Chapter 3 presents revisions to the text, tables, and figures of the Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Project EIR. The first part of this chapter presents revisions to the EIR gathered from Chapter 2, Comments and Responses. The second part of the chapter presents staff-initiated text changes to correct minor inconsistencies, to add minor information or clarification related to the Proposed Project, and to correct minor errors. These corrections do not change the analysis and conclusions presented in the Draft EIR. Revisions are listed in sequential order by volume/chapter/section (for Chapter IV)/page. Deletions in text and tables are shown in strike through and new text is shown in underline. Figures and tables are noted as “(New)” or “(Revised).” In addition to the revisions shown below, other minor changes are made to the EIR to correct typographical errors.

3.1 CHANGES IN RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

VOLUME 1

SUMMARY

The last three sentences of the paragraph under the heading “Existing Uses” on EIR p. S.1 are revised as follows:

…The designated historic buildings within the Development Plan Area on the Islands are Buildings 1, 2 and 3 on Treasure Island, and the Torpedo Assembly Building, the Nimitz House, and Quarters 10 and its garage on Yerba Buena Island. In addition, the National Register-listed Senior Officers’ Quarters Historic District is located on Yerba Buena Island; it is comprised of Quarters 1 through 7, a family quarters, associated garages and formal landscaping elements. The Islands also include areas that are not part of the Development Plan Area: U.S. Coast Guard facilities on Yerba Buena Island, a U.S. Department of Labor Job Corps campus on Treasure Island, and Federal Highway Administration (“FHWA”) land occupied by the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge (“Bay Bridge”) and tunnel structures on Yerba Buena Island.

Text is added after the first sentence to the first full paragraph on EIR p. S.3 as follows:

The existing chapel would be retained in its current location and continue to be used for general assembly and non-denominational religious activities.

The second sentence of the paragraph under the heading “Tidelands Trust” on EIR p. S.5 is revised to delete reference to the 2 acres on Yerba Buena Island:

These areas include all of Treasure Island, about 2 acres of land on Yerba Buena Island, and all of the tidal and submerged lands within the Project Area.
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Text is added to the first sentence of the second paragraph under Mitigation Measure M-TR-1 in Table S.1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures on EIR p. S.14 as follows:

The Plan shall disseminate appropriate information to contractors and affected agencies with respect to coordinating construction activities to minimize overall disruptions and ensure that overall circulation on the Islands is maintained to the extent possible, with particular focus on ensuring pedestrian, transit, and bicycle connectivity and access to the Bay and to recreational uses to the extent feasible.

A fifth bulleted item is added to the list of four bulleted items under Mitigation Measure M-TR-1 in Table S.1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures on EIR p. S.16 as follows:

- Require contractors to notify vendors that STAA trucks larger than 65 feet exiting from the eastbound direction of the Bay Bridge may only use the off-ramp on the east side of Yerba Buena Island.

Text is added to the third sentence of the first paragraph under Mitigation Measure M-TR-24 in Table S.1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures starting on EIR p. S.18 as follows:

If the queues between First Street and the westbound on-ramp on the west side of Yerba Buena Island result in an operational delay to Muni service equal to or greater than the prevailing headway during the AM, PM or Saturday peak periods, SFMTA, in consultation with TITMA, shall implement a southbound transit-only lane between First Street on Treasure Island and the transit and emergency vehicle-only westbound Bay Bridge on-ramp.

The second bulleted item under Mitigation Measure M-TR-24 in Table S.1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures on EIR p. S.19 is revised as follows:

- Elimination of the proposed southbound Class II bicycle lane on Treasure Island Road and a small portion of Hillcrest Road south of the intersection with Macalla Road. The Class I facility on Treasure Island Road connecting Treasure Island and the proposed new lookout point, just south of the Macalla Road intersection, would remain. Bicyclists who use the Class I path to the lookout point and continue on Treasure Island Road toward Hillcrest Road would have to share the lane with traffic, similar to other roadways where bicycle lanes are not provided. Bicyclists would still be able to use Class I bicycle paths and Class II bicycle lanes proposed on Macalla Road to connect between the Islands and the bicycle path on the new east span of the Bay Bridge.

