SoMa Plan</b>	<b>Alternative 1: No Project Alternative</b>	<b>Alternative 2: Reduced Heights Alternative</b>	<b>Alternative 3: Modified TODCO Plan</b>	<b>Alternative 4: Land Use Variant</b>	<b>Alternative 5: Land Use Plan Only Alternative</b>
<b>Cumulative Historical Resources</b>	<b>Impact C-CP-1:</b> Development under the Plan, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, could result in demolition and/or alteration of historical resources, thereby contributing considerably to significant cumulative historical resources impacts. <b>(SUM)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (SUM)
<b>Cumulative Historical Resources</b>	<b>Impact C-CP-2:</b> The proposed open space improvements and the proposed street network changes within the Plan Area, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to significant cumulative historical resources impacts. <b>(LTS)</b>	No impact. (NI)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)
<b>Cumulative Archeological Resources</b>	<b>Impact C-CP-3:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 or a tribal cultural resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21084.3. <b>(LTSM)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTSM)

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation



TABLE S-3 COMPARISON OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PLAN TO THE IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVES

Impacts	Central SoMa Plan	Alternative 1: No Project Alternative	Alternative 2: Reduced Heights Alternative	Alternative 3: Modified TODCO Plan	Alternative 4: Land Use Variant	Alternative 5: Land Use Plan Only Alternative
<b>Cumulative Paleontological Resources and Human Remains</b>	<b>Impact C-CP-4:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature, and would not disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. <b>(LTS)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)
<b>D. Transportation and Circulation</b>						
<b>VMT</b>	<b>Impact TR-1:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would not cause substantial additional VMT or substantially increase automobile travel. <b>(LTS)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Greater than the proposed Plan. (LTS)
<b>Traffic Hazards</b>	<b>Impact TR-2:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would not result in traffic hazards. <b>(LTS)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Greater than the proposed Plan. (LTS)

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

**TABLE S-3 COMPARISON OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PLAN TO THE IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVES**

<b>Impacts</b>	<b>Central SoMa Plan</b>	<b>Alternative 1: No Project Alternative</b>	<b>Alternative 2: Reduced Heights Alternative</b>	<b>Alternative 3: Modified TODCO Plan</b>	<b>Alternative 4: Land Use Variant</b>	<b>Alternative 5: Land Use Plan Only Alternative</b>
<b>Transit</b>	<b>Impact TR-3:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would result in a substantial increase in transit demand that would not be accommodated by local transit capacity, and would cause a substantial increase in delays resulting in adverse impacts on local and regional transit routes. <b>(SUM)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan, but no mechanism for mitigation. (SU)	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Similar to the proposed Plan; significant delay would occur in both the AM and PM peaks instead of only PM, fewer lines significantly impacted. (SUM)
<b>Pedestrians</b>	<b>Impact TR-4:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would not result in pedestrian safety hazards nor result in a substantial overcrowding on sidewalks or at corner locations, but would result in overcrowding at crosswalks. <b>(SUM)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan for pedestrian crowding; greater than the proposed Plan for pedestrian capacity impacts. (SU)	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Less than the proposed Plan for pedestrian crowding. (SUM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Similar to the proposed Plan for pedestrian volumes; greater than the proposed Plan for pedestrian capacity impacts. (SUM)
<b>Bicyclists</b>	<b>Impact TR-5:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would not result in potentially hazardous conditions for bicyclists, or otherwise substantially interfere with bicycle accessibility. <b>(LTS)</b>	Greater than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Greater than the proposed Plan. (LTS)

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

TABLE S-3 COMPARISON OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PLAN TO THE IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVES

