

Appendix B
**Impacts Evaluated in
Addendum 6**



APPENDIX B IMPACTS EVALUATED IN ADDENDUM 6			
<i>Impact(s)</i>	<i>Impact Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Impact Not Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Reason Further Analysis Is Not Required¹</i>
SECTION II.B.1 (LAND USE AND PLANS)			
Impact LU-1 Implementation of the Project would not physically divide an established community.	X		
Impact LU-2 Implementation of the Project would not conflict with land use plans, policies, or regulations adopted to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect.	X		
Impact LU-3 Implementation of the Project would not have a substantial adverse impact on the existing character of the vicinity.	X		
SECTION II.B.2 (POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT)			
Impact PH-1 Construction of the Project would not induce substantial direct population growth.	X		
Impact PH-2 Operation of the Project would not induce substantial direct or indirect population growth.	X		
Impact PH-2a Operation of Candlestick Point would not induce substantial direct or indirect population growth.		X	See Note (4). Final EIR pp. III.C-14– III.C-17.
Impact PH-2b Operation of HPS Phase II would not induce substantial direct or indirect population growth.		X	See Notes (1), (2), (4). Final EIR pp. III.C-18– III.C-20.
Impact PH-3 The Project would not displace existing housing units or residents, necessitating the construction of new units elsewhere.		X	See Notes (1) and (6). Final EIR pp. III.C-21– III.C-22.
Impact PH-3a Implementation of the Project would not displace existing housing units and residents at Candlestick Point, necessitating the construction of new units elsewhere.		X	See Notes (1) and (6). Final EIR p. III.C-21.
Impact PH-3b Implementation of the Project would not displace existing housing units or residents at HPS Phase II, necessitating the construction of new units elsewhere.		X	See Notes (1) and (6). Final EIR p. III.C-21.
SECTION II.B.3 (TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION)			
Impact TR-1 Construction of the Project would result in transportation impacts in the Project vicinity due to construction vehicle traffic and roadway construction and would contribute to cumulative construction impacts in the Project vicinity.	X		

¹ Notes: (1) The proposed Project modifications would have no effect on the impact because the modifications do not alter the activity that causes the impact. (2) The proposed Project modifications would have no effect on the impact because the impact concerns an aspect of the project that is not affected by the proposed modifications. (3) The proposed Project modifications would have no effect on the impact because the impact relates to an element of the 2010 Project no longer proposed. (4) The specific impact of proposed Project modifications is addressed in the analysis of a combined CP/HPS2 impact statement. (5) The proposed Project modifications would not change the combined CP/HPS2 impact because the impact is localized at CP or HPS2. (6) The Final EIR found the Project would have no effect on the impact and the proposed Project modifications would not change this conclusion.

APPENDIX B IMPACTS EVALUATED IN ADDENDUM 6

<i>Impact(s)</i>	<i>Impact Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Impact Not Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Reason Further Analysis Is Not Required¹</i>
Impact TR-2 Implementation of the Project would cause an increase in traffic that would be substantial relative to the existing and proposed capacity of the street system, even with implementation of a Travel Demand Management Plan.	X		
Impact TR-3 Implementation of the Project would contribute traffic to significant cumulative impacts at intersections in the Project vicinity.	X		
Impact TR-4 At the intersection of Tunnel/Blanken, implementation of the Project would result in significant Project AM peak hour traffic impacts, and would contribute to cumulative PM peak hour traffic impacts.	X		
Impact TR-5 Implementation of the Project would contribute traffic at some study area intersections that would operate at LOS E or LOS F under 2030 No Project conditions.	X		
Impact TR-6 Implementation of the Project could contribute traffic at the intersections of Geneva/US-101 Southbound Ramps and Harney/US-101 Northbound Ramps, which would operate at LOS F under 2030 No Project conditions.	X		
Impact TR-7 Implementation of the Project could contribute traffic to the intersections of Amador/Cargo/Illinois, which would operate at LOS E under 2030 No Project.	X		
Impact TR-8 Implementation of the Project could contribute traffic to the intersections of Bayshore/Geneva, which would operate at LOS F under 2030 No Project.	X		
Impact TR-9 Implementation of the Project would have less-than-significant Project and cumulative impacts at some study area intersections that would operate at LOS E or LOS F under 2030 No Project conditions.	X		
Impact TR-10 Implementation of the Project would result in significant Project traffic spillover impacts and contribute to cumulative traffic spillover impacts.	X		
Impact TR-11 Implementation of the Project would contribute to significant cumulative traffic impacts at four freeway segments.	X		
Impact TR-12 Implementation of the Project would result in significant impacts at four freeway on-ramp locations.	X		
Impact TR-13 Implementation of the Project would contribute to significant cumulative traffic impacts at 12 freeway ramp locations.	X		
Impact TR-14 Implementation of the Project could result in significant impacts related to freeway diverge queue storage at the Harney/US-101 Northbound Off-ramp.	X		
Impact TR-15 Implementation of the Project could contribute to significant cumulative traffic impacts related to freeway diverge queue storage at some off-ramp locations (US-101 Northbound off-ramp to Harney Way, and US-101 Southbound Off-ramp to Harney Way/Geneva Avenue).	X		
Impact TR-16 Implementation of the Project would increase traffic volumes and would not make a considerable contribution to cumulative traffic volumes on Harney Way.	X		
Impact TR-17 Implementation of the Project would not exceed available transit capacity, because the Project and the Project's contribution to cumulative demand would be accommodated within the existing transit service, proposed TEP service, plus the service proposed as part of the Project.	X		
Impact TR-18 With full implementation of the Project with proposed transit improvements, the Project demand and the Project's contribution to cumulative demand would not exceed the proposed transit system's capacity at the study area cordons.	X		

APPENDIX B IMPACTS EVALUATED IN ADDENDUM 6			
<i>Impact(s)</i>	<i>Impact Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Impact Not Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Reason Further Analysis Is Not Required¹</i>
Impact TR-19 Implementation of the Project would add transit trips and the Project's contribution to cumulative transit trips to the Downtown Screenlines would not increase demands in excess of available capacity.	X		
Impact TR-20 Implementation of the Project would add transit trips and the Project's contribution to cumulative transit trips would not contribute significantly to Regional Screenlines conditions where overall ridership is projected to exceed available capacity.	X		
Impact TR-21 Implementation of the Project could increase congestion and contribute to cumulative conditions at intersections along San Bruno Avenue, which would increase travel times and impact operations of the 9-San Bruno.	X		
Impact TR-22 Implementation of the Project would contribute traffic to cumulative conditions at intersections along Palou Avenue, which would increase travel times and impact operations of the 23-Monterey, 24-Divisadero, and the 44-O'Shaughnessy.	X		
Impact TR-23 Implementation of the Project would increase congestion at intersections along Gilman Avenue and Paul Avenue, which would increase travel times and would impact operations of the 29-Sunset.	X		
Impact TR-24 Implementation of the Project would increase congestion at intersections along Evans Avenue, which would increase travel times and impact operations of the 48-Quintara-24 th Street.	X		
Impact TR-25 Implementation of the Project would increase congestion at intersections in the study area, and make a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts that would increase travel times and impact operations of the 54-Felton.	X		
Impact TR-26 Implementation of the Project would increase congestion at intersections along Third Street, and make a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts that would increase travel times and impact operations of the T-Third.	X		
Impact TR-27 Implementation of the Project could increase congestion at the intersection of Geneva Avenue and Bayshore Boulevard. This would increase travel times and impact operations of the 28L-19 th Avenue/Geneva Limited.	X		
Impact TR-28 Implementation of the Project would increase congestion on US-101 mainline and ramps, which would increase travel times and impact operations of the 9X, 9AX, 9BX-Bayshore Expresses, and 14X-Mission Express. The Project would also contribute to cumulative impacts on these transit routes on US-101.	X		
Impact TR-29 Implementation of the Project would not contribute to cumulative impacts on the 14X-Mission Express transit route when on I-280.	X		
Impact TR-30 Implementation of the Project would increase congestion and contribute to cumulative congestion on US-101 and on Bayshore Boulevard, which would increase travel times and adversely affect operations of SamTrans bus lines on these facilities. No feasible mitigation has been identified.	X		
Impact TR-31 During implementation of the Project, bicycle facilities would be expanded to serve additional users. This would be a beneficial impact of the Project.	X		
Impact TR-32 Implementation of the Project's proposed transit preferential treatments and significant increases in traffic volumes on Palou Avenue could result in impacts on bicycle travel on Bicycle Routes #70 and #170 between Griffith Street and Third Street.	X		
Impact TR-33 During implementation of the Project, pedestrian facilities would be expanded to serve additional users. This would be a beneficial impact of the Project.	X		