The lead-in sentence and the second list of bulleted items under Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2 in Table S.1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures starting on EIR p. S.27 and continuing on p. S.28 are revised as follows:

TIDA shall require that, to the extent feasible, project sponsors also engage in early implementation of the following combustion emission reduction measures, during construction activities:
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- To the extent feasible, the project applicant shall utilize EPA Tier 3 engine standards or better at the start of construction for all off-road equipment, or utilize Retrofit Emission Control Devices which consist of diesel oxidation catalysts, diesel particulate filters or similar retrofit equipment control technology verified by the California Air Resources Board (“CARB”) (http://www.arb.ca.gov/diesel/verdev/verdev.htm).

- To the extent feasible, the project applicant shall utilize EPA Tier 4 engine standards or better for 50 percent of the fleet at construction initiation, increasing to 75 percent by 2015, and 100 percent by 2018, to the extent that EPA Tier 4 equipment is commercially available.

- To the extent feasible, the project applicant shall utilize 2007 or newer model year haul trucks, to the extent that they are commercially available.

- Diesel-powered generators for construction activity shall be prohibited as a condition of construction contracts for each Major Phase, unless TIDA has made a finding in writing in connection with the Major Phase that there are no other commercially available alternatives to providing localized power.

Text is added to the end of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3 in Table S.1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures on EIR p. S.28 as follows:

TIDA shall also determine whether Tier 3 or Tier 4 engines, non-diesel powered generators, or year 2010 or newer haul trucks are commercially available for that phase, and, if so, require the use of such engines or haul trucks.

Text is added to Mitigation Measure M-AQ-5 in Table S.1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures on EIR p. S.29 as follows:

**Mitigation Measure M-AQ-5: Ferry Particulate Emissions.** All ferries providing service between Treasure Island and San Francisco shall meet applicable California Air Resources Board regulations. Additionally, all ferries shall be equipped with diesel particulate filters or an alternative equivalent technology to reduce diesel particulate emissions.

The third and fourth sentences under Mitigation Measure M-BI-1c in Table S.1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures on EIR p. S.35 are revised as follows:

A no-disturbance buffer of 100 feet shall be created around active bat roosts being used for maternity or hibernation purposes. A reduced buffer could be provided for on a case-by-case basis by the bat biologist, at a distance to be determined in consultation with CDFG and based on site-specific conditions.

Text is added to Mitigation Measure M-BI-1d in Table S.1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures on EIR p. S.35 as follows:

**Mitigation Measure M-BI-1d: Control of Domestic and Feral Animals.** To avoid conflicts with wildlife on Yerba Buena Island and the remaining natural habitats on Yerba Buena Island, the Islands’ Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions, TIDA Rules...
and Regulations, and/or other similar enforceable instruments or regulations, shall prohibit off-leash dogs outside of designated, enclosed, off-leash dog parks on Yerba Buena Island and the feeding of feral cats on both islands. Building tenants shall be provided with educational materials regarding these restrictions, rules, and/or regulations. Non-resident pet owners and the public using the Islands shall be alerted to these restrictions, rules, and/or regulations through appropriate signage in public areas.

Mitigation Measure M-BI-2c in Table S.1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures on EIR p. S.37 is revised as follows:

**Mitigation Measure M-BI-2c: Eelgrass Bed Survey and Avoidance.** Prior to Within three to six months of the initiation of construction activities that might affect SAV beds, and not less frequently than biennially (every two years) thereafter, all eelgrass beds shall be surveyed or otherwise identified, including their proximity and potential impact from ongoing or pending onshore or offshore activities identified. All TIDA staff in charge of overseeing construction for the Proposed Project, and all construction contractors and subcontractors involved in Project construction activities in Bay waters that are within a quarter mile of Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island, along Treasure Island’s shoreline, or involved in transporting materials and supplies by water to either Island shall be required to undergo thorough environmental training. This training will present information on the locations of all eelgrass beds, the kinds of construction and vessel transit activities that can impact eelgrass beds, all mitigation measures that contractors must adhere to so that any disturbance or damage to eelgrass beds may be avoided and the beds protected, and who to notify in the event of any disturbance. Any work barges or vessels engaged in construction activities shall avoid transiting through and avoid anchoring in any eelgrass beds located around Treasure Island. TIDA personnel responsible for overseeing Project contractors, as well as all Project contractor and subcontractor management personnel, shall ensure that all boat operators and work crews are aware of eelgrass bed locations and the requirement to avoid disturbing them.