Impacts	Central SoMa Plan	Alternative 1: No Project Alternative	Alternative 2: Reduced Heights Alternative	Alternative 3: Modified TODCO Plan	Alternative 4: Land Use Variant	Alternative 5: Land Use Plan Only Alternative
<b>Loading</b>	<b>Impact TR-6:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would result in a reduction in on-street commercial loading supply such that the loading demand during the peak hour of loading activities would not be accommodated within on-street loading supply, would impact existing passenger loading/unloading zones, and may create hazardous conditions or significant delay that may affect transit, other vehicles, bicycles, or pedestrians. <b>(SUM)</b>	Less loading demand than the proposed Plan; no reduction in on-street parking. (LTS)	Less loading demand than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Loading demand similar to the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Same loading demand as the proposed Plan; no reduction in on-street loading supply. (LTSM)
<b>Parking</b>	<b>Impact TR-7:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would not result in a substantial parking deficit that would create hazardous conditions or significant delays affecting transit, bicycles, or pedestrians, and where particular characteristics of the Plan demonstrably render use of other modes infeasible. <b>(LTS)</b>	Less parking demand than the proposed Plan; no reduction in on-street parking supply. (LTS)	Less parking demand than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Less parking demand than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Same parking demand as the proposed Plan; no reduction in on-street parking supply. (LTS)
<b>Emergency Vehicle Access</b>	<b>Impact TR-8:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, could result in significant impacts on emergency vehicle access. <b>(LTSM)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

**TABLE S-3 COMPARISON OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PLAN TO THE IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVES**

<b>Impacts</b>	<b>Central SoMa Plan</b>	<b>Alternative 1: No Project Alternative</b>	<b>Alternative 2: Reduced Heights Alternative</b>	<b>Alternative 3: Modified TODCO Plan</b>	<b>Alternative 4: Land Use Variant</b>	<b>Alternative 5: Land Use Plan Only Alternative</b>
<b>Construction</b>	<b>Impact TR-9:</b> Construction activities associated with development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would result in substantial interference with pedestrian, bicycle, or vehicle circulation and accessibility to adjoining areas, and would not result in potentially hazardous conditions. <b>(SUM)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)
<b>Cumulative VMT</b>	<b>Impact C-TR-1:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would not result in significant impacts related to VMT. <b>(LTS)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Greater than the proposed Plan. (LTS)
<b>Cumulative Traffic Hazards</b>	<b>Impact C-TR-2:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would not result in significant impacts related to traffic hazards. <b>(LTS)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Greater than the proposed Plan. (LTS)

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

**TABLE S-3 COMPARISON OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PLAN TO THE IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVES**

<b>Impacts</b>	<b>Central SoMa Plan</b>	<b>Alternative 1: No Project Alternative</b>	<b>Alternative 2: Reduced Heights Alternative</b>	<b>Alternative 3: Modified TODCO Plan</b>	<b>Alternative 4: Land Use Variant</b>	<b>Alternative 5: Land Use Plan Only Alternative</b>
<b>Cumulative Transit</b>	<b>Impact C-TR-3:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would contribute considerably to significant cumulative transit impacts on local and regional transit providers. <b>(SUM)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan, but no mechanism for mitigation. (SU)	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (SUM)
<b>Cumulative Pedestrians</b>	<b>Impact C-TR-4:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would contribute considerably to significant cumulative pedestrian impacts. <b>(SUM)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan for pedestrian crowding; greater than the proposed Plan for pedestrian capacity impacts. (SU)	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Similar to the proposed Plan for pedestrian volumes; greater than proposed Plan for pedestrian capacity impacts. (SUM)
<b>Cumulative Bicyclists</b>	<b>Impact C-TR-5:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would not result in cumulative bicycle impacts. <b>(LTS)</b>	Greater than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Greater than the proposed Plan. (LTS)

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

**TABLE S-3 COMPARISON OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PLAN TO THE IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVES**

<b>Impacts</b>	<b>Central SoMa Plan</b>	<b>Alternative 1: No Project Alternative</b>	<b>Alternative 2: Reduced Heights Alternative</b>	<b>Alternative 3: Modified TODCO Plan</b>	<b>Alternative 4: Land Use Variant</b>	<b>Alternative 5: Land Use Plan Only Alternative</b>
<b>Cumulative Loading</b>	<b>Impact C-TR-6:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would contribute considerably to significant cumulative loading impacts. <b>(SUM)</b>	Less loading demand than the proposed Plan; no reduction in on-street loading supply. (LTS)	Less loading demand than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Less loading demand than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Same loading demand as the proposed Plan; no reduction in on-street loading supply. (LTS)
<b>Cumulative Parking</b>	<b>Impact C-TR-7:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would not result in cumulative parking impacts. <b>(LTS)</b>	Less parking demand than the proposed Plan, no reduction in on-street parking supply. (LTS)	Less parking demand than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Less parking demand than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Same parking demand as the proposed Plan, no reduction in on-street parking supply. (LTS)
<b>Cumulative Emergency Vehicle Access</b>	<b>Impact C-TR-8:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, could contribute considerably to significant cumulative emergency vehicle access impacts. <b>(LTSM)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