APPENDIX B IMPACTS EVALUATED IN ADDENDUM 6			
<i>Impact(s)</i>	<i>Impact Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Impact Not Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Reason Further Analysis Is Not Required¹</i>
Impact TR-34 Implementation of the Project would result in traffic volumes on area roadways that would not substantially affect pedestrian circulation and safety in the Project vicinity.	X		
Impact TR-35 Implementation of the Project would not result in significant impacts associated with a lack of an adequate supply of parking that could not be accommodated within alternative modes.	X		
Impact TR-36 Implementation of the Project roadway improvements would displace on-street parking spaces, and the existing demand could be accommodated in the nearby vicinity.	X		
Impact TR-37 Implementation of the Project would not result in significant impacts associated with a lack of adequate supply of loading spaces.	X		
Impact TR-38 For as many as 12 times a year, 49ers games at the proposed stadium would result in significant impacts on study area roadways and intersections.		X	See Note (3). Final EIR pp. III.D-125– III.D-131.
Impact TR-39 Implementation of the Project with existing game day service and Project transit improvements would not be adequate to accommodate projected transit demand.		X	See Note (3). Final EIR pp. III.D-131– III.D-133.
Impact TR-40 For as many of 12 times per year during game days, bicycle access in the vicinity of the proposed stadium would be constrained, however, accommodations for bicycle access and circulation would be provided.		X	See Note (3). Final EIR pp. III.D-133– III.D-134.
Impact TR-41 For as many of 12 times per year during game days, pedestrian access in the vicinity of the proposed stadium would be constrained, however, accommodations for pedestrian access and circulation would be provided.		X	See Note (3). Final EIR p. III.D-134.
Impact TR-42 For as many as 12 times per year during game days, access to state park facilities for vehicles, bicyclists and pedestrians would be constrained, and heavy traffic congestion could discourage use of the park. However, access for vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians would be maintained.		X	See Note (3). Final EIR pp. III.D-134– III.D-135.
Impact TR-43 For as many of 12 times per year during game days, parking demand associated with sell-out events would exceed the proposed on-site supply, resulting in a parking supply shortfall. The shortfall would be accommodated within other on-street and off-street parking facilities, and some patrons may elect to take transit to the stadium.		X	See Note (3). Final EIR pp. III.D-135– III.D-137.
Impact TR-44 Implementation of the Project would result in stadium game day loading demand that would be accommodated within the proposed on-site supply.		X	See Note (3). Final EIR pp. III.D-137– III.D-138.
Impact TR-45 During game days, accommodation for emergency access would be provided.		X	See Note (3). Final EIR p. III.D-138.
Impact TR-46 Weekday evening secondary events at the stadium would result in increased congestion at intersections, freeway mainline, and freeway ramps already operating at unacceptable LOS under Project conditions without a secondary event, and result in significant impacts at nine additional intersections and one additional freeway off-ramp.		X	See Note (3). Final EIR pp. III.D-138– III.D-141.

APPENDIX B IMPACTS EVALUATED IN ADDENDUM 6			
<i>Impact(s)</i>	<i>Impact Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Impact Not Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Reason Further Analysis Is Not Required¹</i>
Impact TR-47 With implementation of the Project, the existing transit service and Project improvements would not be adequate to accommodate projected transit demand during secondary events with attendance of 37,500 spectators. In addition, transit lines serving the area would experience additional delays due to traffic generated by the secondary event.		X	See Note (3). Final EIR pp. III.D-141–III.D-142.
Impact TR-48 With implementation of the Project, bicycle circulation would not be impeded during secondary events at the stadium.		X	See Note (3). Final EIR p. III.D-142.
Impact TR-49 With implementation of the Project, pedestrian circulation would not be impeded during secondary events at the stadium.		X	See Note (3). Final EIR p. III.D-143.
Impact TR-50 With implementation of the Project, parking demand associated with a secondary event with an attendance of 37,500 spectators would be accommodated within the proposed supply.		X	See Note (3). Final EIR p. III.D-143.
Impact TR-51 With implementation of the Project, weekday evening events at the arena would exacerbate congestion at intersections, freeway mainline, and freeway ramps already operating at unacceptable LOS under Project conditions without an arena event, and result in significant traffic impacts at Harney Way and Jamestown Avenue, which was operating acceptably under Project conditions without an arena event.	X		
Impact TR-52 With implementation of the Project, sell-out weekday evening events at the arena could impact existing and proposed transit service.	X		
Impact TR-53 With implementation of the Project, bicycle circulation would not be impeded during arena events.	X		
Impact TR-54 With implementation of the Project, pedestrian circulation would not be impeded during arena events.	X		
Impact TR-55 With implementation of the Project, arena parking demand would be accommodated on street and within proposed off-street parking facilities.	X		
Impact TR-56 Implementation of the Project would not impact air traffic.	X		
Impact TR-57 Implementation of the Project would not create hazards due to any proposed design features.	X		
Impact TR-58 Implementation of the Project would not result in significant emergency access impacts.	X		
SECTION II.B.4 (AESTHETICS)			
Impact AE-1 Construction activities associated with the Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista or scenic resources.	X		
Impact AE-2 Construction activities associated with the Project would not result in temporary degradation of the visual character or quality of the site.	X		
Impact AE-3 Construction activities associated with the Project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or night views in the area or that would substantially impact other people or properties.	X		
Impact AE-4 Implementation of the Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.	X		

APPENDIX B IMPACTS EVALUATED IN ADDENDUM 6

<i>Impact(s)</i>	<i>Impact Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Impact Not Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Reason Further Analysis Is Not Required¹</i>
Impact AE-5 Implementation of the Project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and other features of the built or natural environment that contribute to a scenic public setting.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR p. III.E-60.
Impact AE-5a Implementation of the Project at Candlestick Point would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and other features of the built or natural environment that contribute to a scenic public setting.	X		
Impact AE-5b Implementation of the Project at HPS Phase II would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and other features of the built or natural environment that contribute to a scenic public setting.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR p. III.E-59. Addendum 5 pp. 139–140.
Impact AE-6 Implementation of the Project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR pp. III.E-69– III.E-70.
Impact AE-6a Implementation of the Project at Candlestick Point would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings.	X		
Impact AE-6b Implementation of the Project at HPS Phase II would not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.E-65– III.E-69. Addendum 5 pp. 140–163.
Impact AE-7 Implementation of the Project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or night views in the area or that would substantially impact other people or properties.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR pp. III.E-76– III.E-77.
Impact AE-7a Implementation of the Project at Candlestick Point would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or night views in the area or that would substantially impact other people or properties.	X		
Impact AE-7b Implementation of the Project at HPS Phase II would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or night views in the area or that would substantially impact other people or properties.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.E-74– III.E-76. Addendum 5 p. 163.

