

# Final Environmental Impact Report

## Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Projects and Rezoning

San Francisco Redevelopment Agency  
San Francisco Planning Department

Planning Department File No. 1996.546E  
State Clearinghouse No. 2003062094

Draft EIR Publication Date: October 19, 2004  
Draft EIR Public Hearing Date: December 7, 2004  
Draft EIR Public Comment Period: October 19, 2004 to  
December 10, 2004  
Final EIR Certification Date: March 2, 2006

● *indicates material that is new or has been revised since publication  
of the Draft EIR*



## S. SUMMARY

---

### A. PROJECT AREA HISTORY

This is the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Projects and Rezoning (the Project). The Project consists of a series of actions and programs to foster public and private investment and development in the Bayview Hunters Point Area (Project Area). It would authorize the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (the Agency) to use redevelopment tools, such as tax-increment financing, land acquisition, and affordable housing development, to assist in improving conditions in the Project Area.

The Project would encourage a mix of development, retention, and rehabilitation activities in the Project Area that enhance and strengthen existing activities in Bayview Hunters Point and benefit current residents and businesses without displacing or replacing them. The Project would provide opportunities for economic development by retaining and creating new businesses and housing, as well as through new construction and rehabilitation. The Project also promotes community enhancements through the creation of open space and streetscape programs and through design guidelines. Although these goals would generally be consistent with existing applicable *General Plan* goals and policies, adoption of the Project would require that some components of the *General Plan* be amended so that all plans are consistent. It should be noted that the *General Plan* contains a number of elements with objectives, policies, and principles that are relevant to the Project that would not require any changes.

Bayview Hunters Point is one of four areas in the eastern portion of the City identified in the Planning Department's current Eastern Neighborhoods community planning and rezoning process. The Eastern Neighborhoods, which are comprised of Showplace Square/Potrero Hill, The Mission, South of Market, and Bayview Hunters Point and represent roughly one-quarter of the City, are being studied to identify core areas where Production, Distribution, and Repair (PDR) businesses are needed to maintain a diverse economy. PDR is a new land use category that is proposed to replace M-1 and M-2 industrial zoning. If approved, these core

areas will be zoned to promote business and job expansion, while the rest of the Eastern Neighborhoods will allow or expressly encourage housing.

The Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning is part of a larger initiative embodied in the Citywide Action Plan formulated by the Planning Department to provide a comprehensive long-term framework for the allocation of development that will enhance the quality and character of the City's neighborhoods. The Citywide Action Plan directs housing in places with public transit and urban amenities, new office uses in and around downtown, and industrial uses in industrial lands. Within the Eastern Neighborhoods, this effort has focused on balancing the need to expand housing opportunities while protecting PDR activities in industrial lands in the City.

The *Bayview Hunters Point Community Revitalization Concept Plan (Concept Plan)*, which is also discussed in detail in Section II.C, Project Area History and Demographics, provided many of the community goals, objectives, and visioning used as the basis for the Eastern Neighborhoods community planning and rezoning effort. The goals, objectives, projects, and programs included in the Project are the result of extensive community meetings and workshops, and reflect ideas and concerns expressed by community residents and stakeholders, including the Bayview Hunters Point Project Area Committee (PAC).

The Agency and the Bayview Hunters Point PAC, which is a community-elected group made up of local residents, property owners, business owners, and community organizations working collaboratively with the Planning Department in its Eastern Community planning process, determined that "Rezoning Option C: High Housing Option" as described in the *Community Planning in the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning Options Workbook (Workbook)*, created the most development potential of the zoning alternatives and was most consistent with the *Concept Plan*. For this reason, this document considers Rezoning Option C as the Project for environmental review purposes. Land use and zoning controls associated with the Project would be considered as amendments to the *San Francisco Planning Code* by the Planning Commission and San Francisco Board of Supervisors at a later date. In addition, "Rezoning Option B: Moderate Housing Option" is evaluated in this EIR as an alternative to the Project. A detailed discussion of the process by which the rezoning options were determined is presented in Section II.C, Project Area History and Demographics, of this document.

## B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Agency proposes the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment and Rezoning Project, which is located in the southeastern quadrant of the City and County of San Francisco in an area referred to as Bayview Hunters Point. The Project consists of the following elements:

- Adoption of the 1,575-acre Bayview Hunters Point (BVHP) Redevelopment Plan, which contains an amendment to the existing 137-acre Hunters Point (HP) Redevelopment Project Area to include an additional 1,438 acres. Redevelopment activity within the 1,575-acre amended BVHP Redevelopment Plan Area would be divided into seven activity nodes, including Northern Gateway, Town Center, Health Center, Oakinba, South Basin, Hunters Point Shoreline, and Candlestick Point. The land use districts, allowable uses, and development controls for the existing HP Redevelopment Project Area would not change; however, the *San Francisco Planning Code* would be applied to future development proposals in the added area as it exists at the time of a development application.
- Amendments to the existing 126-acre India Basin Industrial Park (IBIP) Redevelopment Plan and the existing 20-acre Bayview Industrial Triangle (BIT) Redevelopment Plan to: (1) revise the land use districts, allowable uses, and development controls of each plan to be consistent with the rezoning work of the San Francisco Planning Department; and (2) allow housing and mixed-use development along the Third Street Light Rail Transit (LRT) corridor. The proposed BIT Redevelopment Plan Amendment would also institute tax increment financing as the means to fund Agency activities and programs in the Redevelopment Project Area.
- Adoption of the BVHP, IBIP, and BIT Redevelopment Plans which anticipates new development resulting in approximately 2.4 million square feet (sf) of net new floor area, including commercial, retail, industrial, and residential land uses, as well as approximately 5,523 net new employees, and an increase of approximately 3,700 net new dwelling units.
- Implementation of three major community redevelopment programs in the BVHP, IBIP, and BIT Redevelopment Plan Areas, which include an Economic Development Program, Affordable Housing Program, and a Community Enhancements Program.
- Rezoning in the Project Area consistent with “Rezoning Option C: High Housing Option” as reflected in the *Community Planning in the Eastern Neighborhoods, Rezoning Options Workbook (Workbook)*.<sup>1</sup>
- Development of the Stadium Development Retail/Entertainment Center, consistent with Propositions D and F of the June 1997 San Francisco ballot.
- Development and construction of the Bayview Connections Urban Open Space Project.

The Project is a 30-year program that would authorize the Agency to participate in certain projects and programs seeking to correct or alleviate documented physical and economic blighting conditions in the Project Area. It is proposed as an incremental urban infill and rehabilitation program for private properties and public facilities within the Project Area. As such, development or redevelopment activities that are fostered by implementation of the Project would be built and occupied over time and full build-out could extend beyond 30 years.

The Project is designed to encourage and assist in the development of a more land-use intensive mixed-use district than currently exists. Special emphasis would be placed on increasing residential development in a manner that successfully integrates the PDR businesses that are needed to maintain a diverse economy; expanding existing arts, cultural, and community activities; aiding existing businesses and attracting new commercial development; rehabilitating existing commercial and residential space in historic buildings; expanding medical enterprises; and accommodating the Stadium Development Retail/Entertainment Center. In addition, the Project calls for the development and rehabilitation of affordable housing units and affordable community-service office space, as well as the implementation of community redevelopment programs.

Implementation of the Project would create approximately 2,400,000 net new square feet of floor, including 115,000 square feet of Cultural/Institutional/Educational uses; 50,000 square feet of Medical and Health Services; 220,000 square feet of Management and Information Professional Services; 425,000 square feet of PDR; 1,591,850 square feet of Retail and Entertainment; and 5,000 square feet of Visitor Lodging. In addition, the project would result in about 3,700 dwelling units. These dwelling units would include approximately 1,075 multi-family owner-occupied units (one to three bedrooms); 1,000 multi-family rental units (studio and one bedrooms); 925 single-family rentals (three to four bedrooms); and 700 multi-family rental units (two to four bedrooms). Redevelopment of specific sites could include a mix of uses on any given site consistent with controls in the *Planning Code* and the applicable Redevelopment Plans. This EIR analyzes overall changes in land use in the Project Area, but does not assume detailed plans for specific development sites.

The achievement of the Project's revitalization goals for the Project Area will necessitate a collaborative effort between the Agency and City departments. Redevelopment tools and resources will be used in conjunction with the tools and resources of local, state, and federal agencies to maximize the effective use of public funds.

## C. ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

The Project would foster a mix of development and rehabilitation activities in the Project Area, emphasizing residential, PDR, medical and community-serving uses, as well as office, retail, stadium, hotel, and parking uses. Build-out of these uses would reflect the new land use controls, as well as overall growth projections for the City of San Francisco. As shown in Chapter III, Environmental Setting and Impacts, and summarized below, implementation of the Project would create limited significant physical environmental effects, but would include three significant and unavoidable impacts including:

- 1) **Urban Design and Visual Quality (Views)**. The Stadium Development Retail/Entertainment Center would have a visual impact on short-range views. The new stadium would obstruct scenic views of the bay looking southeast along Gilman Avenue. The new mall would block some shoreline and bay views from residences at the St. Francis Bay Condominiums on the southern side of Bayview Hill. The new mall would also change the visual character of the Candlestick Point State Recreation Area, as a portion of the park would be used for parking. These are considered significant, unavoidable visual impacts to scenic views of the Bay.
- 2) **Transportation (Intersection Operation)**. The intersection of Third Street/Cesar Chavez Street would be considered a significant unavoidable impact since no mitigation is available to reduce this impact to less than significant.

- 3) **Transportation (Freeway Operation)**. The Level of Service F freeway operation at northbound US 101 south of I-280 would be considered a significant and unavoidable impact as no feasible mitigation is available.

As stated previously, the proposed land use controls would be generally consistent with existing applicable *General Plan* goals and policies; however, adoption of the Project would require that some components of the *General Plan* be amended so that all plans are consistent. The *General Plan* contains a number of elements with objectives, policies, and principles that are relevant to the Project and would not require any changes. Further, the Project would be consistent with the *San Francisco Planning Code*, once the Code has been amended to include the proposed zoning changes, as well as the HP, BIT, and IBIP Redevelopment Plans, once amended and adopted. (The Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan will be renamed the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan.)