The first full paragraph on EIR p. S.56 is revised as follows:

Under the No Ferry Service Alternative, up to 5,100 residential units would be constructed, 2,900 fewer than with the Proposed Project. While the same amount of retail space would be developed, there would also be less neighborhood-serving retail than in the Proposed Project. Residential parking would also be reduced to about 8,255 parking spaces. Most other land uses would be the same as with the Proposed Project: 100,000 sq. ft. of office space; 500 hotel rooms, including 50 on Yerba Buena Island; adaptive reuse of about 311,000 sq. ft. of Buildings 1, 2, and 3 with retail, light industrial/food production, and entertainment uses; landside facilities to support the approved expanded Clipper Cove Marina; retention and continued use of the existing chapel for general assembly and non-denominational religious activities; new landside and waterside launch facilities at the existing sailing center on Treasure Island Sailing Center; and reuse or reconstruction of the existing Treasure Island elementary school at its current location.
New text summarizing the new Reduced Parking Alternative is added after the heading “C. No Ferry Service Alternative” on EIR p. S.57.

D. Reduced Parking Alternative

Under the Reduced Parking Alternative the number of off-street parking spaces would be reduced. The alternative would provide a maximum of 0.5 parking spaces per residential unit, for a total of 4,000 parking spaces available to residents on an Islands-wide basis. It would provide a maximum of 1 parking space per 1,000 sq. ft. of commercial/flex space in Buildings 1, 2, and 3 and for office uses, and a maximum of 0.4 parking spaces per hotel room. Retail parking would continue to be provided at a maximum of 2 spaces per 1,000 sq. ft., as in the Proposed Project. The amount of parking for open space uses and the marina and Sailing Center would also remain as in the Proposed Project. On-street parking, all of which would continue to be metered spaces, would remain at 1,035 spaces because the on-street parking supply is a function of the layout of the street network, which was not assumed to change.

Thus the primary difference between the Proposed Project and the Reduced Parking Alternative is that the maximum amount of off-street parking spaces would be reduced by about 4,030 – from about 9,646 in the Proposed Project to about 5,616 spaces. Land uses would remain the same as those in the Proposed Project under this alternative, except that fewer parking spaces would be permitted to be constructed for residential and hotel uses and less parking would be permitted to be constructed for certain commercial uses. The numbers, types, and sizes of buildings would not change substantially with this alternative. This alternative would also include a new joint police/fire station, an upgraded or replaced school, and new and/or upgraded public utilities, including a water distribution system, wastewater collection and treatment, and stormwater collection and treatment similar to the Proposed Project. Under this alternative, there would also be approximately 300 acres of parks and public open space on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island, and a Habitat Management Plan would be implemented for much of the undeveloped portions of Yerba Buena Island. Geotechnical stabilization would be the same as the Proposed Project. The Reduced Parking Alternative would include the same base transit service, new bicycle, transit, and pedestrian facilities, and a new Ferry Terminal and intermodal Transit Hub on Treasure Island.

The same Tidelands Trust Exchange Agreement as described for the Proposed Project would be necessary to implement the Reduced Parking Alternative. As for the Proposed Project, the San Francisco General Plan and the San Francisco Planning Code would be amended, and an Area Plan/SUD and Design for Development would be adopted. All other approvals required for the Proposed Project would be necessary to implement this alternative.
Impact AE-4 in Table S.3: Comparison of Project and Alternative Impacts starting on EIR p. S.59 is revised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED PROJECT</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic / Impact</td>
<td>No Project Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced Development Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact AE-4:</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of the Proposed Project would increase the nighttime lighting requirements within the Development Plan Area, and would affect nighttime views of the Bay from public areas, and would increase potential sources of glare. (Less than Significant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHAPTER I, INTRODUCTION**

The first sentence of the second paragraph on p. I.3 is revised as follows:

The U.S. Coast Guard also requested approximately 39-48 acres plus water area for facilities on Yerba Buena Island, and received authorization from the Navy for property transfer effective March 3, 1998, and November 27, 2002.

**CHAPTER II, PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The last sentence of the first paragraph on p. II.1 is revised as follows:

The Islands also include a U.S. Coast Guard Station and Sector Facility, a U.S. Department of Labor Job Corps campus, and Federal Highway Administration (“FHWA”) land occupied by the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge (“Bay Bridge”) and tunnel structures.