APPENDIX B IMPACTS EVALUATED IN ADDENDUM 6			
<i>Impact(s)</i>	<i>Impact Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Impact Not Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Reason Further Analysis Is Not Required¹</i>
SECTION II.B.5 (SHADOWS)			
Impact SH-1 Implementation of the Project would not result in new structures with the potential to cast shadows on existing or proposed parks and open space in a manner that would have an adverse effect on the use of the open space.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR pp. IV-196–IV-207.
Impact SH-1a Implementation of the Project at Candlestick Point would not result in new structures with the potential to cast shadows on existing or proposed parks and open space in a manner that would have an adverse effect on the use of the open space.	X		
Impact SH-1b Implementation of the Project at HPS Phase II would not result in new structures with the potential to cast shadows on existing or proposed parks and open space in a manner that would have an adverse effect on the use of the open space.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.F-26–III.F-41. Addendum 5 pp. 165–168.
SECTION II.B.6 (WIND)			
Impact W-1 Implementation of the Project would not include tall structures that would result in ground-level-equivalent wind speed exceeding 26 mph for a single hour of the year in pedestrian corridors and public spaces.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR p. III.G-9.
Impact W-1a Implementation of the Project at Candlestick Point would not include tall structures that would result in ground-level-equivalent wind speed exceeding 26 mph for a single hour of the year in pedestrian corridors and public spaces.	X		
Impact W-1b Implementation of the Project at HPS Phase II would not include tall structures that would result in ground-level-equivalent wind speed exceeding 26 mph for a single hour of the year in pedestrian corridors and public spaces.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR p. III.G-8. Addendum 5 pp. 169–170.
SECTION II.B.7 (AIR QUALITY)			
Impact AQ-1 Construction activities associated with the Project would not result in short-term increases in emission of criteria air pollutants and precursors that exceed BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria.	X		
Impact AQ-2 Construction activities associated with the Project would not result in impacts to on-site and off-site populations from Project-generated emissions of DPM.	X		
Impact AQ-2a Construction at Candlestick Point would not result in impacts to off-site populations from Project-generated emissions of DPM.	X		
Impact AQ-2b Construction at HPS Phase II would not result in impacts to off-site populations from Project-generated emissions of DPM.		X	See Note (4). Final EIR, pp. III.H-27–III.H-28. Addendum 5, p. 173.
Impact AQ-2c Construction activities associated with the Project would not result in impacts to the existing Alice Griffith Public Housing from Project-generated emissions of DPM.	X		

APPENDIX B IMPACTS EVALUATED IN ADDENDUM 6

<i>Impact(s)</i>	<i>Impact Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Impact Not Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Reason Further Analysis Is Not Required¹</i>
Impact AQ-3 Construction activities associated with the Project would not result in impacts to off-site and Alice Griffith populations from emissions of TACs bound to soil-PM ₁₀ .		X	See Note (5). Final EIR p. III.H-32.
Impact AQ-3a Construction at Candlestick Point would not result in impacts to off-site and Alice Griffith populations from emissions of TACs bound to soil-PM ₁₀ .	X		
Impact AQ-3b Construction at HPS Phase II would not result in impacts to off-site and Alice Griffith populations from emissions of TACs bound to soil-PM ₁₀ .		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.H-31–III.H-32.
Impact AQ-4 Operation of the Project would violate BAAQMD CEQA significance thresholds for mass criteria pollutant emissions from mobile and area sources and contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation at full buildout.	X		
Impact AQ-5 Operation of the Project would not cause local concentrations of CO to exceed State and federal ambient air quality standards due to motor vehicles trips.	X		
Impact AQ-6 Implementation of HPS Phase II would not expose nearby receptors to an increase in local concentrations of toxic air contaminants due to the operation of Research and Development uses.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.H-36–III.H-37. Addendum 5 pp. 177–178.
Impact AQ-7 Operation of the Project would not expose receptors to concentrations of PM _{2.5} above a 0.2 µg/m ³ action level for PM _{2.5} and, therefore, would not substantially affect the health of nearby receptors as a result of an increase in local concentrations of vehicle emissions (PM _{2.5}) associated with vehicle use attributable to operation of the Project.	X		
Impact AQ-8 Implementation of the Project would not generate objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.	X		
Impact AQ-9 The Project would conform to the current regional air quality plan.	X		

SECTION II.B.8 (NOISE AND VIBRATION)

Impact NO-1 Construction activities associated with the Project would generate increased noise levels for both off-site and on-site sensitive receptors; however, the Project’s construction noise impacts would occur primarily in noise-sensitive areas adjacent or near to active construction sites (which would vary in location and duration over the entire period the proposed Project would be under construction); they would also not occur during recognized sleep hours, and would be consistent with the requirements for construction noise that exist in Sections 2907 and 2908 of the <i>Municipal Code</i> .		X	See Note (5). Final EIR p. III.I-32.
Impact NO-1a Construction at Candlestick Point would generate increased noise levels for both off-site and on-site sensitive receptors; however, the Project’s construction noise impacts would occur primarily in noise-sensitive areas adjacent or near to active construction sites (which would vary in location and duration over the entire period the proposed Project would be under construction), they would not occur during recognized sleep hours, and would be consistent with the requirements for construction noise that exist in Sections 2907 & 2908 of the <i>Municipal Code</i> .	X		

APPENDIX B IMPACTS EVALUATED IN ADDENDUM 6			
Impact(s)	Impact Evaluated in Addendum 6	Impact Not Evaluated in Addendum 6	Reason Further Analysis Is Not Required ¹
Impact NO-1b Construction at HPS Phase II would generate increased noise levels for both off-site and on-site sensitive receptors; however, the Project's construction noise impacts would be temporary, they would also not occur during recognized sleep hours, and would be consistent with the requirements for construction noise that exist in Sections 2907 and 2908 of the <i>Municipal Code</i> .		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.I-30–III.I-32. Addendum 5 pp. 187–193.
Impact NO-2 Construction activities associated with the Project would create excessive groundborne vibration levels in existing residential neighborhoods adjacent to the Project site and at proposed on-site residential uses should the latter be occupied before Project construction activity on adjacent parcels is complete. Although the Project's construction vibration impacts would be temporary, would not occur during recognized sleep hours, and would be consistent with the requirements for construction activities that exist in Sections 2907 & 2908 of the <i>Municipal Code</i> , vibration levels would still be significant.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR pp. III.I-37–III.I-38.
Impact NO-2a Construction activities at Candlestick Point would create excessive groundborne vibration levels in existing residential neighborhoods adjacent to the Project site and at proposed on-site residential uses should the latter be occupied before Project construction activity on adjacent parcels is complete. Although the Project's construction vibration impacts would be temporary, would not occur during recognized sleep hours, and would be consistent with the requirements for construction activities that exist in Sections 2907 & 2908 of the <i>Municipal Code</i> , vibration levels would still be significant.	X		
Impact NO-2b Rock removal in the Alice Griffith and Jamestown districts would result in vibration levels that exceed the FTA threshold of 80 VdB or could cause damage to structures from vibration caused by the fracturing of bedrock for excavation.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.I-35–III.I-36.
Impact NO-2c Construction at HPS Phase II would create excessive groundborne vibration levels in existing residential neighborhoods adjacent to the Project site and at proposed on-site residential uses should the latter be occupied before Project construction activity on adjacent parcels is complete. Although the Project's construction vibration impacts would be temporary, would not occur during recognized sleep hours, and would be consistent with the requirements for construction activities that exist in Sections 2907 & 2908 of the <i>Municipal Code</i> , vibration levels would be significant		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.I-36–III.I-37. Addendum 5 pp. 193–196.
Impact NO-3 Construction activities associated with the Project would result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels.	X		
Impact NO-4 Implementation of the Project, including the use of mechanical equipment or the delivery of goods, would not expose noise-sensitive land uses on or off site to noise levels that exceed the standards established by the City.	X		
Impact NO-5 Implementation of the Project would not generate or expose persons on or off site to excessive groundborne vibration.	X		
Impact NO-6 Operation of the Project would generate increased local traffic volumes that could cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in existing residential areas along the major Project site access routes.	X		
Impact NO-7 Noise during football games and concerts at the proposed stadium would result in temporary increases in ambient noise levels that could adversely affect surrounding residents for the duration of a game or concert.		X	See Note (3). Final EIR pp. III.I-44–III.I-51.