## LAND USE

Implementation of the Project would transform Bayview Hunters Point into a moderate scale, transit-oriented, mixed-use residential and commercial district focused along the Third Street corridor. On Third Street, new land uses would include ground-level retail with higher-density residential and, where appropriate, commercial and light PDR above. Transit-supportive pedestrian and streetscape improvements, focused in the Town Center, would be implemented on Third Street to stimulate economic revitalization of the Third Street commercial core. Much of the existing industrial areas not adjacent to Third Street would remain unchanged except in the eastern section of the Project Area where a new mixed-use residential community with shoreline open space would be created. In addition, buffer zones would be established throughout the Project Area to provide a transition between industrial and mixed uses and residential uses.

New cultural, educational and institutional uses would be encouraged in the vicinity of the Bayview Opera House, and new medical and health services related to the existing health and senior services would also be developed. Various types of retail activity would be distributed throughout the Project Area.

The Project would result in substantial changes in land use character. However these changes are necessary to achieve redevelopment goals related to the elimination of economic and physical blight within the Project Area. The Project would generally create a more compatible land use pattern in the Project Area by implementing new zoning controls that would locate and concentrate new development in appropriate locations, and establish buffer zones between existing and new residential uses and industrial and mixed-use development. None of the proposed rezoning changes would physically divide an established community or adversely change the character of an established community. In fact, implementation of the Project would: (1) upgrade the overall economic and physical conditions of Project Area; (2) safeguard the preservation and retention of existing residential uses; and (3) create economic development opportunities for existing residents.

While the proposed rezoning within the Project Area would create new zoning districts, the existing land use classifications and height limits would largely be retained.

## **POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND HOUSING**

The Project is a “high housing option” plan that would revise land use controls to allow more intensive development of medical, retail, and commercial uses, as well as additional housing. Through these changes in land use controls and designations, the Project could reduce the potential amount of employment associated with PDR activities and increase the potential amount of employment in medical, retail, and commercial activities. Development of approximately 2.4 million square feet as envisioned by the Project would accommodate an estimated 5,523 new jobs, which is intended, in part, to provide employment opportunities for residents of the area.



The projected need for affordable housing may exceed that provided by the Project in the Project Area; however, there are no standards of significance for the provision of affordable housing, and, therefore, this is not considered to be a significant adverse impact. Nevertheless, the Project includes an Affordable Housing Program to address the need for affordable housing in the Project Area and to assist current homeowners in maintaining and retaining their homes. Further, the number of non-affordable housing units provided in the Project Area would exceed the demand for these units.

The transportation model for the Project anticipates population growth of 20,896 residents in the Project Area in 2025. This increase would be significantly larger than the increase of 2,815 residents anticipated without the project in the Year 2025 and would account for nearly one-quarter (24 percent) of the citywide population growth (80,100 residents) anticipated in San Francisco during this same 25-year period.

## **VISUAL QUALITY**

### **View Corridors and Visual Quality**

Bayview Hunters Point consists of visually heterogeneous neighborhoods located in the southeastern quadrant of San Francisco, surrounded by the Visitacion Valley to the south, Bernal Heights to the west, and Hunters Point Shipyard and the San Francisco Bay to the east. The area has distinct visual boundaries and surroundings, such as Cesar Chavez Street to the north and the US 101 freeway to the west. The most prominent visual landmarks in the Project Area are San Francisco Bay to the east and the hills, including Hunters Point Hill and Silver Terrace Hill in the approximate center of the Project Area, and Bayview Hill to the south. Within these boundaries are single-family houses, apartment buildings, parklands, undeveloped properties, and a wide variety of retail and commercial buildings, as well as industrial warehouses and structures. Third Street, a major commercial corridor, is in the natural valley created by Hunters Point Hill and Silver Terrace Hill.

The overall visual impression of the Project Area would change subtly as street trees and greenery are added, infill development is completed on various sites, the Hunters Point Power

Plant is eventually replaced with less visually dominant mixed-use development, and certain Port and State lands along the shoreline are converted to public park uses.

New development would generally be consistent with existing development with regard to height and scale, and major scenic views or view corridors would not be obstructed. Renovation and rehabilitation of existing structures, particularly along Third Street, would contribute to enhanced visual quality. The Project would also aid in separating industrial uses from mixed use and residential uses, thereby providing increased visual coherence. In fact, one of the intended goals of the Project is to improve the visual character of the Project Area by eliminating physical blight.

However, development of the Stadium Development Retail/Entertainment Center would result in visual impacts on short-range views due to the allowed mass and height of the proposed structure. The new stadium would obstruct scenic views of the bay looking southeast along Gilman Street. The new mall would block some shoreline and bay views from residences at the St. Francis Bay Condominiums on the southern side of Bayview Hill. The new mall would also change the visual character of the Candlestick Point State Recreation Area, as a portion of the park would be used for parking. These are considered significant, unavoidable visual impacts to scenic views of the Bay. However, the removal of the existing stadium may improve southern views of the bay from those areas directly north of Candlestick Park.

### **Lighting**

The mixed-use development of vacant parcels and unused buildings with infill development would create new sources of light, particularly as residential uses are added to Third Street, and as transition areas are created between exclusively industrial areas and mixed use areas. As the Project envisions creation of development that takes advantage of the Third Street Light Rail Transit (LRT), creating a 24-hour community (office and commercial during the day, and residential at night), the mixed use areas are likely to require nighttime lighting in addition to any security lighting that would normally occur. These new sources of light would be typical of urban development elsewhere in San Francisco and would not generate obtrusive lighting that would be substantially visible from other neighborhoods.

The impact of lighting from Stadium Development Retail/Entertainment Center would depend on the combination of effects from stadium light towers, scoreboards, parking lot lights, circulation traffic, the frequency of night games at the stadium, and architectural/perimeter lighting from the entire complex. While the existing stadium lighting would be replaced in kind with lighting for the new stadium, the new mall would be an ongoing, new source of light. The new mall would be open during some portion of the evening, and lights from the new mall, the parking lot, and vehicles would represent an unavoidable increase in overall lighting levels. The new mall lights would be seen from numerous vantage points and nearby residential areas. This substantial new source of light could adversely affect adjacent properties, which is considered a significant and unavoidable impact. Chapter IV identifies a mitigation measure to avoid this effect.

#### Bayview Connections Urban Open Space Project

As part of the Bayview Connections Urban Open Space Project, portions of Mendell Avenue and Oakdale Avenue at the Opera House block would be permanently closed to vehicle traffic. It would become new community space as part of an enhanced Opera House Plaza open space area for community functions. Additionally, the proposed Oakdale transit hub, at Third Street and Oakdale Avenue, would have transit shelters and a plaza.

As part of the Bayview Opera House Plaza Project, a significant new public space would be constructed adjacent to the Opera House on Third Street. This pedestrian and streetscape improvement project would create a greater visual cohesion between the Southeast Community Facility and the Third Street Opera House Block. Oakdale and Palou Avenues would have landscape and street improvements, including increased street lighting, street trees and infill planting, street furniture, designated bicycle lanes, and street bulb-outs, which would echo the streetscape improvements along the Third Street corridor.

In addition, a proposed senior housing project would be constructed across the street at McKinnon Street, east of Third Street. The new buildings would block a portion of the west elevation of the Bayview Opera House from Third Street. The historic north façade, however, would remain visible from Third Street and McKinnon Street. While the proposed senior housing project would be a major new addition to this area in terms of scale and bulk, it would be expected to be generally compatible with adjacent development.

These improvements would not affect mid- or long-range views of Bernal Heights to the west and Silver Terrace to the north. The addition of landscaping and removal of vehicle access would examine the existing conditions. In general, the Bayview Connections Urban Open Space Project would have a beneficial aesthetic impact.

## **SHADOW**

The Project includes rezoning within the Project Area. In some cases, rezoning could increase the potential height of new development in excess of 40 feet, which could potentially shade recreation and open space areas under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department. The Project would incorporate existing *San Francisco Planning Code* controls that apply to the Project Area, and new development in the Project Area would be subject to *Planning Code* Sections 146, 147, and 295 regarding new shadows. New structures proposed over 40 feet in height would be subject to Section 295 review of shadow effects on Recreation and Park Department property.

## **WIND**

In developed areas, buildings that are about 100 feet or more in height can redirect wind flows around buildings and divert winds downward to street level, which can result in increased wind speed and turbulence at street level. The extent and magnitude of wind effects caused by new buildings in the area would depend on the actual design, height, bulk, placement of each specific structure in relationship to prevailing winds, adjacent buildings, streets, and open space areas.

A building that is surrounded by taller structures is not likely to cause adverse wind accelerations at ground level, while even a small building can cause wind problems if it is freestanding and exposed. For example, the proposed mall in the Candlestick Point Activity Node would not result in a significant wind impact because the 60 foot tall mall would be sheltered by the 200-foot tall stadium.

Buildings over a height of 100 feet could be planned in portions of the Candlestick Point Activity Node, and these new taller buildings could adversely affect the street-level wind

environment. However, design information is not yet available for specific buildings and no further conclusion can be made at this time. Although Section 148 of the *Planning Code* does not apply to the Project Area, wind evaluations would be required for future development for those projects that propose buildings within these specific activity nodes, which would exceed 100 feet in height. These wind evaluations would focus on the potential for hazardous winds and would evaluate the need for building redesign, windbreak features, or further detailed wind-tunnel studies of structures proposed in the future. The building design and review process for each specific project would require analysis and mitigation of any hazardous wind effects. Wind impacts would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis.

## **CULTURAL RESOURCES**

### **Prehistoric and Historic Archaeological Deposits**

Documented prehistoric and historic archeological deposits are located within the Northern Gateway, Town Center, and South Basin Activity Nodes, although archaeological sites could be located throughout the Project Area, as described in Section III.J, Setting. The Project calls for development activities to occur on infill sites. Ground-disturbing activities in close proximity to these sites could damage or destroy archeological resources potentially eligible for inclusion in the CRHR. In addition, development in these areas would greatly increase the possibility of encountering other related and/or similar resources potentially eligible for inclusion in the CRHR. As a result, development on or near these locations could lead to potentially significant impacts to prehistoric and historic archaeological deposits (see Mitigation Measures 12, 13, and 14).

### **Potentially Historic Structures**

No historic structures have been identified within Candlestick Point Activity Node. Properties within the Northern Gateway Activity Node, Town Center Activity Node, Health Center Activity Node, Oakinba Activity Node, South Basin Activity Node, and Hunter's Point Shoreline Activity Node have been assigned a status code of "3," "4," or "5." (see Table B-1 in Appendix B).

The Project calls for a significant amount of new construction to occur on underutilized parcels and vacant infill opportunity sites within these activity nodes. Construction activities directed toward any of the properties assigned a status code of “3,” “4,” or “5” requiring demolition, relocation, or substantial alterations to the structure or its immediate surrounding, such that the structure’s potential historic significance would be materially impaired, would be a significant effect on the environment. This would be considered a potentially significant impact (see Mitigation Measures 15 and 16).