The second sentence of the first paragraph on EIR p. II.6 is revised as follows:

Treasure Island contains approximately 404 acres of land, and Yerba Buena Island, approximately 450-160 acres.

The third sentence of the last paragraph on EIR p. II.6 is revised as follows:

The Navy has transferred approximately 37 acres in the center of Treasure Island to the U.S. Department of Labor for the Job Corps facility, approximately 39-48 acres of land on Yerba Buena Island to the U.S. Coast Guard, and approximately 18 acres of land on Yerba Buena Island to the Federal Highway Administration.
The following text is added after the fifth sentence of the first full paragraph on p. II.9 of Chapter II, Project Description:

Although the Navy has temporarily restricted access to portions of the northern shoreline for remediation activities, interim access to the perimeter pedestrian path and the boat launch is allowed for launching recreational watercraft, e.g. boardsailing and kayaks.

The third sentence of the first full paragraph on EIR p. II.9 is revised as follows:

Current non-residential uses include offices, a small restaurant, a convenience store, several event venues, a guard shack, warehouse/storage/manufacturing facilities, a childcare center, a fire station and fire training academy, a wastewater treatment plant, a gymnasium, film production facilities, a chapel, and a yacht club.

The first sentence of the last paragraph on p. II.10 is revised as follows to note that the Coast Guard has been present on Yerba Buena Island, along with other military services, since 1840:

Yerba Buena Island is a natural island that has been used by private parties and by the U.S. Army, and Navy and Coast Guard since the 1840s.

The third full paragraph on EIR p. II.11 is revised as follows:

U.S. Coast Guard facilities occupy approximately 39-48 acres of land on Yerba Buena Island adjacent to the Project Area. The U.S. Coast Guard Station and Sector Facility, on the southeast side of Yerba Buena Island, includes housing, administrative facilities, open storage and docks, buoy maintenance facilities, and a lighthouse built in 1872. Coast Guard facilities also include a vehicle tracking system facility on the northwestern part of Yerba Buena Island and Navigation Light No. 6 on the northern end of Treasure Island. The Coast Guard facilities are expected to remain in use in their present location for the foreseeable future.

The fourth sentence in the last paragraph on p. II.11 is corrected to read as follows:

A water supply pipeline (used only in emergencies) extends under the east span of the Bay Bridge and is supplied by the East Bay Municipal Utilities District (“EBMUD”).

The second sentence in the second paragraph on EIR p. II.14 is revised to delete reference to the 2 acres on Yerba Buena Island:

These areas include all of Treasure Island, approximately 2 acres of land on Yerba Buena Island, and all of the tidal and submerged lands within the Project Area.

The following new bulleted item is added to the listing under the heading “E. Development Plan Characteristics” on EIR p. II.16, to follow the sixth item (“Rehabilitation of the historic buildings on Yerba Buena Island”):

- Retention and continued use of the existing chapel in its existing location for general assembly and non-denominational religious activities;
The first paragraph under the heading “Island Center District” on EIR p. II.21 is revised as follows:

The Island Center District would occupy the southern portion of Treasure Island and would abut the southern/southeastern boundary of the Jobs Corps campus. This new neighborhood would include a dense mix of retail, restaurant, office, hotel, residential, transit, and community services uses. The Ferry Terminal and intermodal Transit Hub would be located in the Island Center at the southwestern shore of Treasure Island. A pedestrian link is planned between the Ferry Terminal and Clipper Cove, with pedestrian paths around and connecting to corridors through Buildings 1, 2 and 3, the historic structures (see Figure II.10: Proposed Street System, p. II.41). Buildings 1, 2, and 3 would be adaptively reused for commercial and recreation/entertainment uses. As part of the adaptive reuse, Building 111, which is an addition to Building 3, would be demolished. The existing chapel would be retained in its current location and used for general assembly and non-denominational religious activities.

Footnote 18 on EIR p. II.24 is revised as follows:

Family-sized units are those with two or more bedrooms. While 20 percent of the units is the minimum proposed number of family-sized units, a larger number was used for the purpose of analyzing transportation impacts, since the Proposed Project is likely to include more than the minimum number of family-sized units. As described in more detail in Section IV.E, Transportation, trip generation rates for units of two bedrooms or more are higher than those for one bedroom or less. This EIR assumes that the proposed 8,000 residences would include about 2,005 studio and one-bedroom units, and about 5,995 units with two or more bedrooms, resulting in a larger travel demand than would result with the minimum number of family-sized units.