APPENDIX B IMPACTS EVALUATED IN ADDENDUM 6

<i>Impact(s)</i>	<i>Impact Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Impact Not Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Reason Further Analysis Is Not Required¹</i>
Impact NO-8 Implementation of the Project would not expose residents and visitors to excessive noise levels from flights from San Francisco International Airport such that the noise would be disruptive or cause annoyance.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR p. III.I-51.

SECTION II.B.9 (CULTURAL RESOURCES AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES)

Impact CP-1 Construction activities associated with the Project could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR p. III.J-35.
Impact CP-1a Construction at Candlestick Point would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource.	X		
Impact CP-1b Construction at HPS Phase II could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.J-33–III.J-35. Addendum 5 pp. 207–213.
Impact CP-2 Construction activities associated with the Project would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resources, including prehistoric Native American resources, Chinese fishing camps, and maritime related resources.		X	See Note (5) Final EIR p. III.J-40.
Impact CP-2a Construction at Candlestick Point would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resources, including prehistoric Native American, Chinese fishing camp, and maritime-related archaeological remains.	X		
Impact CP-2b Construction at HPS Phase II would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resources, including prehistoric Native American resources, Chinese fishing camps, and maritime related resources.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR p. III.J-39. Addendum 5 pp. 214–220.
Impact CP-3 Construction activities associated with the Project would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a paleontological resource.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR p. III.J-43.
Impact CP-3a Construction at Candlestick Point would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a paleontological resource.	X		
Impact CP-3b Construction at HPS Phase II would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a paleontological resource.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.J-41–III.J-42. Addendum 5 pp. 220–221.
Impact CP-3c Construction of the Yosemite Slough bridge, shoreline improvements, and the marina improvements activities, including in-water activities, would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a paleontological resource.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.J-42–III.J-43.

APPENDIX B IMPACTS EVALUATED IN ADDENDUM 6			
<i>Impact(s)</i>	<i>Impact Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Impact Not Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Reason Further Analysis Is Not Required¹</i>
Impact CP-3d Pile driving associated with construction of the Yosemite Slough bridge, shoreline improvements, and the marina improvements would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a paleontological resource.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR p. III.J-43.
SECTION II.B.10 (HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS)			
Impact HZ-1 Construction activities associated with the Project would not expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials as a result of the disturbance of soil and/or groundwater with known contaminants from historic uses.		X	See Note (5) Final EIR pp. III.K-57–III.K-58.
Impact HZ-1a Construction at Candlestick Point bayward of the historic high tide line would not expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials as a result of the disturbance of soil and/or groundwater with known contaminants from historic uses.	X		
Impact HZ-1b Construction at HPS Phase II would not expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials as a result of the disturbance of soil and/or groundwater with known contaminants from historic uses.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.K-55–III.K-57. Addendum 5 pp. 226–228.
Impact HZ-2 Construction activities associated with the Project would not expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials as a result of the disturbance of soil and/or groundwater with previously unidentified subsurface contaminants from historic uses.		X	See Note (5) Final EIR p. III.K-60.
Impact HZ-2a Construction at Candlestick Point would not expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials as a result of the disturbance of soil and/or groundwater with previously unidentified subsurface contaminants from historic uses.	X		
Impact HZ-2b Construction at HPS Phase II would not expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials as a result of the disturbance of soil and/or groundwater with previously unidentified subsurface contaminants from historic uses.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.K-59–III.K-60. Addendum 5 pp. 228–229.
Impact HZ-3 Construction activities associated with the Project would not expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials as a result of off-site transport and disposal of contaminated soil and groundwater.		X	See Note (5) Final EIR p. III.K-63.
Impact HZ-3a Construction at Candlestick Point would not expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials as a result of off-site transport and disposal of contaminated soil and groundwater.	X		
Impact HZ-3b Construction at HPS Phase II would not expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials as a result of off-site transport and disposal of contaminated soil and groundwater.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR p. III.K-62. Addendum 5 pp. 229–230.

APPENDIX B IMPACTS EVALUATED IN ADDENDUM 6			
<i>Impact(s)</i>	<i>Impact Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Impact Not Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Reason Further Analysis Is Not Required¹</i>
Impact HZ-4 Construction activities associated with the Project would not expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials as a result of improvements to existing and installation of new underground utilities.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR p. III.K-64
Impact HZ-4a Construction at Candlestick Point would not expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials as a result of improvements to existing and installation of new underground utilities.	X		
Impact HZ-4b Construction at HPS Phase II would not expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials as a result of improvements to existing and installation of new underground utilities.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR p. III.K-64. Addendum 5 pp. 230–231.
Impact HZ-5 Construction activities associated with the Project would not create vertical conduits for hazardous materials that could contaminate groundwater as a result of installation of foundation support piles.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR pp. III.K-66– III.K-67
Impact HZ-5a Construction at Candlestick Point would not create vertical conduits for hazardous materials that could contaminate groundwater as a result of installation of foundation support piles.	X		
Impact HZ-5b Construction at HPS Phase II would not create vertical conduits for hazardous materials that could contaminate groundwater as a result of installation of foundation support piles.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR p. III.K-66. Addendum 5 p. 231.
Impact HZ-6 Construction activities associated with the Project would not expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials as a result of the handling, stockpiling, and transport of soil that may contain contaminants.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR p. III.K-70.
Impact HZ-6a Construction at Candlestick Point would not expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials as a result of handling, stockpiling, and transport of soil that may contain contaminants.	X		
Impact HZ-6b Construction at HPS Phase II would not expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials as a result of handling, stockpiling, and transport of soil that may contain contaminants.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.K-68– III.K-69. Addendum 5 pp. 231–232.
Impact HZ-7 Construction activities associated with the Project would not expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials that could be present in stormwater runoff.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR p. III.K-71.
Impact HZ-7a Construction at Candlestick Point would not expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials that could be present in stormwater runoff.	X		

APPENDIX B IMPACTS EVALUATED IN ADDENDUM 6			
<i>Impact(s)</i>	<i>Impact Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Impact Not Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Reason Further Analysis Is Not Required¹</i>
Impact HZ-7b Construction at HPS Phase II would not expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials that could be present in stormwater runoff.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR p. III.K-71. Addendum 5 pp. 233.
Impact HZ-8 Project occupants or visitors in or near portions of HPS Phase II where remediation has not been fully completed would not be exposed to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.K-72–III.K-74. Addendum 5 p. 234.
Impact HZ-9 Construction at HPS Phase II would not expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials as a result of Yosemite Slough bridge construction.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.K-74–III.K-79.
Impact HZ-10 Construction activities associated with the Project in shoreline areas would not expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials as a result of the disturbance of sediment or soil that may contain chemical or radiological contaminants.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR p. III.K-85.
Impact HZ-10a Construction in the shoreline areas at Candlestick Point would not expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials as a result of the disturbance of sediment or soil that may contain chemical contaminants.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.K-80–III.K-81.
Impact HZ-10b Construction in the shoreline areas at HPS Phase II would not expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials as a result of the disturbance of sediment or soil that is radiologically affected or that may contain chemical contaminants.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.K-74–III.K-79. Addendum 5 pp. 234–235.
Impact HZ-11 Construction activities associated with the Project on Navy-owned property, including improvements to existing utilities and installation of new underground utilities, would not expose occupants, construction workers, the public, or the environment to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials as a result of the disturbance of soil, sediment, or groundwater that may contain contaminants from historic uses, including radiological contaminants.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.K-85–III.K-86. Addendum 5 pp. 235–236.
Impact HZ-12 Remediation activities conducted on behalf of the City or Project Applicant at the HPS Phase II parcels transferred prior to completion of remediation in an “early transfer” would not expose remediation and construction workers, the public, or the environment to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials as a result of the disturbance of soil, sediment, and/or groundwater that may contain contaminants from historic uses.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.K-86–III.K-88. Addendum 5 p. 236.