## **TRANSPORTATION**

### **Traffic Impacts**

The transportation analysis for this EIR reviewed 15 intersections serving the Project Area; 15 study intersections operate at acceptable levels of service in the PM peak hour (LOS D or better). The six study intersections evaluated for the midday peak hour would operate at satisfactory conditions on weekends. With conditions for the year 2025 Base Case plus the Project, five intersections would be significantly impacted by Project traffic. In the weekday PM peak hour, the additional trips generated by the Project would deteriorate levels of service to unacceptable levels at two study intersections, and would contribute to substantial delay at four intersections. The Third Street/Evans Avenue intersection would worsen the LOS D in the 2025 Base Case to LOS E with Project conditions. The Bayshore Boulevard/Paul Avenue would worsen from LOS D to LOS F. The following six intersections would operate at LOS E or F for the year 2025 Project conditions, with generally greater delays than for 2025 Baseline conditions:

- Third Street/Cesar Chavez Street (LOS F, increase in delay);
- Third Street/Evans Avenue (from LOS D to LOS E);
- Bayshore Boulevard/Paul Avenue (from LOS D to LOS F);
- Bayshore Boulevard/Silver Avenue (LOS F, increase in delay);
- Bayshore Boulevard/Industrial Way/Alemanay Boulevard (LOS F); and
- Cesar Chavez Street/Evans Avenue (LOS F, increase in delay)

- The Project would be considered to have a substantial contribution to LOS E or F conditions at five of these six intersections. At the Bayshore Boulevard/Industrial Street/Alemaný Boulevard intersection, the Project would contribute less than 0.5 percent of the trips at the critical turning movement. The Project's impacts would be less-than-significant.
- Chapter IV identifies mitigation measures to reduce Project impacts. The intersections of Third Street/Cesar Chavez Street, Third Street/Evans Avenue, Bayshore Boulevard/Paul Avenue, Bayshore Boulevard/Silver Avenue, and the Evans Avenue/Cesar Chavez Street intersections mitigation measures would be feasible. The mitigation measures identified for conditions at the Third Street/Cesar Chavez intersection are considered infeasible, and that impact would be an unavoidable significant adverse effect.
- In addition, the freeway segment northbound US 101 south of I-280 would be considered a significant and unavoidable impact as no feasible mitigation is available.

### **Transit Impacts**

The Project would generate approximately 10,766 new transit trips (5,323 inbound; 5,443 outbound) new transit trips on a typical weekday and 889 trips (458 inbound; 431 outbound) during PM peak hour. The majority of the transit trips would be generated by the Candlestick, Health Center and the Hunters Point Shoreline Activity Nodes. There would be a net increase of 858 MUNI riders during the PM peak hour within the Project Area. The estimated MUNI ridership also includes transfers to the regional transit carriers, such as AC Transit, Golden Gate, SamTrans and BART. All MUNI bus lines would operate substantially below capacity for both inbound and outbound directions, except the west screenline in the inbound direction. Over 31,000 transit trips currently cross the three regional screenlines. More than half (69 percent) of transit trips cross the East Bay screenline, with approximately 82 percent of these trips on BART. Approximately 3,890 trips cross the North Bay screenline, mostly on the Golden Gate Transit buses. Approximately 5,840 trips cross the South Bay screenline, with approximately 54 percent of these trips on BART. All regional transit providers currently operate at less than their design capacity (meaning seats are

generally available), except BART in the East Bay Corridor. BART East Bay corridor would operate at 120 percent capacity, which would near its capacity threshold of 135 percent.

### **Pedestrian Impacts**

The Project would generate approximately 2,210 net new pedestrian trips on a typical weekday during PM peak hour. As most of the streets in the Study Area have sidewalks and the estimated pedestrian trips would be dispersed throughout the Project Area, no significant pedestrian impacts would be expected. It is anticipated, however, that there would be a moderate increase in pedestrian trips at the crosswalks near the LRT stations along Third Street. This increase would not impact the operations of the existing crosswalks. It should be noted that currently, however, several streets on the west side of Third Street do not have complete sidewalks and crosswalk painting is faded.



### **Bicycle Impacts**

The Project would generate approximately 79 new bicycle trips on a typical weekday during the PM peak hour for the Study Area. There are currently eight bicycle routes in Bayview Hunters Point, one of which has designated bicycle lane (Route 68) and one of them has wide curb lanes (Route 7). As these 79 bicycle trips would be dispersed throughout the Project Area during the PM peak hour, no significant pedestrian impacts would be expected.

### **Parking Impacts**

A parking demand analysis used the methodology established in the *SF Guidelines*. The Project would generate demand for approximately 9,150 to 10,630 parking spaces of which 6,621 would be long-term parking (4,070 to 5,550 for residential uses and 2,551 for non-residential uses) and 2,530 would be short-term parking.

It is anticipated that specific development would meet *Planning Code* parking requirements. As presented in the Setting, sections of the Project Area have available parking. In general, parking is more constrained in portions of the industrial areas and along Third Street.

### **Loading Impacts**

Loading demand was estimated based on the methodology presented in the *SF Guidelines*. The Project would generate a demand for approximately 32 loading spaces during an average hour and 40 spaces during the peak hour. It is recommended that the Redevelopment Agency, Planning Department, and Municipal Transportation Agency should establish procedures and requirements for detailed operational level analysis as specific development projects advance through the City's review process.

### **Goods Movement**

The amount of truck trips in 2025 would be approximately 77 during the average hour and 96 during the peak hour. It is anticipated that these trucks would use major arterials such as Third

Street to access the freeways and industrial and retail destinations in the Project Area. Therefore, these roads will experience additional truck traffic.

### **Construction Impacts**

Potential construction impacts for individual developments in the Project Area due to implementing the Project are not considered significant as they are temporary and of short-term duration. The City of San Francisco has established requirements and procedures for construction projects. Specific impacts for each development would be analyzed on a project-by-project basis.

### **AIR QUALITY**

To perform a plan-level analysis, as suggested by the BAAQMD to evaluate the air quality impacts resulting from implementation of a Redevelopment Plan, the population estimates of the Project were compared to the population assumptions in the 2000 Clean Air Plan. The Project population assumptions are based on the San Francisco cumulative growth scenario of one percent from 2000 to 2025 (based on ABAG Projections 2002), while the 2000 Clean Air Plan population growth assumption is 1.1 percent for the region. Therefore, population growth for the region will not exceed the values included in the current 2000 Clean Air Plan.

Future vehicle trips were based on data from the San Francisco Transportation Authority's citywide travel forecasting model. This model assumes that increases in vehicle miles traveled are lower in the future than the rate of increase in population for the City of San Francisco because of patterns of public transportation in San Francisco. This is consistent with the current 2000 Clean Air Plan population and growth assumptions for vehicle-miles traveled, and shows consistency of the Project with the *San Francisco General Plan* and the 2000 Clean Air Plan.

In addition, the *San Francisco General Plan* is consistent with the 2000 Clean Air Plan because it has adopted and implemented the 2000 Clean Air Plan Transportation Control Measures into the *General Plan's* Transportation Element. The Project would be consistent

with the *General Plan* policies regarding Transportation Control Measures and would, therefore, be consistent with the 2000 Clean Air Plan Transportation Control Measures.

In addition to the regional contribution to the total pollution burden, traffic due to implementing the Project could result in localized CO hot spots stagnation points, such as major intersections and heavily traveled and congested roadways. However, based upon the CALINE4 model, which is used to estimate CO concentrations for the seven worst intersections that operate at an LOS D or worse (see Section III.C, Transportation) under existing conditions, future year 2025 cumulative conditions, and future year 2025 cumulative-plus-project conditions, congestion at these intersections not violate federal or state CO standards.

Demolition and construction activities can generate emissions that impact air quality, including PM<sub>10</sub> emissions. The analysis of project construction impacts follows BAAQMD recommendations in focusing effort on the development of effective and comprehensive PM<sub>10</sub> control measures, rather than the detailed quantification of emissions, primarily because the mitigation measures outlined within the *BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines* would reduce temporary construction air quality impacts to less-than-significant levels.

With respect to Toxic Air Contaminants (TAC), California law and BAAQMD rules provide various mechanisms designed to protect sensitive receptors, including school siting procedures, BAAQMD permit procedures, BAAQMD review of TAC emissions, and provision of the Hot Spots program, when a sensitive receptor is located within 500 meters (1,640 feet) of a source of TACs. Nonetheless, without the ability to predict future TAC concentrations, and in the absence of specific standards of significance for risks from TACs, the significance of this potential impact is unknown.

## **NOISE**

Construction-related noise impacts resulting from implementation of the Project would have a short-term effect at individual project locations. In addition to noise from the construction sites, construction activities would cause increased traffic noise along access routes to the development sites. However, construction activities in the Project Area would be conducted in

compliance with the *San Francisco Noise Ordinance* (Article 29, *San Francisco Police Code*). Section 2908 of the *Noise Ordinance* prohibits construction work between 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., if noise would exceed the ambient noise level by 5 dBA at the project property line, unless a special permit is authorized by the Director of Public Works. Compliance with the *Noise Ordinance* would reduce any impacts to a less-than-significant level.

New development resulting from implementing the Project may introduce a variety of stationary sources of noise, including electrical and mechanical air conditioning equipment, most of which would be located on rooftops. Although noise levels from equipment sources may be annoying in a quiet environment, existing ambient noise conditions within the Project Area would generally mask on-site equipment noise. Noise levels from operation of equipment would result in an increase of ambient noise levels that would be less than significant.

In addition to air quality effects, traffic due to implementing the Project could result in noise impacts at major intersections. Project-related traffic could add more cars to area roadways, and could increase the noise associated with cause existing non-project traffic to travel at slower, less pollution-efficient travel speeds. Table III.I-5 presents noise levels at five locations associated with traffic increases in the Project Area. Weekday PM peak-hour traffic conditions were estimated for existing conditions, future conditions without the Project, and future cumulative conditions for year 2025. Development resulting from the Project would create a less-than-significant increase in noise levels in the Project Area, because the noise levels would not increase above 2.8 dBA. Nuisance noise is generally limited by the San Francisco Noise Ordinance to increases of 5 dBA above ambient conditions.