TABLE S-3 COMPARISON OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PLAN TO THE IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVES

Impacts	Central SoMa Plan	Alternative 1: No Project Alternative	Alternative 2: Reduced Heights Alternative	Alternative 3: Modified TODCO Plan	Alternative 4: Land Use Variant	Alternative 5: Land Use Plan Only Alternative
<b>Cumulative Construction</b>	<b>Impact C-TR-9:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would not result in significant cumulative construction-related transportation impacts. (LTS)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)
<b>E. Noise and Vibration</b>						
<b>Traffic Noise</b>	<b>Impact NO-1:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed street network changes, would generate noise that would result in exposure of persons to noise in excess of standards in the <i>San Francisco General Plan</i> or Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the <i>Police Code</i> ), and would result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise above existing levels. (SUM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)
<b>Construction Noise</b>	<b>Impact NO-2:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed street network changes, would result in construction activities in the Plan Area that could expose persons to substantial temporary or periodic increases in noise levels substantially in excess of ambient levels. (SUM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (SUM)

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

TABLE S-3 COMPARISON OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PLAN TO THE IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVES

Impacts	Central SoMa Plan	Alternative 1: No Project Alternative	Alternative 2: Reduced Heights Alternative	Alternative 3: Modified TODCO Plan	Alternative 4: Land Use Variant	Alternative 5: Land Use Plan Only Alternative
<b>Construction Vibration</b>	<b>Impact NO-3:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed street network changes, would result in construction activities that could expose persons to temporary increases in vibration substantially in excess of ambient levels. <b>(LTSM)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTSM)
<b>Cumulative Traffic Noise</b>	<b>Impact C-NO-1:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed street network changes and open space improvements, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would result in cumulative noise impacts. <b>(SUM)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Less the proposed Plan. (LTS)
<b>F. Air Quality</b>						
<b>Conflict with Clean Air Plan</b>	<b>Impact AQ-1:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and proposed street network changes, would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the <i>2010 Clean Air Plan</i> . <b>(LTS)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)
<b>Criteria Air Pollutants (from Plan)</b>	<b>Impact AQ-2:</b> The Plan would not violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard. <b>(LTS)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation



TABLE S-3 COMPARISON OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PLAN TO THE IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVES

Impacts	Central SoMa Plan	Alternative 1: No Project Alternative	Alternative 2: Reduced Heights Alternative	Alternative 3: Modified TODCO Plan	Alternative 4: Land Use Variant	Alternative 5: Land Use Plan Only Alternative
<b>Criteria Air Pollutants (Operational from Subsequent Development Projects)</b>	<b>Impact AQ-3:</b> Operation of subsequent individual development projects in the Plan Area and street network changes could violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, and/or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard. <b>(SUM)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan.(SUM)	Less than the proposed Plan.(SUM)	Less than the proposed Plan.(SUM)	Less than the proposed Plan.(SUM)	Similar to the proposed Plan.(SUM)
<b>Criteria Air Pollutants (Construction)</b>	<b>Impact AQ-4:</b> Development under the Plan, but not the proposed street network changes and open space improvements, would result in construction activities that could violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard. <b>(LTSM)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTSM)
<b>PM<sub>2.5</sub> and TACs (Operational)</b>	<b>Impact AQ-5:</b> Development under the Plan, including proposed street network changes, would result in operational emissions of fine particulate matter (PM <sub>2.5</sub> ) and toxic air contaminants that would result in exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. <b>(SUM)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (SUM)

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

**TABLE S-3 COMPARISON OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PLAN TO THE IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVES**