APPENDIX B IMPACTS EVALUATED IN ADDENDUM 6			
<i>Impact(s)</i>	<i>Impact Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Impact Not Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Reason Further Analysis Is Not Required¹</i>
Impact HZ-13 Construction of off-site roadway improvements would not expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials as a result of the disturbance of soil or groundwater that may contain contaminants.	X		
Impact HZ-14 Construction activities associated with the Project would not expose ecological receptors to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials as a result of the disturbance of soil, sediment, and/or groundwater with contaminants from historic uses.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR p. III.K-96.
Impact HZ-14a Construction at Candlestick Point would not expose ecological receptors to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials as a result of the disturbance of soil, sediment, and/or groundwater that may contain contaminants from historic uses.	X		
Impact HZ-14b Construction at HPS Phase II would not expose ecological receptors to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials as a result of the disturbance of soil, sediment, and/or groundwater that may contain contaminants from historic uses.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.K-92–III.K-96. Addendum 5 p. 237.
Impact HZ-15 Construction and grading activities associated with the Project would not disturb soil or rock that could be a source of naturally occurring asbestos in a manner that would present a human health hazard.	X		
Impact HZ-16 Construction activities associated with the Project would not result in a health hazard to construction workers, the public, or the environment as a result of the demolition or renovation of existing structures that could include asbestos-containing materials, lead-based paint, PCBs, or fluorescent lights containing mercury.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR p. III.K-102.
Impact HZ-16a Construction at Candlestick Point would not result in a health hazard to construction workers, the public, or the environment as a result of the demolition or renovation of existing structures that could include asbestos-containing materials, lead-based paint, PCBs, or fluorescent lights containing mercury.	X		
Impact HZ-16b Construction at HPS Phase II would not result in a health hazard to construction workers, the public, or the environment as a result of the demolition or renovation of existing structures that could include asbestos-containing materials, lead-based paint, PCBs, or fluorescent lights containing mercury.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR p. III.K-102. Addendum 5 p. 238.
Impact HZ-17 Construction activities associated with the Project would not expose construction workers to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials in soil, sediment, or groundwater in a manner which would present a human health risk.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR p. III.K-104.
Impact HZ-17a Construction at Candlestick Point would not expose construction workers to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials in soil or groundwater in a manner which would present a human health risk.	X		
Impact HZ-17b Construction at HPS Phase II would not expose construction workers to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials in soil, sediment, or groundwater in a manner which would present a human health risk.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR p. III.K-103. Addendum 5 pp. 238–239.

APPENDIX B IMPACTS EVALUATED IN ADDENDUM 6			
Impact(s)	Impact Evaluated in Addendum 6	Impact Not Evaluated in Addendum 6	Reason Further Analysis Is Not Required ¹
Impact HZ-18 Construction activities associated with the Project would not result in a human health risk involving the disturbance of naturally occurring asbestos, demolition of buildings that could contain hazardous substances in building materials, or possible disturbance of contaminated soils or groundwater within one-quarter mile of an existing school.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR p. III.K-107.
Impact HZ-18a Construction at Candlestick Point would not result in a human health risk involving the disturbance of naturally occurring asbestos, demolition of buildings that could contain hazardous substances in building materials, or possible disturbance of contaminated soils or groundwater within one-quarter mile of an existing school.	X		
Impact HZ-18b Construction at HPS Phase II would not result in a human health risk involving the disturbance of naturally occurring asbestos, demolition of buildings that could contain hazardous substances in building materials, or possible disturbance of contaminated soils or groundwater within one-quarter mile of an existing school.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR p. III.K-105– III.K-107. Addendum 5 p. 239.
Impact HZ-19 Simultaneous construction activities at the Project site would not pose a human health risk from the release of contaminants from historic uses or fill.	X		
Impact HZ-20 Construction activities associated with the Project would not result in adverse impacts to construction workers, visitors, or the environment from the routine use, storage, transportation, and disposal of hazardous materials.	X		
Impact HZ-21 Implementation of the Project would not result in adverse impacts to residents, visitors, or the environment from periodic maintenance requiring excavation of site soils to maintain or replace utilities, repair foundations, or make other subsurface repairs.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR p. III.K-110.
Impact HZ-21a Implementation of the Project at Candlestick Point would not result in adverse impacts to residents, visitors, or the environment from periodic maintenance requiring excavation of site soils to maintain or replace utilities, repair foundations, or make other subsurface repairs.	X		
Impact HZ-21b Implementation of the Project at HPS Phase II would not result in adverse impacts to residents, visitors, or the environment from periodic maintenance requiring excavation of site soils to maintain or replace utilities, repair foundations, or make other subsurface repairs.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR p. III.K-110. Addendum 5 pp. 241–242.
Impact HZ-22 Implementation of the Project would not result in a significant impact involving the routine use, storage, transportation, and disposal of hazardous materials.	X		
Impact HZ-23 Implementation of the Project would not pose a human health risk and/or result in an adverse effect on the environment from reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.	X		
Impact HZ-24 Areas designated for research and development uses within HPS Phase II would not pose a human health risk as a result of hazardous air emissions within one-quarter mile of a school.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR p. III.K-115. Addendum 5 p. 244.

APPENDIX B IMPACTS EVALUATED IN ADDENDUM 6			
<i>Impact(s)</i>	<i>Impact Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Impact Not Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Reason Further Analysis Is Not Required¹</i>
Impact HZ-25 The Project site is not within the San Francisco Airport Land Use Policy Plan and the Project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project site.		X	See Note (6). Final EIR p. III.K-116. Addendum 5 p. 245.
Impact HZ-26 Implementation of the Project would not occur within the vicinity of a private airstrip and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project site.		X	See Note (6). Final EIR p. III.K-116. Addendum 5 p. 245.
Impact HZ-27 Implementation of the Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving fires or conflict with emergency response or evacuation plans.	X		
SECTION II.B.11 (GEOLOGY AND SOILS)			
Impact GE-1 Construction activities associated with the Project would not result in the loss of topsoil caused by soil erosion.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR p. III.L-32.
Impact GE-1a Construction at Candlestick Point, including the Yosemite Slough bridge, would not result in the loss of topsoil caused by soil erosion.	X		
Impact GE-1b Construction at HPS Phase II would not result in the loss of topsoil caused by soil erosion.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR p. III.L-32. Addendum 5 pp. 250–251.
Impact GE-2 Construction activities associated with the Project would not result in damage to structures caused by settlement from lowering of groundwater levels.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR pp. III.L-34–III.L-35.
Impact GE-2a Construction at Candlestick Point and the Yosemite Slough bridge would not result in damage to structures from settlement caused by lowering of groundwater levels.	X		
Impact GE-2b Construction at HPS Phase II would not result in damage to structures caused by settlement from lowering of groundwater levels.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR p. III.L-34. Addendum 5 p. 251.
Impact GE-3 Rock removal activities at the Alice Griffith Public Housing site and the Jamestown area would not result in damage to structures from vibration and/or settlement caused by the fracturing of bedrock for excavation.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.L-35–III.L-36.