The Enhanced Truck Route Program would designate truck routes to divert traffic away from residential areas and would physically improve truck routes with landscaping appropriate for truck “parkways.” Streetscape amenities, such as increased lighting, wider sidewalks, and bicycle lanes would create streets that are intended to be safer for pedestrians. Although the specific routes are not finalized, it is assumed that the new truck routes would have an overall beneficial effect on the noise environment in the Project Area by focusing truck traffic on non-residential routes.

Existing traffic noise levels at most of the study locations near residential uses are high enough (above 65 dBA on the exterior of the building) for the *San Francisco General Plan* Environmental Protection Element to discourage new residential development unless noise reduction features are included in their design. New residential buildings are required to meet interior noise standards established in Title 24 of the *California Code of Regulations* and, therefore, include noise insulation based on existing noise levels at these sites.

Implementation of the Project could result in new or expanded retail and entertainment uses (such as the Stadium Development Retail/Entertainment Center) that could affect nearby residences. While the associated noise conditions may disturb residents occupying new buildings in the vicinity, noise effects would be limited by the noise insulation requirements for new residential construction, project review requirements for entertainment uses in the Project Area, and enforcement of the San Francisco Noise Ordinance.

The Project would mainly rezone existing industrial land uses to new PDR zoning designations that would create distinct industrial areas and residential uses mixed with commercial and PDR uses along the Third Street corridor. These land uses would not differ with existing land uses with respect to ambient noises; however, the rezoning would create a buffer or transition zone by placing light PDR zones between heavy PDR zones and residential and other sensitive receptors. While exterior noise levels may increase and result in associated interior noise level increases, these increases would not be of the magnitude to substantially alter the exterior noise environment and would not cause a significant impact.

## **HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

Implementation of the Project would encourage growth and expansion of existing and new businesses, some of which could be industrial, which could use, handle, transport, or dispose of hazardous materials and hazardous wastes. The increased use of hazardous substances could increase the potential for exposure to workers, the public, and the environment. When handled properly and used in compliance with permitted and other regulatory requirements, such as Brownfields regulations and policies, the Polanco Redevelopment Act, the California Health and Safety Code, the California Land Environmental Restoration and Reuse Act, and

the San Francisco Health Code, hazardous substances are anticipated to not necessarily pose a human health concern or a threat to the environment. Although the risk of upset can never be completely eliminated, any future production or generation of hazardous materials would not be expected to create a public health or environmental hazard if adequate safety precautions are employed. This impact would be considered less than significant.

Because the extent of demolition or renovation that would occur due to the implementation of the Project is unknown, and the location and quantity of hazardous building materials within the Project Area is also unknown, the specific potential for worker and public exposure to hazardous building materials cannot be evaluated at this time. Potential exposure to hazardous materials must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and would be subject to appropriate regulatory oversight.

Based on the nature and extent of identified sites containing hazardous materials, as well as historical and current land uses within the Project Area, the potential exists to encounter hazardous substances in the soil or groundwater during excavation and grading activities. Contaminated material may require special handling and disposal requirements if removed from the site. If hazardous substances were encountered during implementation of the Project, the need for site investigations and remediation would be determined on a case-by-case basis by the appropriate regulatory agency.

## **GEOLOGY**

The Project Area is already a developed urban area, and future renovation or replacement of existing structures would not change the geological, soil, or seismic environment of the area. Nonetheless, because it is necessary to design structures and facilities to withstand the anticipated effects of geologic failure, such as seismic activity from nearby as well as distant faults or landslides, there is a comprehensive regulatory environment in place to ensure that risks to people and property are managed to the maximum extent practical. The major state regulations protecting the public from geo-seismic hazards, other than surface faulting, are contained in the California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 2, the California Building Code and the California Public Resources Code, Division 2, Chapter 7.8, The Seismic Hazards

Mapping Act. Both the California Building Code and the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act apply to public buildings and a large percentage of private buildings intended for human use or occupancy. On July 29, 2003, California adopted a new building code for most commercial construction, developed by the National Fire Protection Association, as the basis for updating the state's building code. The state also adopted the International Building Code as the basis for California's residential construction. Following incorporation of the new codes into the state's existing building code, and a series of public hearings, the revised code could become law as early as 2005. Project permits issued after the adoption of the law would be subject to the provisions of the revised code. At the local level, each individual development project resulting from implementation of the Project would be required to conform to the *San Francisco Building Code*, which includes seismic safety performance standards that apply to all new construction in the city. The San Francisco Department of Building Inspection (DBI) would, in its review of building permit applications, require that each individual development project prepare a geotechnical report pursuant to the State Seismic Hazards Mapping Act. The report would assess the nature and severity of geologic hazard(s) on the site and recommend project design and construction features that would reduce the hazard(s).

To ensure compliance with all current *San Francisco Building Code* provisions regarding structural safety, when the DBI reviews the geotechnical report and building plans for each development proposal, it determines the necessary engineering and design features for the project to reduce potential damage to structures from geologic failure. Therefore, potential damage to structures in the Project Area would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level through the DBI requirement for a geotechnical report and review of the building permit application pursuant to its implementation of the *Building Code*.

## **HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

Groundwater dewatering may be required for construction of specific redevelopment projects; however, this temporary dewatering would not substantially affect groundwater resources, and discharge of any groundwater produced by dewatering to the sewer system would be regulated by a permit from the City. Further, groundwater is not used or planned as a potable water supply in this part of San Francisco. Flooding hazards are not an issue because, with the

possible exception of flooding due to inadequate sewer capacity, the Project Area is not subject to flooding and the Project would have no impacts on flooding.

Implementation of the Project would facilitate new development in the Project Area which, as a worst-case scenario, would generate increased year-round sanitary sewage flows to the combined sewer system and would result in no change in stormwater runoff. Because the combined sewer system is designed to overflow during intense storms and because the increase in sanitary sewage flows would occur year-round, the Project could indirectly result in cumulative, long-term contributions to an increase in average volume of CSO discharges in the Project Area.

However, compliance with the following existing regulations and policies would protect water quality and beneficial uses of the Bay:

- The Project Sponsor would be required to coordinate with the SFPUC to ensure that new developments resulting from implementation of the Project would remain in full compliance with all aspects of the federal CSO Control Policy, including the nine minimum controls and appropriate pretreatment and pollution prevention programs. This includes compliance of all new developments with Article 4.1 of the San Francisco Public Works Code during both construction and operation. This would ensure consistency with existing water quality regulation protecting Bay water quality.
- The Project Sponsor would be required to comply with conservation of water use consistent with existing and future guidelines recommended by the SFPUC. This would reduce the volume of sanitary flow to the combined sewer system.
- The Project Sponsor would be required to incorporate recycled water use in planning and design (i.e., install dual plumbing) of major new developments consistent with guidelines in the Recycled Water Ordinance and the Recycled Water Master Plan Update, when adopted. This would reduce the volume of sanitary flow to the combined sewer system.

In addition, concurrent with the proposed schedule for implementation of the Project, the SFPUC has numerous ongoing planning efforts that address CSO discharges and associated water quality impacts as part of citywide plans and programs. These planning efforts address long-term objectives of compliance with existing and future regulatory requirements and overall protection of water quality, aquatic resources and beneficial uses of San Francisco Bay. Any activities associated with the Project that could affect wastewater and stormwater management must be conducted within the context of the existing regulatory framework, but



also coordinated within the context of ongoing and future citywide planning efforts. Coordination of the Project with these plans would provide additional protection of water quality and beneficial uses.

## **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

The Project Area is almost entirely built out and supports no known sensitive species. Also, the Project does not have specific physical elements other than those associated with changing truck routes, land use designations, and improvements to existing landscaping. For these reasons, implementation of the Project does not exceed the significance criteria as they relate to sensitive species, wildlife movement, or species diversity. Implementation of the Project may result in impacts to wetland habitat, street trees, and nesting birds. Although these elements are discussed and mitigation measures is proposed, it is expected that site-specific environmental evaluation would be conducted for site-specific individual projects that fall within the Project Area.

Construction activities within or near shoreline portions of the Project Area could directly impact wetlands, mud flats, or salt marsh habitats in a variety of ways, including placement of fill, structures, or alteration of habitat. Any activities within these areas could result in loss of sensitive habitats or species that use these habitats. Impacts to these sensitive habitats could be considered potentially significant (see **Mitigation Measure 17**).

Construction activities associated with the Project would generally be limited to existing paved streets or disturbed areas. Street trees within the Project Area are not sensitive species. However, there is potential that damage to existing street trees and other mature vegetation (as a result of injury to roots, trunk, or branches) could occur at any construction site within the Project Area. Because they are regulated by the Urban Forestry Ordinance, damage to, or removal of, existing mature trees could be considered a potentially significant impact (see **Mitigation Measure 18**).

Removal of street trees and other landscape vegetation could also result in disturbance or mortality of adult or juvenile resident bird species. Disturbance could result in nest abandonment. Because of the high levels of development and human activity in the Project

Area, only common urban bird species are likely to nest in street trees. No special-status species are known to nest within the Project Area. For these reasons, removal of street trees and landscape vegetation would not surpass the significance criteria for this project and would be considered a less-than-significant impact; therefore, no mitigation is required. Depending on the timing and species affected, vegetation removal could result in a potential violation of Fish and Game Code (Sections 3503, 3513, or 3800) if it would result in destruction of bird nests. It is expected that the project sponsor would comply with the applicable regulations. Although this impact is considered less than significant, the following improvement measure is provided to facilitate compliance with state and federal laws related to the protection of nesting birds (see **Mitigation Measure 19**). With implementation of Mitigation Measures 17 through 19, all impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

## **PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES**

### **Police Protection**

As of July 2004, the SFPD had approximately 100 sworn personnel in the Bayview Station and maintained a ratio of 3.8 sworn personnel per 1,000 City residents based on the 26,249 residents in the Project Area. Implementation of the Project (6,146 residential units) would increase the residents within the Project Area by approximately 20,896 persons. In order to maintain the service ratio of 3.8 sworn personnel per 1,000 City residents and meet the needs of the City, the SFPD would need to provide an additional 80 officers (79.4) under the Project buildout by 2025.

The ability of the SFPD to support the needs of future growth is dependent upon its financial ability to hire additional sworn personnel. As stated previously, the Mayor's 2004-2005 budget includes funding to hire 40 new police officers within the SFPD. Although it is currently unknown what stations these new officers will be assigned to, it is assumed that this increase and other potential increases in sworn personnel could be assigned to the Bayview Station as a result of project implementation. Since the existing Bayview Station was constructed in 1997, it is assumed that this facility would be able to provide adequate space for some of the additional 80 sworn officers that would be needed as a result of the Project

buildout. However, this increase in personnel and likely related increase in police facilities is a less-than-significant impact as new development would be subject to impact fees that could be used to construct new facilities.