<b>Impacts</b>	<b>Central SoMa Plan</b>	<b>Alternative 1: No Project Alternative</b>	<b>Alternative 2: Reduced Heights Alternative</b>	<b>Alternative 3: Modified TODCO Plan</b>	<b>Alternative 4: Land Use Variant</b>	<b>Alternative 5: Land Use Plan Only Alternative</b>
<b>PM<sub>2.5</sub> and TACs (Construction)</b>	<b>Impact AQ-6:</b> Development under the Plan, including proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would result in construction activities that would expose sensitive receptors to substantial levels of fine particulate matter (PM <sub>2.5</sub> ) and toxic air contaminants generated by construction equipment. <b>(LTSM)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTSM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTSM)
<b>Odors</b>	<b>Impact AQ-7:</b> Implementation of the Plan would not expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. <b>(LTS)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)
<b>Cumulative Criteria Air Pollutants</b>	<b>Impact C-AQ-1:</b> Development under the Plan, including proposed street network changes, but not open space improvements, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, under cumulative 2040 conditions, would contribute considerably to criteria air pollutant impacts. <b>(SUM)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Similar to the proposed Plan.(SUM)

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

TABLE S-3 COMPARISON OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PLAN TO THE IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVES

Impacts	Central SoMa Plan	Alternative 1: No Project Alternative	Alternative 2: Reduced Heights Alternative	Alternative 3: Modified TODCO Plan	Alternative 4: Land Use Variant	Alternative 5: Land Use Plan Only Alternative
<b>Cumulative PM<sub>2.5</sub> and TACs</b>	<b>Impact C-AQ-2:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed street network changes, but not open space improvements, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would result in exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial levels of fine particulate matter (PM <sub>2.5</sub> ) and toxic air contaminants under 2040 cumulative conditions. <b>(SUM)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Similar to the proposed Plan.(SUM)
<b>G. Wind</b>						
<b>Wind</b>	<b>Impact WI-1:</b> Subsequent future development anticipated under the Plan could alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas. <b>(SUM)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Less than the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (SUM)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (SUM)
<b>Cumulative Wind</b>	<b>Impact C-WI-1:</b> Development under the Plan, combined with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, could result in cumulative significant impacts related to wind. <b>(LTS)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)
<b>H. Shadow</b>						
<b>Shadow</b>	<b>Impact SH-1:</b> Development under the Plan would not create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects existing outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas. <b>(LTS)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to or less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

**TABLE S-3 COMPARISON OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PLAN TO THE IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVES**

<b>Impacts</b>	<b>Central SoMa Plan</b>	<b>Alternative 1: No Project Alternative</b>	<b>Alternative 2: Reduced Heights Alternative</b>	<b>Alternative 3: Modified TODCO Plan</b>	<b>Alternative 4: Land Use Variant</b>	<b>Alternative 5: Land Use Plan Only Alternative</b>
<b>Cumulative Shadow</b>	<b>Impact C-SH-1:</b> Implementation of the Plan, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact on shadow conditions. <b>(LTS)</b>	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Less than the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar to the proposed Plan. (LTS)
<b>I. Hydrology and Water Quality</b>						
<b>Flooding</b>	<b>Impact HY-6:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, would not exacerbate future flood hazards in a manner that could expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death. <b>(LTS)</b>	Similar the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar the proposed Plan. (LTS)
<b>Cumulative Wastewater</b>	<b>Impact C-HY-2:</b> Operation of individual development projects through implementation of the Plan, in combination with past, present, and foreseeable future development in San Francisco, would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the SEP; violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements; otherwise substantially degrade water quality; or result in an increase in the frequency of combined sewer discharges from the City's combined sewer system. <b>(LTS)</b>	Similar the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar the proposed Plan. (LTS)

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

**TABLE S-3 COMPARISON OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PLAN TO THE IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVES**

<b>Impacts</b>	<b>Central SoMa Plan</b>	<b>Alternative 1: No Project Alternative</b>	<b>Alternative 2: Reduced Heights Alternative</b>	<b>Alternative 3: Modified TODCO Plan</b>	<b>Alternative 4: Land Use Variant</b>	<b>Alternative 5: Land Use Plan Only Alternative</b>
<b>Cumulative Flooding</b>	<b>Impact C-HY-3:</b> Development under the Plan, including the proposed open space improvements and street network changes, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not exacerbate future flood hazards that could expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death. (LTS)	Similar the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar the proposed Plan. (LTS)	Similar the proposed Plan. (LTS)