APPENDIX B IMPACTS EVALUATED IN ADDENDUM 6			
<i>Impact(s)</i>	<i>Impact Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Impact Not Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Reason Further Analysis Is Not Required¹</i>
Impact GE-4 Implementation of the Project would not expose people and structures to substantial adverse effects caused by seismically induced groundshaking.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR pp. III.L-39–III.L-40.
Impact GE-4a Implementation of the Project at Candlestick Point, including the Yosemite Slough bridge and Alice Griffith Housing, would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects caused by seismically induced groundshaking.	X		
Impact GE-4b Implementation of the Project at HPS Phase II would not expose people and structures to substantial adverse effects caused by seismically induced groundshaking.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR p. III.L-39. Addendum 5 pp. 251–252.
Impact GE-5 Implementation of the Project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects caused by seismically induced ground failure such as liquefaction, lateral spreading, and settlement.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR p. III.L-45.
Impact GE-5a Implementation of the Project at Candlestick Point, including the Alice Griffith Housing and Yosemite Slough bridge, would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects caused by seismically induced ground failure such as liquefaction, lateral spreading, and settlement.	X		
Impact GE-5b Implementation of the Project at HPS Phase II would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects caused by seismically induced ground failure such as liquefaction, lateral spreading, and settlement.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.L-44–III.L-45. Addendum 5 pp. 252–254.
Impact GE-6 Implementation of the Project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects caused by seismically induced landslides.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR p. III.L-48.
Impact GE-6a Implementation of the Project at Candlestick Point, including the Alice Griffith Housing, would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects caused by seismically induced landslides.	X		
Impact GE-6b Implementation of the Project at HPS Phase II would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects caused by seismically induced landslides.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR p. III.L-48. Addendum 5 p. 255.
Impact GE-7 Implementation of the Project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects caused by shoreline instability.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR p. III.L-50.
Impact GE-7a Implementation of the Project at Candlestick Point would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects caused by shoreline instability.	X		

APPENDIX B IMPACTS EVALUATED IN ADDENDUM 6			
<i>Impact(s)</i>	<i>Impact Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Impact Not Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Reason Further Analysis Is Not Required¹</i>
Impact GE-7b Implementation of the Project at HPS Phase II would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects caused by shoreline instability.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.L-49–III.L-50. Addendum 5 pp. 255–257.
Impact GE-8 Implementation of the Project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects caused by landslides.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR p. III.L-51.
Impact GE-8a Implementation of the Project at Candlestick Point would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects caused by landslides.	X		
Impact GE-8b Implementation of the Project at HPS Phase II would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects caused by landslides.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR p. III.L-51. Addendum 5 pp. 256–257.
Impact GE-9 Implementation of the Project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects caused by damage from settlement.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR p. III.L-55.
Impact GE-9a Implementation of the Project at Candlestick Point, including Alice Griffith Housing and the Yosemite Slough bridge, would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects caused by damage from settlement.	X		
Impact GE-9b Implementation of the Project at HPS Phase II would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects caused by damage from settlement.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.L-54–III.L-55. Addendum 5 pp. 257–258.
Impact GE-10 Implementation of the Project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects caused by expansive soils.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR p. III.L-58.
Impact GE-10a Implementation of the Project at Candlestick Point, including Alice Griffith Housing and the Yosemite Slough bridge, would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects caused by expansive soils.	X		
Impact GE-10b Implementation of the Project at HPS Phase II would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects caused by expansive soils.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR p. III.L-58. Addendum 5 p. 258.

APPENDIX B IMPACTS EVALUATED IN ADDENDUM 6			
<i>Impact(s)</i>	<i>Impact Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Impact Not Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Reason Further Analysis Is Not Required¹</i>
Impact GE-11 Implementation of the Project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects caused by corrosive soils.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR p. III.L-61.
Impact GE-11a Implementation of the Project at Candlestick Point, including Alice Griffith Housing and the Yosemite Slough bridge, would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects caused by corrosive soils.	X		
Impact GE-11b Implementation of the Project at HPS Phase II would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects caused by corrosive soils.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR p. III.L-61. Addendum 5 p. 258.
Impact GE-12 Implementation of the Project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects caused by surface fault rupture.	X		
Impact GE-13 Implementation of the Project would not result in the use of soils incapable of adequately supporting septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater.	X		
Impact GE-14 Implementation of the Project would not result in a substantial change of topography or destruction of unique geologic features.	X		

SECTION II.B.12 (HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY)

Impact HY-1 Construction activities associated with the Project would not cause an exceedance of water quality standards or contribute to or cause a violation of waste discharge requirements.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR pp. III.M-71–III.M-74.
Impact HY-1a Construction at Candlestick Point would not cause an exceedance of water quality standards or contribute to or cause a violation of waste discharge requirements.	X		
Impact HY-1b Construction at HPS Phase II would not cause an exceedance of water quality standards or contribute to or cause a violation of waste discharge requirements.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.M-66–III.M-70. Addendum 5 pp. 265–266.
Impact HY-1c Construction of the Yosemite Slough bridge would not cause an exceedance of water quality standards or contribute to or cause a violation of waste discharge requirements.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.M-70–III.M-71.
Impact HY-2 Construction activities associated with the Project 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.	X		
Impact HY-3 Construction activities associated with the Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site.	X		

APPENDIX B IMPACTS EVALUATED IN ADDENDUM 6			
<i>Impact(s)</i>	<i>Impact Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Impact Not Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Reason Further Analysis Is Not Required¹</i>
Impact HY-4 Construction activities associated with the Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on or off site.	X		
Impact HY-5 Construction activities associated with the Project would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm sewer systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.	X		
Impact HY-6 Implementation of the Project would not contribute to violations of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR p. III.M-91.
Impact HY-6a Implementation of the Project at Candlestick Point would not contribute to violations of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.	X		
Impact HY-6b Implementation of the Project at HPS Phase II would not contribute to violations of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.M-84– III.M-89. Addendum 5 pp. 269–272.
Impact HY-6c Implementation of the Yosemite Slough bridge would not contribute to violations of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR p. III.M-90.
Impact HY-7 Implementation of the Project would not otherwise degrade water quality.	X		
Impact HY-8 Implementation of the Project 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.	X		
Impact HY-9 Implementation of the Project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, and would not result in substantial erosion or siltation on site or off site.	X		
Impact HY-10 Implementation of the Project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site, through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff, and would not result in flooding on site or off site.	X		
Impact HY-11 Implementation of the Project would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm sewer systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.	X		
Impact HY-12 Implementation of the Project would not place housing in a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR p. III.M-101.
Impact HY-12a Implementation of the Project at Candlestick Point would not place housing in a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map.	X		

APPENDIX B IMPACTS EVALUATED IN ADDENDUM 6			
<i>Impact(s)</i>	<i>Impact Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Impact Not Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Reason Further Analysis Is Not Required¹</i>
Impact HY-12b Implementation of the Project at HPS Phase II would not place housing in a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR p. III.M-101. Addendum 5 pp. 275–277.
Impact HY-13 Implementation of the Project would not place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area or impede or redirect flood flows.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR p. III.M-103.
Impact HY-13a Implementation of the Project at Candlestick Point would not place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area that could impede or redirect flood flows.	X		
Impact HY-13b Implementation of the Project at HPS Phase II would not place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area or impede or redirect flood flows.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR p. III.M-102. Addendum 5 pp. 277–278.
Impact HY-13c The Yosemite Slough bridge would not place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area or impede or redirect flood flows.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR p. III.M-103.
Impact HY-14 Implementation of the Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.	X		
Impact HY-15 Implementation of the Project would not expose people or structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.	X		

SECTION II.B.13 (BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES)

(Note: Project impacts for Impact BI-3a through Impact BI-21b are provided by Impact BI-22 through Impact BI-26)

Impact BI-1 Implementation of the Project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.		X	See Note (6). Final EIR p. III.N-49.
Impact BI-2 Implementation of the Project would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any common species or habitats through substantial interference with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.	X		
Impact BI-3a Construction at Candlestick Point would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any plant species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS.	X		
Impact BI-3b Construction at HPS Phase II and construction of the Yosemite Slough bridge would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any plant species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR p. III.N-55. Addendum 5 p. 286.