Further, it should be noted that in as much as the SFPD bases its future growth and projections upon the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) projections, the population increase as a result of the Project has already been assumed under the ABAG 2025 projections for the City as a whole. In addition, if successful, the Project would eliminate blight that is currently prevalent in the area through the development of affordable housing; provisions for retail, commercial, and community space; and overall economic and community enhancement. These physical improvements could help lessen illegal activities through the introduction of new residents and a revitalized commercial district along Third Street.

### **Fire Protection**

The SFFD does not have adopted standards or performance objectives for response times or service ratios. However, development associated with the Project would be required to comply with all regulations of the 2001 California Fire Code, which establishes requirements pertaining to fire protection systems, including the provision of state-mandated smoke alarms, fire extinguishers, appropriate building access, and emergency response notification systems. As stated previously, the SFFD currently maintains average emergency response times with existing equipment of approximately 2.5 minutes to 4.5 minutes to the Project Area. The SFFD has stated that the existing fire protection services in the Project Area are adequate, and that development under the Project could cause delays in response due to traffic concerns and added call volume.

One of the most important criteria for effective firefighting is the response time needed to reach the site of the fire. Existing stations are strategically located to ensure adequate service within the Project Area. Nevertheless, additional development at buildout under the Project would increase the number of residents and employees residing in the Project Area, as well as increase the total number of structures. In addition, implementation of the Project could cause delays in response times due to traffic concerns and added call volume. Based on the potential

for increased medical calls, responses to alarms, and increased traffic in the area, the SFFD has stated that another ambulance and possibly another engine company would be necessary to serve the Project Area. However, as also noted by the SFFD, Project Area redevelopment and associated revenues would constitute a contributory impact on the city as a whole, as future revenues could be used to help maintain firehouses in the area if deemed necessary by the City. This, combined with the relatively dispersed and incremental nature of proposed development, would result in a less-than-significant impact on fire services. In addition, developer impact fees would be assessed that could be used to construct new facilities.

The quantity of water required for fire protection (i.e., fire flows) varies and is dependent upon many factors that are specific to each particular building, such as the floor area, type of construction, expected occupancy, type of activities conducted within the building, and the distance to adjacent buildings. Due to the possibility of a fire occurring on any given day, the required fire flow in the Project Area must operate with maximum-day demands occurring elsewhere throughout the water system. Since project-specific fire flows and fire-flow demand rates are not currently available, this analysis relies on a worst-case scenario, or maximum demand of fire flow requirements, as found in Appendix IIIA of the California Fire Code. The maximum fire flow that any structure or project site would require is 8,000 gallons per minute (gpm) for a duration of four hours. It should be noted that exceptions to this occur when the building is provided with an approved automatic sprinkler system, in which a reduction of 75 percent of the fire flow is allowed. As such, with the provision of sprinkler systems for structures throughout the Project Area, the maximum fire flow required would be 2,000 gpm. However, all development plans would be reviewed by the SFFD prior to construction to ensure that adequate fire flows would be maintained (including localized pipe upgrades or connections that might be required to connect new buildings to the system), and that an adequate number of fire hydrants would be provided in the appropriate locations in compliance with the California Fire Code. Therefore, although the existing fire flows are unknown, adequate fire flows would be required by law prior to construction.

## **Schools**

The increase of approximately 1,248 students within the SFUSD in the Study Area would increase enrollment in the schools serving the project area to approximately 3,845 students, which could reach the existing capacity of these schools. As this is a conservative analysis of the Study Area, and the SFUSD anticipates a decrease in the student population over the next ten years, new or expanded school facilities are not anticipated to be required as a direct result of implementation of the Project. In addition, as discussed in the SFUSD Facilities Master Plan, enrollment is anticipated to decrease over the next ten years and result in an increase in excess capacity, which would ensure that the additional students resulting from implementation of the Project would be provided with sufficient educational facilities to meet their academic needs. With the anticipated increase in excess capacity throughout the SFUSD over the next ten years, impacts to school services are considered a less-than-significant impact within the Study Area.

## **Libraries**

With implementation of the Project, it is anticipated that approximately 20,896 residents with an associated 6,146 dwelling units would occur at buildout. This increase in residents would substantially intensify the demand for library services and facilities as well as community centers, and may require new construction. As stated in the San Francisco Public Library Strategic Plan (2003-2006), there is no national standard for library service. Instead, each library must evaluate how it may best meet the needs of the community. To this end, the San Francisco Public Library has developed a Strategic Plan that provides every library facility and program with a unifying organizational vision and system-wide goals. These goals are broad and flexible enough to tailor services to each unique neighborhood. The Strategic Plan also provides a framework to consider opportunities for new programs and services.

As stated previously, the Branch Library Improvement Program, which is currently underway, will renovate 19 branches, replace four leased facilities with City-owned branches, and construct a new branch in Mission Bay. Thus, because the Bayview/Anna E. Waden library branch is included in this planned upgrade, and because the Strategic Plan outlines continuous

measures to maintain and improve the existing library facilities for the surrounding communities, it is anticipated that the upgraded facilities would be able to accommodate the increase in residential population as a result of the Project.

In addition, new development would contribute revenue from property taxes to the City fund, which could be used to fund library services, if the City deemed necessary. In addition, new development would also be subject to development impact fees that could be used to construct new library facilities or expand existing libraries.

### **Parks**

The increase in residents and visitors anticipated by the project would likely increase the demand for new or expanded recreation facilities. The Community Enhancements Program will both add open space and new recreation areas, as well as provide for their long-term maintenance. These planned open space projects are expected to convert industrial uses to open space and recreational uses and in the case of shoreline parklands, would open up views of the bay that are currently blocked by industrial development or are inaccessible to the public. Because the existing project area is predominantly industrial, increasing park services and open space would have no adverse impacts, and could even result in a positive beneficial impact to the community.

### **Water Supply**

Senate Bills 221 and 610 require a water provider to furnish substantial evidence that adequate water supplies would be available to meet the water demands of new customers through normal and single-dry and multiple-dry years for a 20-year period. This evidence is established in a project-specific water supply assessment (WSA) or an Urban Water Management Plan. The Project would include development of about 2.4 million square feet of mixed uses. New population in the Project Area would include about 20,896 new residents and about 5,308 net new employees. Water generation factors are based on population with 60 gallons per day for residents and 35 gallons per day per employee for all commercial and institutional uses. At build-out in 2025, all development due to implementation of the Project would use about 1,439,540 gallons per day of water. Development and population growth

associated with the Project would be within the ABAG Year 2000 Projections, and as such, the project would not be required to obtain a water assessment from the SFPUC. Because the Project would be within expected growth projections for the City, less-than-significant water supply impacts are anticipated.

### **Wastewater**

The Project would create about 2.4 million square feet of mixed uses. Generation factors from the 1998 Mission Bay Subsequent Environmental Impact Report were used to determine daily wastewater demand for the Project. At buildout in 2025, all development would generate approximately 940,336 gallons of wastewater per day, as presented in Table III.O-4. Because the Project would be within expected growth projection for the City, less-than-significant impacts on wastewater treatment capacity are anticipated.

### **Solid Waste**

Residents in the Project Area would be expected to generate approximately 9,250 pounds of solid waste per day, and approximately 3,376,250 pounds per year (365 days). The Project Area is expected to have 2.4 million square feet of development, which would be expected to generate 39,971 pounds per day and 10,392,460 pounds per year (260 weekdays) of solid waste, as presented in Table III.O-5.

In 2002, San Francisco generated a total of 1,882,490 tons of solid waste, of which 702,012 tons (or 37 percent) were disposed of in the Altamont Landfill and 1,180,478 tons (or 63 percent) were diverted from the solid waste stream through recycling, composting, reuse, source reduction, and other efforts. It is anticipated that the City will continue to improve solid waste service, in order to achieve the recycling goal of 75 percent by 2010, as adopted by the Board of Supervisors in 2002. In addition, the Altamont Landfill is assumed to remain operational for another 19 to 28 years, with an increase of 250 acres of fill area under the expansion plan.

An expansion to the Altamont Landfill was recently approved through a CUP, and a new solid waste facilities permit is anticipated to be approved in summer 2004, extending the facility's

lifespan and increasing the landfill capacity by 40 million tons. Thus, the solid waste disposal demand within the City can be met through 2026, at the very least, once expansion of the Altamont Landfill occurs.

Because of the presumed increase in solid waste recycling and the proposed landfill expansion in size and capacity, the impacts on solid waste from implementation of the Project would be less than significant.

## **ENERGY**

Implementing the Project would result in the consumption of energy in the form of electricity, natural gas, and fuel (gasoline and diesel) during both construction and operation of new buildings. New and remodeled buildings resulting from the Project would be regulated by the Energy Efficiency Standards of Title 24. Compliance with Title 24 would be enforced by the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection through the building permit review process before commitment of energy resource would occur. Compliance with Title 24 would ensure that new buildings resulting from implementation of the Project would not use fuel or energy in a wasteful manner. The additional energy consumption in terms of operational or construction demand would not, by itself, require significant additional capacity in the area that could have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

Although energy costs and environmental impacts of energy consumption may vary with increases in future demand and potential scenarios that may evolve to meet such demand, it is reasonable to expect that the availability of electricity, natural gas, and other fuels will be sufficient to meet energy demand over the next 10 to 20 years.

## **D. MITIGATION MEASURES**

The analysis in Chapter III identifies potential significant environmental effects that could occur from development under the Project. Most of those significant adverse effects could be reduced or eliminated through implementation of the mitigation measures that have been recommended. Development projects proposed in the Project Area would be reviewed by the San Francisco Planning Department, and mitigation measures would be included as part of



project plans, or required under Conditional Use or other approval processes. The mitigation measures that would reduce adverse environmental effects are comprehensively identified in Chapter IV, Mitigation Measures, of this document, and are also provided below for case of reference. Mitigation measures identified in this EIR would be required by decision makers as conditions of project approval unless they are demonstrated to be infeasible based on substantial evidence in the record.