## LEGEND:

NI = No impact

LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

LTSM = Less than significant or negligible impact; after mitigation

SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation

SUM = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

## Environmentally Superior Alternative

The No Project Alternative would result in less new construction and new development than the Plan or the other alternatives. Consequently, the No Project Alternative's impacts related to construction and operation of new developments would also be less than the Plan or the other alternatives. As indicated in Table S-3, the No Project Alternative would avoid eight of the significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the Plan. This alternative would, however, introduce a new significant and unavoidable impact to pedestrian capacity that would not occur under the Plan, and the No Project Alternative would not meet most of the basic project objectives. Furthermore, per CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2), if the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

Of the remaining four alternatives (Reduced Heights Alternative, Modified TODCO Plan, Land Use Variant, and Land Use Plan Only Alternative), the Land Use Plan Only Alternative is considered the environmentally superior alternative. The Land Use Plan Only Alternative would result in a similar amount of new construction and new development compared to the Plan. By not implementing the street network improvements proposed by the Plan, however, this alternative would avoid eight associated significant secondary effects related to traffic noise, on-street loading, and emergency vehicle access. The absence of the Plan's street network improvements under this alternative would result in incrementally higher VMT than the Plan, and incrementally greater potential for traffic/bicycle/pedestrian conflicts compared to the Plan. Such effects would, however, be less than significant, as under the Plan. The Land Use Plan Only Alternative would result in other significant effects related to transit and pedestrians. These significant effects would require implementation of mitigation measures M-ALT-TR-1, Upgrade Transit-Only Lanes on Third Street, and M-ALT-TR-2, Upgrade Additional Central SoMa Area Crosswalks.

As with the No Project Alternative, the Reduced Heights Alternative, the Modified TODCO Plan, and the Land Use Variant all would, in varying degrees, result in lower development intensity than the Plan. As such, many of the construction and operational effects of these alternatives would be less than the Plan. However, the Reduced Heights Alternative, the Modified TODCO Plan, and the Land Use Variant would not avoid any of the significant and unavoidable environmental effects associated with the Plan. With all of these lower development intensity alternatives, to the extent that the demand for additional developed space would be met elsewhere in the Bay Area, employees in and residents of such development could potentially generate substantially greater impacts on transportation systems (including vehicle miles traveled), air quality, and greenhouse gases than would be the case for development in the more compact and better-served-by-transit Plan Area. This would be particularly likely for development in more outlying parts of the region where fewer services and less transit access is provided. Therefore, while it would be speculative to attempt to quantify or specify the location where such development would occur and the subsequent impacts thereof, it is acknowledged that these lower intensity alternatives would incrementally reduce local impacts in the Plan Area and in San Francisco, while potentially increasing regional emissions of criteria air pollutants and greenhouse gases, as well as regional traffic congestion. They could also incrementally increase impacts related to "greenfield" development on previously undeveloped locations in the Bay Area and, possibly, beyond.

## Areas of Controversy and Issues to Be Resolved

The Planning Department prepared and distributed a notice announcing the availability of a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR and Notice of Public Scoping Meeting for the Plan on April 24, 2013.<sup>8</sup> The notices were mailed to adjacent cities and counties, other public agencies and interested parties. A public scoping meeting was held at the Mendelsohn House, 737 Folsom Street (within the Plan Area) on May 15, 2013, at which oral comments from the public addressing the scope of the environmental analysis were received and transcribed. At the public meeting, four people commented. Written comments regarding the scope of the EIR were accepted for a standard 30-day period from April 24, 2013, until May 24, 2013. Seventeen total comment letters were received, of which two arrived after the close of the comment period.

Additionally, the Planning Department received comments on the Initial Study, published February 12, 2014.