APPENDIX B IMPACTS EVALUATED IN ADDENDUM 6			
Impact(s)	Impact Evaluated in Addendum 6	Impact Not Evaluated in Addendum 6	Reason Further Analysis Is Not Required ¹
Impact BI-4a Construction at Candlestick Point would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i> through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.	X		
Impact BI-4b Construction at HPS Phase II would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i> (including, but not limited to, marsh, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.N-63–III.N-66. Addendum 5 pp. 286–288.
Impact BI-4c Construction of the Yosemite Slough bridge would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i> (including, but not limited to, marsh, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.N-66–III.N-67.
Impact BI-5a Construction at Candlestick Point would not have a substantial adverse effect on eelgrass beds, a sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the CDFG or USFWS.	X		
Impact BI-5b Construction at HPS Phase II and construction of the Yosemite Slough bridge would not have a substantial adverse effect on eelgrass beds, a sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the CDFG or USFWS.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.N-68–III.N-70. Addendum 5 p. 288.
Impact BI-6a Construction at Candlestick Point would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any bird species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS.	X		
Impact BI-6b Construction at HPS Phase II would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any bird species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.N-73–III.N-74. Addendum 5 p. 289.
Impact BI-7a Construction at Candlestick Point would not have a substantial adverse effect on the quantity and quality of suitable foraging habitat for raptors.	X		
Impact BI-7b Implementation of the Project at HPS Phase II would not have a substantial adverse effect on the quantity and quality of suitable foraging habitat for raptors.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.N-75–III.N-77. Addendum 5 pp. 289–290.
Impact BI-8a Construction at Candlestick Point would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on the western red bat, a species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS.	X		

APPENDIX B IMPACTS EVALUATED IN ADDENDUM 6			
<i>Impact(s)</i>	<i>Impact Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Impact Not Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Reason Further Analysis Is Not Required¹</i>
Impact BI-8b Construction at HPS Phase II would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on the western red bat, a species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR p. III.N-78. Addendum 5 pp. 290–291.
Impact BI-9a Pile driving associated with construction at Candlestick Point would not have a substantial adverse effect either directly or through habitat modifications, on marine mammals or fish identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS.	X		
Impact BI-9b Pile driving associated with construction of the marina and the Yosemite Slough bridge would not have a substantial adverse effect at HPS Phase II, either directly or through habitat modifications, on marine mammals or fish identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.N-79–III.N-81. Addendum 5 p. 291.
Impact BI-10a Construction of the Candlestick Point would require the removal of hard substrates (riprap) used by native oysters, but would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on this species.	X		
Impact BI-10b Construction at HPS Phase II would require removal of hard substrates (docks, riprap, seawalls, pilings, etc.) used by native oysters, but would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on this species.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.N-82–III.N-83. Addendum 5 pp. 291–292.
Impact BI-10c Construction of the Yosemite Slough bridge may require removal of hard substrates (docks, riprap, seawalls, pilings, etc.) used by native oysters, but would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on this species.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR p. III.N-83.
Impact BI-11a Construction at Candlestick Point would not have a substantial adverse effect on designated critical habitat for green sturgeon and Central California Coast steelhead, and would not result in impacts to individuals of these species as well as Chinook salmon and longfin smelt through disturbance and loss of aquatic and mudflat habitat as a result of construction of shoreline revetments.	X		
Impact BI-11b Construction at HPS Phase II would not have a substantial adverse effect on designated critical habitat for green sturgeon and Central California Coast steelhead, and would not result in impacts to individuals of these species as well as Chinook salmon and longfin smelt through temporary and permanent disturbance of aquatic and mudflat habitat during construction of shoreline revetments.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.N-84–III.N-85. Addendum 5 p. 292.
Impact BI-11c Construction of the Yosemite Slough bridge would not have a substantial adverse effect on designated critical habitat for green sturgeon and Central California Coast steelhead and would not result in impacts to individuals of these species, Chinook salmon, or longfin smelt through disturbance or loss of aquatic and mudflat habitat as a result of construction of shoreline revetments.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.N-85–III.N-86.

APPENDIX B IMPACTS EVALUATED IN ADDENDUM 6			
<i>Impact(s)</i>	<i>Impact Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Impact Not Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Reason Further Analysis Is Not Required¹</i>
Impact BI-12a Construction at Candlestick Point would not have a substantial adverse effect on designated essential fish habitat through (EFH) or result in a substantial change in total available essential fish habitat through placement of riprap and other fill or through temporary water-quality impacts during construction. EFH is a sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the CDFG or USFWS.	X		
Impact BI-12b Construction at HPS Phase II would not have a substantial adverse effect on designated essential fish habitat through (EFH) through placement of riprap and other fill, or through temporary water-quality impacts during construction. EFH is a sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the CDFG or USFWS.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.N-88–III.N-90. Addendum 5 p. 293.
Impact BI-12c Construction of the Yosemite Slough bridge would not have a substantial adverse effect on designated essential fish habitat through (EFH) through placement of riprap and other fill, or through temporary water-quality impacts during construction. EFH is a sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the CDFG or USFWS.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR p. III.N-91.
Impact BI-13a Construction at Candlestick Point would not interfere substantially with the movement of native resident or migratory wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridor, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.	X		
Impact BI-13b Construction at HPS Phase II and construction of the Yosemite Slough bridge would not interfere substantially with the movement of native resident or migratory wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, but it could impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.N-92–III.N-93. Addendum 5 p. 294.
Impact BI-14a Construction at Candlestick Point would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.	X		
Impact BI-14b Construction at HPS Phase II and Yosemite Slough bridge would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.N-96–III.N-97. Addendum 5 pp. 294–295.
Impact BI-15a Construction within the shoreline or Bay at Candlestick Point would not result in the disturbance of contaminated soil or the re-suspension of contaminated sediments.	X		
Impact BI-15b Construction within the shoreline or Bay at HPS Phase II would not result in the disturbance of contaminated soil or the re-suspension of contaminated sediments.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.N-97–III.N-98. Addendum 5 pp. 295–296.

APPENDIX B IMPACTS EVALUATED IN ADDENDUM 6			
<i>Impact(s)</i>	<i>Impact Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Impact Not Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Reason Further Analysis Is Not Required¹</i>
Impact BI-16a Implementation of the Project at Candlestick Point would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS or interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.	X		
Impact BI-16b Implementation of the Project at HPS Phase II, including operation of the proposed marina, would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on aquatic species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS or interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.N-99–III.N-100. Addendum 5 pp. 296–297.
Impact BI-17a Implementation of the Project at Candlestick Point would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on nesting American peregrine falcons, identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS.	X		
Impact BI-17b Implementation of the Project at HPS Phase II would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on nesting American peregrine falcons, identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.N-100–III.N-101. Addendum 5 p. 298.
Impact BI-18a Implementation of the Project at Candlestick Point would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on aquatic species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS, or have a substantial adverse effect on designated EFH, a sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the NMFS.	X		
Impact BI-18b Implementation of the marina in HPS Phase II would require routine maintenance dredging of the marina, which could remove habitat or generate substantial increases in turbidity within the marina, but would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS, or have a substantial adverse effect on designated EFH, a sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the NMFS.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.N-101–III.N-103. Addendum 5 p. 298.
Impact BI-19a Implementation of the Project at Candlestick Point would not result in impacts to aquatic organisms through the re-suspension of contaminated sediments.	X		
Impact BI-19b Implementation of the marina in HPS Phase II would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on sensitive aquatic species, identified as candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS, or have a substantial adverse effect on designated EFH, a sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the CDFG or USFWS, or have a substantial effect on predators that prey on contaminated species or feed on contaminated substrates as a result of routine maintenance dredging or could generate routine increases in turbidity within the marina that would result in the re-suspension of contaminated sediments.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.N-104–III.N-105. Addendum 5 pp. 299–300.