## **PLANS AND POLICIES**

There would be no significant or potentially significant impacts with respect to plans and policies; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

## **LAND USE AND ZONING**

There would be no significant or potentially significant impacts with respect to land use and zoning; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

## **EMPLOYMENT, POPULATION, AND HOUSING**

There would be no significant or potentially significant impacts with respect to employment, population, and housing; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

## **TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION**

### **Mitigation Measure 1: Third Street/Cesar Chavez Street**

- Physical changes to the intersection's geometry would have to be made to mitigate the scenario's impact at this intersection. With the installation of the Third Street LRT, Third Street at Cesar Chavez Street will provide one left turn lane, one through lane, and one shared through-right lane at the northbound approach. To mitigate the project's impact at this intersection, one additional northbound left turn lane would need to be provided. This mitigation measure would result in operating conditions of LOS E (68.8 seconds of delay), with less delay experienced than in the no-project conditions.
- With the Third Street LRT, space could not be taken from the center of Third Street. Parking will not be allowed in either direction on Third Street. To accommodate the additional space needed for a second left turn lane, Third Street would therefore need to be widened to the east. Additional right-of-way acquisition would be necessary in the northeast and southeast quadrants of the intersections to facilitate the widening of Third

Street. This would require the demolition of a portion of two warehouse structures, and substantial right-of-way acquisition (approximately 5,000 square feet in both the northeast and southeast quadrants of the intersection) of industrially zoned land.

- As noted in the Draft EIR, the *Third Street Light Rail Project FEIR* also identified cumulative traffic impacts at the Third Street/Cesar Chavez intersection as significant and unavoidable. No mitigation measures were provided by the Third Street Light Rail Project. The widening of Third Street at this location would be inconsistent with the pedestrian environment being created by the LRT project. A widening of the roadway of this kind would make the pedestrian crossing of Third Street longer and potentially less safe, and would require more dedicated pedestrian crossing time as part of the signal phasing plan. Thus, this mitigation is considered infeasible and this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

**Mitigation Measure 2:** Third Street/Evans Avenue

- Physical changes to the intersection's geometry would have to be made to mitigate the project's impact at this intersection. With the Third Street LRT, this intersection provides Third Street at Evans Avenue with one through lane and one shared through-right lane in both the northbound and southbound directions. There will be left turn lanes in both directions on Third Street. The eastbound approach on Evans Avenue will have one left turn lane, one through lane, and one shared through-right lane. The westbound approach on Evans Avenue will have one left turn lane, two through lanes, and one right turn lane.

- The *Third Street Light Rail Project FEIS and FEIS for the Disposal and Reuse of Hunters Point Shipyard* proposed that the southbound left-turn lane be eliminated at the Third Street/Evans Avenue intersection with the re-routing of turns via Phelps Street to Evans Avenue. In addition, signalization of the Phelps Street/Evans Avenue intersection and removal of parking spaces along Phelps Street and Evans Avenue were proposed as mitigation. This improvement was found to mitigate the Proposed Project's impact at this intersection. This mitigation measure is feasible, but would require right-of-way acquisition, the removal of on-street parking spaces, and substantial construction to build new roadway and sidewalks.

- This mitigation measure would result in operating conditions of LOS D (53.8 seconds of delay), thus fully mitigating the project's impact at this intersection. The measure will be implemented as part of improvements for the approved Hunters Point Shipyard project.

**Mitigation Measure 3:** Bayshore Boulevard/Paul Avenue

Changes to the signal phasing at this intersection would have to be made to mitigate the project's impact at this intersection. Currently, the left turn movements on northbound and southbound Bayshore Boulevard operate with permitted left turns. These movements would be converted to protected left turn movements. No changes in intersection geometry would be made. This mitigation measure would result in

operating conditions of LOS D (41.6 seconds of delay), with less delay experienced than in the no-project conditions.

● The implementation of this mitigation measure would not lead to any adverse impacts. The DPT evaluated this mitigation measure and identified it to be a feasible measure.

**Mitigation Measure 4:** Bayshore Boulevard/Silver Avenue

● Physical changes to the intersection's geometry would have to be made to mitigate the Project's impact at this intersection. Currently, the eastbound approach on Silver Avenue has a shared left-turn and through lane and shared through and right-turn lane. To mitigate the impact at this intersection, an exclusive eastbound right-turn lane would need to be added. The proposed eastbound approach would consist of a shared left-turn and through lane, through lane and an exclusive right turn lane. To provide the right-turn lane the existing US 101 overcrossing would need to be widened. This widening would be needed for approximately 300 feet approaching the intersection; thus, an 11-foot-wide lane addition would result in a total structural modification of approximately 3,300 square feet. This mitigation measure would result in operating conditions of LOS F (V/C ration of 1.71), with less delay experienced than in the 2025 Base Scenario. This mitigation measure is feasible and would reduce Project impacts to a less-than-significant level.

● ~~**Mitigation Measure 5:** Bayshore Boulevard/Industrial Way/Alemanay Boulevard~~  
(Deleted)

**Mitigation Measure 6:** Cesar Chavez Street/Evans Avenue

Physical changes to the intersection's geometry would have to be made to mitigate the project's impact at this intersection. Evans Avenue provides one left-turn lane and one shared left-right lane on the northbound approach at its intersection with Cesar Chavez Street.

● The *FEIS* for the *Disposal and Reuse of Hunters Point Shipyard* identified a project impact at the Cesar Chavez Street/Evans Avenue intersection and proposed the restriping of the northbound approach to consist of two left turn lanes and a right turn lane. Structural modifications to the viaduct would be necessary to provide a proper curb return for right turn movement and will be implemented as part of the Hunters Point Shipyard project.

● These changes would also mitigate the Project's impact. This mitigation measure would result in operating conditions of LOS E (61.6 seconds of delay), with less delay experienced than in the no-project conditions and thus the Project would have a less-than-significant impact at this intersection.

● The DPT evaluated this mitigation measure and identified the structural modification to the viaduct to be feasible.

**Mitigation Measure 6A:** US 101 South of I-280 (Northbound Direction)

Northbound US 101 south of I-280 would need to be widened to mitigate this impact. However, acquiring additional right-of-way in this section without the demolition of existing residences and businesses is not feasible. This impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

● **Mitigation Measure 6B:** Transportation Demand Management

As part of any development agreements or other contractual relationship that the Agency enters into with developers for development in the Plan area, including, but not limited to the Candlestick Mall project, the Agency could require developers to implement the following programs. These measures may help reduce, but would not mitigate impacts at intersections identified with significant transportation impacts:

1. Transit Pass Sales. To the extent transit pass sales locations do not exist near the development, establish a transit pass sales location at the development.
2. Transit, Pedestrian and Bicycle Information. Provide maps of local pedestrian and bicycle routes, transit stops and routes and other information, including bicycle commuter information, on signs and/or kiosks available at the development. Have the developer provide rideshare information and services through 511.org or an equivalent program.

Employee Transit Subsidies. Require developments with 50 or more employees to use a transit subsidy system (e.g., through the Commuter Check Program) for their employees by incorporating transit subsidy requirements in agreements with developers.

4. Secure Bicycle Parking. In addition to the existing requirements of Planning Code Section 155, require developers to provide bicycle parking spaces in off-street parking areas in accordance with the amounts required by San Francisco Planning Code Section 155.1 for City-owned or leased buildings. In developments with 50 or more employees, require employers to provide clothing lockers and showers for bicyclists.
5. Parking Management Guidelines. Establish mandatory parking management policies for any developers that include parking facilities in their development. The mandatory parking management policies would be designed to discourage long-term parking, provide areas for rideshare vehicles and alternative fuel vehicles.
6. Flexible Work Time/Telecommuting. Require developers to offer employees the opportunity to work on flexible schedules and/or telecommute so they can avoid peak hour traffic conditions.

7. Local Hiring. In addition to any applicable requirements of the City's First Source hiring program, require developers to comply with the Agency's local hiring requirements.

## **VISUAL QUALITY**

**Mitigation Measure 7:** The Bayview Hunters Point Design Guidelines would prevent glare in new development by requiring:

- Lighting would be used to illuminate businesses and improve sidewalk visibility and increase building safety.
- Indirect lighting onto signs and the building façade would be encouraged. This would supplement the street lighting for pedestrians and would identify the building and its business occupants.
- Auxiliary security lighting (i.e., floodlights) would be shielded from public view.

## **SOLAR ACCESS AND SHADING**

There would be no significant or potentially significant impacts with respect to solar access and shading; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

## WIND

There would be no significant or potentially significant impacts with respect to solar access and shading; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

## AIR QUALITY

**Mitigation Measure 8:** The following are construction mitigation measures adapted from the *BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines*:

The project sponsor shall prepare and implement a dust control plan. The plan shall be submitted to the City of San Francisco Public Works Department, which would be responsible for field verification of the plan during construction. The plan shall comply with the City grading ordinance. To reduce particulate matter emissions during construction and demolition phases, the contractor shall include in the dust control plan dust control strategies recommended by the BAAQMD. The project sponsor shall include the following measures, as appropriate, in the plans and specifications for construction contracts, and in the dust control plan.

*Basic Control Measures:* to be implemented on all construction sites.

- Cover all trucks hauling construction and demolition debris from the site;
- Water all exposed or disturbed soil surfaces at least twice daily;
- Use watering to control dust generation during demolition of structures or break-up of pavement;
- Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers on all unpaved parking areas and staging areas;
- Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved parking areas and staging areas;
- Provide daily clean-up of mud and dirt carried onto paved streets from the site.

*Enhanced Control Measures:* to be implemented at construction sites greater than four acres in area.

- Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply non-toxic soil binders to exposed stockpiles of soil, sand, etc.;
- Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph;
- Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways;
- Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.

The following are mitigation measures that would reduce, but not eliminate, the possibility that the risks from TAC emissions from individual facilities within the Project Area could result in risks above BAAQMD significance thresholds for projects:

**Mitigation Measure 9:** Prior to issuing a certificate of occupancy for a facility containing potential TAC sources, obtain written verification from BAAQMD either that the facility has been issued a permit from BAAQMD, if required by law, or that permit requirements do not apply to the facility.

**Mitigation Measure 10:** Prohibit dry cleaning facilities that conduct on-site dry cleaning operations from residential areas within the Project Area. For any dry cleaning operations within the Project Area, require vapor barriers in their design and construction so as to reduce exposure to TACs handled at the facility.

**Mitigation Measure 11:** Require preschool and child care centers to notify BAAQMD and the San Francisco Department of Public Health regarding the locations of their operations, and require these centers to consult with these agencies regarding existing and possible future stationary and mobile sources of TACs. The purpose of these consultations is to obtain information so that preschool and child care centers can be located to minimize potential impacts from TAC emission sources.

## NOISE

There would be no significant or potentially significant impacts with respect to noise; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

## CULTURAL RESOURCES

**Mitigation Measure 12:** Prior to any ground-disturbing activities within the Project Area at a depth of three feet below the existing grade, the archeology testing mitigation measures would be implemented.