The following is a summary of the issues raised by the public and governmental agencies in response to the NOP and Initial Study prepared for the Plan in 2014. The general topic categories of the comments are shown in **bolded text** and are followed by clarifying remarks or general statements in parenthesis, as well as a reference to where the comment is addressed in this EIR:

- **Environmental Review Process** (how will subsequent development projects in the Plan Area undergo CEQA review?) (refer to Chapter I, Introduction, Subsequent Development Projects);
- **Project Objectives/Goals** (specific details should be provided and/or certain revisions to Plan objectives are recommended; one commenter suggests that the Plan accommodate more residential growth, rather than office development in Plan zoning options) (refer to Chapter II, Project Description);
- **Project Description** (specific street improvements including sidewalk widening, additional signals and signage are suggested; the Plan should include policies for local hiring and training goals; the Planning Department should consider an expansion of the Youth and Family Zone Special Use District; additional comments requested increasing height or floor plate limits at specific properties) (refer to Chapter II, Project Description);
- **Land Use and Planning** (concern that the Plan could in some way isolate the neighborhoods to the south) (refer to Section IV.A, Land Use and Land Use Planning);
- **Aesthetics** (concerns associated with the Plan's potential to impact neighborhood character and to result in visually unappealing elements; the EIR should analyze the Plan's potential to have an adverse effect on existing views) (refer to Section IV.B, Aesthetics);
- **Population and Housing** (potential displacement impacts to residences and businesses, impacts on affordable housing needs and obligations, and impacts on local employment opportunities; the EIR should evaluate whether the Plan could result in loss of land and jobs from rezoning areas that currently allow light industrial and manufacturing land uses) (refer to Appendix B, Initial Study, Population and Housing; Chapter II, Project Description; and Section IV.A, Land Use and Land Use Planning);

---

<sup>8</sup> The Plan was known as the Central Corridor Plan at the time of the scoping meeting.

- **Cultural Resources** (concerns related to the Plan's proposed mid-block pedestrian connections and whether constructing these could damage or demolish historical resources) (refer to Section IV.C, Cultural and Paleontological Resources);
- **Transportation and Traffic** (large Moscone Center events should be included in the analysis; impacts to cyclists and pedestrians should be evaluated, specifically impacts to the Yerba Buena Neighborhood and pedestrians with limited mobility; the EIR should evaluate impacts to local and State transportation facilities, public transit facilities, and reasonably foreseeable projects including those of Caltrain and Golden Gate Transit, including proposed bus route changes) (refer to Section IV.D, Transportation and Circulation);
- **Greenhouse Gases** (concerns about potential for the Plan to increase the City's carbon footprint) (this issue was addressed in the Initial Study discussion of Greenhouse Gas Emissions, which concluded that the Plan would not have a significant effect of this kind; see Appendix B);
- **Wind and Shadow** (the potential for the Plan to result in increased shadow and wind impacts; Plan-induced development could add shadow to parks under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department) (refer to Section IV.G, Wind, and Section IV.H, Shadow);
- **Recreation** (concern regarding direct and indirect impacts to parks and recreation facilities within and near the Plan Area, such as South Park, Yerba Buena Gardens, Gene Friend Recreation Center and Victoria Manalo Draves Park; additional demand will be placed on recreational facilities due to population growth) (This issue was considered in the Initial Study discussion of Recreation and Public Space, which concluded that the Plan would not have a significant effect of this kind; see Appendix B);
- **Public Services** (concern regarding the potential for additional demands on public services due to population growth resulting from the Plan; cumulative impacts to public facilities and conveniences, such as restrooms) (This issue was considered in the Initial Study discussion of, Public Services, which concluded that the Plan would not have a significant effect of this kind; see Appendix B);
- **Geology and Soils** (the Plan should acknowledge the area's soils which are largely fill and subject to seismic risk in conjunction with its proposed land uses and changes to the area's urban form) (this issue was considered in the Initial Study discussion of Geology, Soils, and Seismicity, which concluded that the Plan would not have a significant effect of this kind; see Appendix B);
- **Hydrology** (concern that the Plan Area would be subject to sea level rise) (refer to Section IV.I, Hydrology and Water Quality);
- **Cumulative Impacts** (the EIR analysis should include construction and operations timelines for major projects including the Central Subway) (refer to the cumulative analyses provided in Appendix B, Initial Study, and Sections IV.A through IV.I of the EIR); and
- **Alternatives** ("mid-range" build-out zoning alternatives are suggested) (refer to Chapter VI, Alternatives).