APPENDIX B IMPACTS EVALUATED IN ADDENDUM 6

<i>Impact(s)</i>	<i>Impact Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Impact Not Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Reason Further Analysis Is Not Required¹</i>
Impact BI-20a Implementation of the Project at Candlestick Point would not interfere substantially with the movement of resident or migratory bird species by increasing collision hazards and the amount of artificial lighting.	X		
Impact BI-20b Implementation of the Project at HPS Phase II would not interfere substantially with the movement of resident or migratory bird species by increasing collision hazards and the amount of artificial lighting.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR p. III.N-108. Addendum 5 pp. 300–302.
Impact BI-21a Implementation of the Project at Candlestick Point would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.	X		
Impact BI-21b Implementation of the Project at HPS Phase II would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR p. III.N-109. Addendum 5 p. 303.
Impact BI-22 Implementation of the Project would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, by the CDFG, USFWS, or NMFS.	X		
Impact BI-23 Implementation of the Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations by the CDFG, USFWS, or NMFS.	X		
Impact BI-24 Implementation of the Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands and other waters as defined by Section 404 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i> (including, but not limited to, marsh, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.	X		
Impact BI-25 Implementation of the Project would not interfere substantially with the movement of native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery site.	X		
Impact BI-26 Implementation of the Project would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.	X		

SECTION II.B.14 (PUBLIC SERVICES)

Impact PS-1 Construction activities associated with the Project would not result in a need for new or physically altered facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for police protection.		X	See Note (1). Final EIR pp. III.O-7–III.O-8. Addendum 5 pp. 307–308.
Impact PS-2 Implementation of the Project would not result in a need for new or physically altered facilities beyond those included as part of this Project in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for police protection.	X		

APPENDIX B IMPACTS EVALUATED IN ADDENDUM 6			
<i>Impact(s)</i>	<i>Impact Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Impact Not Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Reason Further Analysis Is Not Required¹</i>
Impact PS-3 Construction activities associated with the Project would not result in a need for new or physically altered facilities in order to maintain acceptable response times for fire protection and emergency medical services.		X	See Note (1). Final EIR pp. III.O-17– III.O-18. Addendum 5 p. 310.
Impact PS-4 Implementation of the Project would not result in a need for new or physically altered facilities beyond those included as part of this Project in order to maintain acceptable response times for fire protection and emergency medical services.	X		
Impact PS-5 Construction activities associated with the Project would not affect the provision of school services by decreasing access to school services.		X	See Note (6). Final EIR p. III.O-28. Addendum 5 pp. 311–312.
Impact PS-6 New students associated with implementation of the Project would not require new or expanded school facilities, the construction of which could result in substantial adverse impacts.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.O-28– III.O-31. Addendum 5 p. 312
Impact PS-7 Construction activities associated with the Project would not affect provision of school services by decreasing access to library services.		X	See Notes (6). Final EIR p. III.O-35. Addendum 5 p. 313.
Impact PS-8 Implementation of the Project would not result in an increase in demand for library services that is not met by existing library facilities in the vicinity that have been expanded or updated.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.O-35– III.O-36. Addendum 5 p. 313.
SECTION II.B.15 (RECREATION)			
Impact RE-1 Construction of the parks, recreational uses, and open space proposed by the Project would not result in substantial adverse physical environmental impacts beyond those analyzed and disclosed in this EIR.	X		
Impact RE-2 Implementation of the Project would not increase the use of existing parks and recreational facilities that would cause the substantial physical deterioration of the facilities to occur or to be accelerated, nor would it result in the need for, new or physically altered park or recreational facilities.	X		
Impact RE-3 Implementation of the Project would decrease the size of CPSRA but would not, overall, have an adverse effect on the recreational opportunities offered by that park, nor would it substantially adversely affect windsurfing opportunities at the Project site.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.P-32– III.P-33.

APPENDIX B IMPACTS EVALUATED IN ADDENDUM 6			
<i>Impact(s)</i>	<i>Impact Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Impact Not Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Reason Further Analysis Is Not Required¹</i>
SECTION II.B.16 (UTILITIES)			
Impact UT-1 Implementation of the Project would not require water supplies in excess of existing entitlements or result in the need for new or expanded entitlements.	X		
Impact UT-2 Implementation of the Project would not require or result in the construction of new or expanded water treatment facilities. The Project would require the expansion of an auxiliary water conveyance system to provide adequate water supply for firefighting to the Project site.	X		
Impact UT-3 Implementation of the Project would not require expansion of existing off-site wastewater conveyance or treatment facilities.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR pp. III.Q-32– III.Q-33.
Impact UT-3a Implementation of the Project at Candlestick Point would not require expansion of existing off-site wastewater conveyance facilities.	X		
Impact UT-3b Implementation of the Project at HPS Phase II would not require expansion of existing off-site wastewater conveyance facilities.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.Q-31– III.Q-32. Addendum 5 pp. 328–329.
Impact UT-4 Implementation of the Project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.	X		
Impact UT-5 Construction activities associated with the Project, including demolition of existing facilities, would not generate construction-related solid waste that would exceed the capacity of landfills serving the City and County of San Francisco.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR p. III.Q-46.
Impact UT-5a Construction at Candlestick Point, including demolition of existing facilities, would not generate construction-related solid waste that would exceed the capacity of landfills serving the City and County of San Francisco.	X		
Impact UT-5b Construction at HPS Phase II, including demolition of existing facilities, would not generate construction-related solid waste that would exceed the capacity of landfills serving the City and County of San Francisco.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR p. III.Q-45. Addendum 5 pp. 330–331.
Impact UT-6 Construction activities associated with the Project would not require the disposal of hazardous wastes such as lead-based paint, asbestos, and contaminated soils that would exceed the capacity of transport, storage, and disposal facilities permitted to treat such waste.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR p. III.Q-48.
Impact UT-6a Construction at Candlestick Point would not require the disposal of hazardous wastes such as lead-based paint, asbestos, and contaminated soils that would exceed the capacity of transport, storage, and disposal facilities permitted to treat such waste.	X		
Impact UT-6b Construction at HPS Phase II would not require the disposal of hazardous wastes such as lead-based paint, asbestos, and contaminated soils that would exceed the capacity of transport, storage, and disposal facilities permitted to treat such waste.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR p. III.Q-47. Addendum 5 p. 331.

APPENDIX B IMPACTS EVALUATED IN ADDENDUM 6			
<i>Impact(s)</i>	<i>Impact Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Impact Not Evaluated in Addendum 6</i>	<i>Reason Further Analysis Is Not Required¹</i>
Impact UT-7 Implementation of the Project would not generate solid waste that would exceed the capacity of landfills serving the City and County of San Francisco.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR p. III.Q-52.
Impact UT-7a Implementation of the Project at Candlestick Point would not generate solid waste that would exceed the capacity of landfills serving the City and County of San Francisco.	X		
Impact UT-7b Implementation of the Project at HPS Phase II would not generate solid waste that would exceed the capacity of landfills serving the City and County of San Francisco.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.Q-51–III.Q-52. Addendum 5 pp. 332–333.
Impact UT-8 Implementation of the Project would not generate hazardous waste that would exceed the permitted capacity of transport, storage, and disposal facilities authorized to treat such waste.		X	See Note (5). Final EIR pp. III.Q-54–III.Q-55.
Impact UT-8a Implementation of the Project at Candlestick Point would not generate hazardous waste that would exceed the permitted capacity of transport, storage, and disposal facilities authorized to treat such waste.	X		
Impact UT-8b Implementation of the Project at HPS Phase II would not generate hazardous waste that would exceed the permitted capacity of transport, storage, and disposal facilities authorized to treat such waste.		X	See Notes (1) and (2). Final EIR pp. III.Q-53–III.Q-54. Addendum 5 p. 333.
Impact UT-9 Implementation of the Project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	X		
Impact UT-10 Implementation of the Project would not require extension of dry utility infrastructure that would exceed the capacity of the services providing such utilities.	X		
SECTION II.B.17 (ENERGY)			
Impact ME-1 Construction activities associated with the Project would not result in the use of large amounts of energy, or use energy in a wasteful manner.	X		
Impact ME-2 Buildings constructed by the Project would not use large amounts of electricity in a wasteful manner.	X		
Impact ME-3 Buildings constructed by the Project would not use large amounts of natural gas in a wasteful manner.	X		
Impact ME-4 Vehicle trips associated with the Project would not use large amounts of energy in a wasteful manner.	X		
SECTION II.B.18 (GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS)			
Impact GC-1 The Project would not result in a substantial contribution to global climate change by increasing GHG emissions in a manner that conflicts with the state goal of reducing GHG emissions in California to 1990 levels by 2020 (e.g., a substantial contribution to global climate change) or conflicts with San Francisco’s Climate Action Plan by impeding implementation of the local GHG reduction goals established by the San Francisco 2008 Greenhouse Gas Reduction Ordinance.	X		

[THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]