Based on a reasonable presumption that archeological resources may be present within the Project Area, the following measures shall be undertaken to avoid any potentially significant adverse effect from the Project on buried or submerged historical resources. The project sponsor shall retain the services of a qualified archeological consultant having expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archeology. The archeological consultant shall undertake an archeological testing program as specified herein. In addition, the consultant shall be available to conduct an archeological monitoring and/or data recovery program if required pursuant to this measure. The archeological consultant's work shall be conducted in accordance with this measure at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer (ERO). All plans and reports prepared by the consultant as specified herein shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment, and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Archeological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction of the project for up to a

maximum of four weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of construction can be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce to a less than significant level potential effects on a significant archeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Sect. 15064.5 (a)(c).

*Archeological Testing Program.* The archeological consultant shall prepare and submit to the ERO for review and approval an archeological testing plan (ATP). The archeological testing program shall be conducted in accordance with the approved ATP. The ATP shall identify the property types of the expected archeological resource(s) that potentially could be adversely affected by the Project, the testing method to be used, and the locations recommended for testing. The purpose of the archeological testing program will be to determine to the extent possible the presence or absence of archeological resources and to identify and to evaluate whether any archeological resource encountered on the site constitutes an historical resource under CEQA.

At the completion of the archeological testing program, the archeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings to the ERO. If based on the archeological testing program the archeological consultant finds that significant archeological resources may be present, the ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant shall determine if additional measures are warranted. Additional measures that may be undertaken include additional archeological testing, archeological monitoring, and/or an archeological data recovery program. If the ERO determines that a significant archeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the Project, at the discretion of the project sponsor either:

- A) The Project shall be re-designed so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archeological resource; or
- B) A data recovery program shall be implemented, unless the ERO determines that the archeological resource is of greater interpretive than research significance and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible.

*Archeological Monitoring Program.* If the ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant determines that an archeological monitoring program shall be implemented the archeological monitoring program shall minimally include the following provisions:

- The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the AMP reasonably prior to any project-related soils disturbing activities commencing. The ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant shall determine what project activities shall be archeologically monitored, In most cases, any soils- disturbing activities, such as demolition, foundation removal, excavation, grading, utilities installation, foundation work, driving of piles (foundation, shoring, etc.), site remediation, etc., shall require archeological monitoring because of the risk these activities pose to potential archaeological resources and to their depositional context;
- The archeological consultant shall advise all project contractors to be on the alert for evidence of the presence of the expected resource(s), of how to identify the evidence of



the expected resource(s), and of the appropriate protocol in the event of apparent discovery of an archeological resource;

- The archeological monitors shall be present on the project site according to a schedule agreed upon by the archeological consultant and the ERO until the ERO has, in consultation with project archeological consultant, determined that project construction activities could have no effects on significant archeological deposits;
- The archeological monitor shall record and be authorized to collect soil samples and artifactual/ecofactual material as warranted for analysis;
- If an intact archeological deposit is encountered, all soils-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit shall cease. The archeological monitor shall be empowered to temporarily redirect demolition/ excavation/ pile driving/ construction activities and equipment until the deposit is evaluated. If in the case of pile driving activity (foundation, shoring, etc.), the archeological monitor has cause to believe that the pile driving activity may affect an archeological resource, the pile driving activity shall be terminated until an appropriate evaluation of the resource has been made in consultation with the ERO. The archeological consultant shall immediately notify the ERO of the encountered archeological deposit. The archeological consultant shall make a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archeological deposit, and present the findings of this assessment to the ERO.

Whether or not significant archeological resources are encountered, the archeological consultant shall submit a written report of the Findings of the monitoring program to the ERO.

*Archeological Data Recovery Program.* The archeological data recovery program shall be conducted in accord with an archeological data recovery plan (ADRP). The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the ADRP prior to preparation of a draft ADRP. The archeological consultant shall submit a draft ADRP to the ERO. The ADRP shall identify how the proposed data recovery program will preserve the significant information the archeological resource is expected to contain. That is, the ADRP will identify what scientific/historical research questions are applicable to the expected resource, what data classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions. Data recovery, in general, should be limited to the portions of the historical property that could be adversely affected by the Project. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be applied to portions of the archeological resources if nondestructive methods are practical.

The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements:

- *Field Methods and Procedures.* Descriptions of proposed field strategies, procedures, and operations.
- *Cataloguing and Laboratory Analysis.* Description of selected cataloguing system and artifact analysis procedures.

- *Discard and Deaccession Policy.* Description of and rationale for field and post-field discard and deaccession policies.
- *Interpretive Program.* Consideration of an on-site/off-site public interpretive program during the course of the archeological data recovery program.
- *Security Measures.* Recommended security measures to protect the archeological resource from vandalism, looting, and non-intentionally damaging activities.
- *Final Report.* Description of proposed report format and distribution of results.
- *Curation.* Description of the procedures and recommendations for the curation of any recovered data having potential research value, identification of appropriate curation facilities, and a summary of the accession policies of the curation facilities.

*Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects.* The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and Federal laws. This shall include immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the Coroner's determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (Pub. Res. Code Sec. 5097.98). The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and MLD shall make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of, with appropriate dignity, human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects (CEQA Guidelines. Sec. 15064.5(d)). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects.

Final Archeological Resources Report. The archeological consultant shall submit a Draft Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archeological resource and describes the archeological and historical research methods employed in the archeological testing/monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the final report.

Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one (1) copy and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. Copies of the FARR shall be sent to the Agency. The Major Environmental Analysis division of the Planning Department shall receive three copies of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest in or the high interpretive value of the resource, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.

Mitigation Measure 13: Based on the reasonable potential that archeological resources may be present within the Project Area, the following measures shall be undertaken to avoid any

potentially significant adverse effect from the Project on buried or submerged historical resources. The project sponsor shall retain the services of a qualified archeological consultant having expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archeology. The archeological consultant shall undertake an archeological monitoring program. All plans and reports prepared by the consultant as specified herein shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment, and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Archeological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction of the project for up to a maximum of four weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of construction can be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce to a less than significant level potential effects on a significant archeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Sect. 15064.5 (a)(c).

Archeological monitoring program (AMP). The archeological monitoring program shall minimally include the following provisions:

- The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the AMP reasonably prior to any project-related soils disturbing activities commencing. The ERO in consultation with the project archeologist shall determine what project activities shall be archeologically monitored. In most cases, any soils disturbing activities, such as demolition, foundation removal, excavation, grading, utilities installation, foundation work, driving of piles (foundation, shoring, etc.), site remediation, etc., shall require archeological monitoring because of the potential risk these activities pose to archaeological resources and to their depositional context;
- The archeological consultant shall advise all project contractors to be on the alert for evidence of the presence of the expected resource(s), of how to identify the evidence of the expected resource(s), and of the appropriate protocol in the event of apparent discovery of an archeological resource;
- The archaeological monitors) shall be present on the project site according to a schedule agreed upon by the archeological consultant and the ERO until the ERO has, in consultation with the archeological consultant, determined that project construction activities could have no effects on significant archeological deposits;
- The archeological monitor shall record and be authorized to collect soil samples and artifactual/ecofactual material as warranted for analysis;
- If an intact archeological deposit is encountered, all soils disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit shall cease. The archeological monitor shall be empowered to temporarily redirect demolition/ excavation/ pile driving/ construction crews and heavy equipment until the deposit is evaluated. If in the case of pile driving activity (foundation, shoring, etc.), the archeological monitor has cause to believe that the pile driving activity may affect an archeological resource, the pile driving activity shall be terminated until an appropriate evaluation of the resource has been made in consultation with the ERO. The archeological consultant shall immediately notify the

ERO of the encountered archeological deposit. The archeological consultant shall, after making a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archeological deposit, present the findings of this assessment to the ERO.

If the ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant determines that a significant archeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the Project, at the discretion of the project sponsor either:

- A) The Project shall be re-designed so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archeological resource; or
- B) An archeological data recovery program shall be implemented, unless the ERO determines that the archeological resource is of greater interpretive than research significance and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible.

If an archeological data recovery program is required by the ERO, the archeological data recovery program shall be conducted in accord with an archeological data recovery plan (ADRP). The project archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the ADRP. The archeological consultant shall prepare a draft ADRP that shall be submitted to the ERO for review and approval. The ADRP shall identify how the proposed data recovery program will preserve the significant information the archeological resource is expected to contain. That is, the ADRP will identify what scientific/historical research questions are applicable to the expected resource, what data classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions. Data recovery, in general, should be limited to the portions of the historical property that could be adversely affected by the Project. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be applied to portions of the archeological resources if nondestructive methods are practical.

The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements:

- *Field Methods and Procedures.* Descriptions of proposed field strategies, procedures, and operations.
- *Cataloguing and Laboratory Analysis.* Description of selected cataloguing system and artifact analysis procedures.
- *Discard and Deaccession Policy.* Description of and rationale for field and post-field discard and deaccession policies.
- *Interpretive Program.* Consideration of an on-site/off-site public interpretive program during the course of the archeological data recovery program.
- *Security Measures.* Recommended security measures to protect the archeological resource from vandalism, looting, and non-intentionally damaging activities.
- *Final Report.* Description of proposed report format and distribution of results.

- *Curation.* Description of the procedures and recommendations for die curation of any recovered data having potential research value, identification of appropriate curation facilities, and a summary of the accession policies of the curation facilities.

*Human Remains, Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects.* The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and Federal Laws, including immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the Coroner's determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (Pub. Res. Code Sec. 5097.98). The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and MLD shall make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of, with appropriate dignity, human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects (CEQA Guidelines. Sec. 15064.5(d)). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, curation, possession, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects.

*Final Archeological Resources Report.* The archeological consultant shall submit a Draft Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical of any discovered archeological resource and describes the archeological and historical research methods employed in the archeological testing/monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the draft final report.

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 Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one (1) copy and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. Copies of the FARR shall be sent to the Agency. The Major Environmental Analysis division of the Planning Department shall receive three copies of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest or interpretive value, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.

**Mitigation Measure 14:** The following mitigation measure is required to avoid any potential adverse effect from the Project on accidentally discovered buried or submerged historical resources as defined in *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5{a}(c). The project sponsor shall distribute the Planning Department archeological resource "ALERT" sheet to the project prime contractor; to any project subcontractor (including demolition, excavation, grading, foundation, pile driving, etc. firms); or utilities firm involved in soils disturbing activities within the project site. Prior to any soils disturbing activities being undertaken each contractor is responsible for ensuring that the "ALERT" sheet is circulated to all field personnel including, machine operators, field crew, pile drivers, supervisory personnel, etc. The project sponsor shall provide the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) with a signed

affidavit from the responsible parties (prime contractor, subcontractors), and utilities firm) to the ERO confirming that all field personnel have received copies of the Alert Sheet.

Should any indication of an archeological resource 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.

If the ERO determines that an archeological resource may be present within the project site, the project sponsor shall retain the services of a qualified archeological consultant. 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.

Measures might include: preservation in situ of the archeological resource; an archaeological monitoring program; or an archeological testing program. If an archeological monitoring program or archeological testing program is required, it shall be consistent with the Major Environmental Analysis (MEA) 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.

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 describing 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.

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 Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one (1) copy and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. Copies of the FARR shall be sent to the Agency. The Major Environmental Analysis division of the Planning Department shall receive three copies of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest or interpretive value, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.

#### **Mitigation Measure 15:**

- A. Prior to any physical removal of a historic resource, the project sponsor would prepare, or cause to be prepared, documentation of the historic resource in a Historic

Resource Documentation Report. Such documentation would follow an appropriate level of data collection, preparation of drawings, and photography based on the historic significance of the historic resource. The Agency in consultation with the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board (LPAB) would select the level of documentation from the four levels (Documentation Level I, II, III, or IV) described in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation and Guidelines for Architectural and Engineering Documentation.

The documentation would be prepared by a licensed architect who meets the qualifications for Historical Architect as set forth in the *Secretary of the Interior's Historic Preservation Professional Qualification Standards*, published in the Federal Register, June 20, 1997 (Volume 62, Number 119). In addition to these qualifications, the Historical Architect would have demonstrated experience in not less than three projects meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation and Guidelines for Architectural and Engineering Documentation. One project must have been approved and accepted by the Historic American Building Survey/Historic American Engineering Record (HABS/HAER), National Park Service.

The Historic Resource Documentation Report would be sent to the following repositories: History Room, San Francisco Public Library, and San Francisco Architectural Heritage.

- B. Prior to undertaking a rehabilitation project of a Historic Resource, the project sponsor would prepare, or cause to be prepared, a historic structure(s) report (HSR) for the historic resource. The HSR would set forth the history of the resource, describe and document its existing condition, make recommendations for repair, rehabilitation, replacement, reconstruction, and other treatments based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings or the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (Secretary of the Interior's Standards). The HSR would act as a guide to the rehabilitation plan for the building(s).

The HSR would be prepared by a licensed architect who meets the qualifications for Historical Architect as set forth in the *Secretary of the Interior's Historic Preservation Professional Qualification Standards*, published in the Federal Register, June 20, 1997 (Volume 62, Number 119).

The project sponsor would retain the services of a Historical Architect as a member of the design team for the proposed rehabilitation project. The Historical Architect could be the same Historical Architect who prepared the HSR, without encountering a conflict of interest.

If not a member of the project team, the Historical Architect would review the rehabilitation plans prepared by the project architect for compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings or the

Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, and Section 1111.6. Standards and Requirements for Review of Applications for Alterations (Article 11).

The Historical Architect would make a report to the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board concerning project compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The LPAB would approve, approve with conditions, or disapprove the project design based on its evaluation using the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The LPAB's decision would be final and not appealable.

C. The project sponsor shall prepare a plan for protection of adjacent historic resources. Such a plan would include the following:

- Storage of materials a sufficient distance away from the historic resource.
- Instructions to equipment operators making them aware of the historic resource and using caution when operating near the resource.
- Monitoring construction activities to assure implementation of the plan.
- The project sponsor shall consult with the San Francisco Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board (LPAB) to evaluate the Project's architectural compatibility with adjacent historic resources(s), as new development may differ in scale, design or materials than the existing older structures, and could change the context of historic resources.

**Mitigation Measure 16:** Prior to undertaking a rehabilitation project as proposed under the Façade Renewal Program, the City or Agency shall prepare a historic structure(s) report (HSR) for the historic resource(s) to be affected. The HSR would set forth the history of the resource, describe and document its existing condition, make recommendations for repair, rehabilitation, replacement, reconstruction, and other treatments based on the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings* (Secretary of the Interior's Standards). The HSR would act as a guide to the rehabilitation plan for the building(s).

The HSR shall be prepared by a licensed architect who meets the qualifications for Historical Architect as set forth in the *Secretary of the Interior's Historic Preservation Professional Qualification Standards*. The Historical Architect would make a report to LAPB concerning project compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The LPAB would approve, approve with conditions, or disapprove the project design based on its evaluation using the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

## HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

There would be no significant or potentially significant impacts with respect to hazards and hazardous materials; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.



## GEOLOGY AND SOILS

There would be no significant or potentially significant impacts with respect to geology and soils; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

## HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

There would be no significant or potentially significant impacts with respect to hydrology and water quality; therefore, no mitigation is required.

## BIOTIC RESOURCES

**Mitigation Measure 17:** To avoid and minimize impacts to sensitive wetland habitats, the Project Sponsor shall complete a wetland delineation and habitat mapping survey for all shoreline areas proposed for construction as a result of the Project. This survey shall be submitted to the Agency and Planning Department (or City). These efforts would identify all sensitive habitats within a specific project area and allow for a quantitative evaluation of project impacts. Any activity that involves dredging or fill of a wetland area would be within the jurisdiction of several regulatory agencies and require permits and mitigation plans to satisfy these agencies (see Regulatory Framework discussion).

Additionally, the Project Sponsor shall complete the following items for each specific project:

- Prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to ensure that there would be no impacts from stormwater runoff on fish or other aquatic species occurring in San Francisco Bay. The SWPPP shall be submitted to the Agency and City.
- Plan construction activities to avoid working directly in sensitive wetlands or mud flats when at all possible. For areas where avoidance is not possible, a permit(s), complete restoration, and cleanup of disrupted areas will be required.

**Mitigation Measure 18:** Specific projects shall avoid damage to, or removal of, street trees to the extent possible. Removal of street trees shall only occur after obtaining the appropriate permit from the DPW. Street trees removed or damaged by construction activities shall be replaced with plantings of the same tree species, or tree species designated or approved by the DPW.

Those trees to be retained shall not be damaged during construction. This shall be achieved by installing temporary fencing at the tree drip line during construction. There shall be no disturbance from construction activity, storage of materials, or worker parking within the drip lines of trees. Existing trees to be retained shall receive summer watering during construction. Continued summer irrigation of these trees shall be incorporated into the landscaping design for any individual project within the Project Area.

**Mitigation Measure 19:** Although this impact is considered less than significant, the following improvement measure is provided to facilitate compliance with state and federal laws relating to the protection of nesting birds.

The removal of trees, shrubs, or weedy vegetation should avoid the February 1 through August 31 bird nesting period to the extent possible. If no vegetation or tree removal is proposed during the nesting period, no surveys are required. If it is not feasible to avoid the nesting period, a survey for nesting birds should be conducted by a qualified wildlife biologist no earlier than 14 days prior to the removal of trees, shrubs, grassland vegetation, buildings, or other construction activity. Survey results shall be valid for 21 days following the survey. The area surveyed should include all construction areas as well as areas within 150 feet outside the boundaries of the areas to be cleared or as otherwise determined by the biologist.

In the event that an active nest is discovered in the areas to be cleared, or in other habitats within 150 feet of construction boundaries, clearing and construction should be postponed for at least two weeks or until a wildlife biologist has determined that the young have fledged (left the nest), the nest is vacated, and there is no evidence of second nesting attempts.

## **PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES**

There would be no significant or potentially significant impacts with respect to public services and utilities; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

## **ENERGY**

There would be no significant or potentially significant impacts with respect to energy; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

## **E. ALTERNATIVES**

In formulating the project alternatives, this EIR uses the CEQA standard of analyzing alternatives that would lessen potentially significant project effects and whose effects can be reasonably ascertained. As previously discussed, implementation of the Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts associated with urban design and visual quality (elimination of viewshed and increased lighting as a result of the Stadium Development Retail/Entertainment Center) and operation of the intersection of Third Street /Cesar Chavez Street.

This section evaluates two alternatives to the Project that would avoid or lessen the identified significant and unavoidable impacts. The No Project Alternative assumes that no

redevelopment plan or rezoning would be implemented in the Project Area. However, development would still occur under current zoning regulations. As few buildings are built to the current height limit, many structures could be renovated, and the Project Area could be redeveloped with mixed-use residential units. The Zoning Option B alternative, as proposed by the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning community planning process, assumes that a redevelopment plan would be implemented, but under a different zoning scheme. This alternative would allow for reduced housing development compared to the proposed full build-out analyzed for the Project. The alternatives analysis is provided in Chapter VI, Alternatives, of this document.

## **F. AREAS OF CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED**

Preparation of the EIR identified the following areas of controversy or unresolved issues regarding the Project.

- Conserve existing housing and provide new housing, while retaining necessary PDR uses that support a diverse local economy
- Preserve and strengthen the fabric of the community, including the Town Center, neighborhoods, institutions, and resources, while eliminating displacement and relocation to the maximum extent possible

## **G. SCOPE OF THE EIR**

This EIR is a Program EIR on the proposed Redevelopment Plans, as defined by California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. As such, any future actions or projects falling within the range of programs or overall development analyzed in the EIR within the Project Area may require any further environmental review, unless there were project-specific or site-specific environmental impacts or other changed circumstances not identified in this Program EIR. The Project would be implemented primarily through the *San Francisco Planning Code*, as amended as a result of this Project. Thus, developments under the Project would be reviewed by the Planning Department under project authorization processes as stated in the *Planning Code*. In the course of such review, the Planning Department could determine that a specific project's impacts are fully encompassed in the Program EIR analysis, and that no further CEQA review would be necessary. In other cases, the Planning Department may

find that potential site-specific or project-specific impacts, such as shadow effects or localized transportation effects, would require further CEQA review. A Negative Declaration, EIR Addendum, or Supplemental EIR, as appropriate, would then be prepared to address specific effects or mitigation measures. Those subsequent CEQA documents would incorporate and use analyses and findings in this EIR (for example, cumulative analysis of transportation conditions, or standard mitigation measures). In this way, the Program EIR prepared for the Project would be expected to streamline CEQA review of future projects.

---

<sup>1</sup> San Francisco Planning Department, 2003.