Figure II.6a: Treasure Island Maximum Height Limit Plan, on EIR p. II.25, is revised, as shown in Section 2.1, Project Description, of this Comments and Responses document on p. 2.1.9.

The second bullet on p. II.28 is revised as follows to clarify the total number of stand-alone affordable housing units proposed:

- Stand-alone Affordable Housing. Up to 1,684 units (which could be a mix of rental and for-sale units) would be in stand-alone, affordable buildings, of which up to around 1,249 units would be developed by developers selected by TIDA or its designee. Up to 1,685 units would be in stand-alone, completely affordable buildings implemented by TIDA or others. The TIDA units would likely include a mix of rental and for-sale units and would target very-low-, low-, and moderate-income households.

The following text is added to the second bulleted item on p. II.31, to provide more detail on the amounts of dredge and fill material:

- The existing Sailing Center near Pier 1 would be improved with new vessel launch and retrieval facilities. The improvements would include a new pier on pilings to accommodate two vessel launch and retrieval cranes, entry landings and gangways, and floating docks. The waterside facilities would require dredging about 1,500 to
3,700 cubic yards, and would result in about 0.25 to 0.4 acre of pile-supported fill and 0.4 to 0.45 acre of floating fill in the Bay. Landside facilities would include restrooms, laundry facilities, and other improvements to serve the tenants of the Sailing Center (as well as future tenants of the separate Marina Project, if approved).

The last bulleted item on EIR p. II.31 is revised as follows:

- A 3-acre Cultural Park adjacent to Building 1. The park would include a future building site for a cultural institution, such as a museum, of up to 75,000 sq. ft. The existing chapel would be retained in its current location.

The paragraph under the heading “Institutional and Public Services” on EIR p. II.33 is revised as follows:

The Development Program would provide space for a variety of community programs in the historic former Administration Building (Building 1), in some of the proposed residential buildings, and in a new 35,000-sq.-ft. building near Pier 1 expected to provide space for recreational or interpretive center activities. Space for public offices, such as TIDA, and childcare also would be provided. Space for an up to 75,000-sq.-ft. museum or other cultural institution is planned in the Cultural Park north of Building 1. The existing chapel, on the site of the proposed Cultural Park, would be retained in its current location and used for general assembly and non-denominational religious activities. The existing public grammar school on Treasure Island, now closed, would be improved or rebuilt as a K-8 public school in coordination with the San Francisco Unified School District. The existing wastewater treatment plant would be replaced by the SFPUC (as discussed below in “Proposed Utilities”). A recycling program would be established, and a recycling center/corporation yard would be provided. A joint police/fire station would be provided on Treasure Island. The existing Job Corps facility would remain in use in its current location on Treasure Island, under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Department of Labor.

The project description in the second paragraph on EIR p. II.35 is revised as follows to indicate that consultation with SFMTA, AC Transit and the Water Emergency Transit Authority (WETA) would be included in the Proposed Project:

Bus stops and facilities for East Bay and San Francisco bus service providers, shuttle service stops, bicycle parking, a pool of shared bicycles (“Bicycle Library”), a car share pool, and administration/office space for the new Treasure Island Transportation Management Agency (“TITMA”) would be located at or near the Transit Hub (see “Encouraging Use of Transit and Discouraging Automobile Use,” EIR p. II.51, for a discussion of TITMA’s responsibilities.) TIDA and TICD would prepare the designs for transit facilities in consultation with SFMTA, AC Transit, and WETA.

Figure II.9: Proposed Shuttle Routes, on EIR p. II.40, is revised, as shown in on p. 2.1.14 of this Comments and Responses document.

Figure II.10: Proposed Street System, on EIR p. II.41, is revised, as shown in Section 2.7, Transportation, of this Comments and Responses document on p. 2.7.12.
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Figure II.12: Proposed Bicycle Routes, on EIR p. II.46, is revised, as shown on p. 2.7.75 of this Comments and Responses document.

Figure II.13: Walking Times to Transit Hub, on EIR p. II.47, is revised, as shown on p. 2.7.96 of this Comments and Responses document.

The second sentence in the first full paragraph on p. II.48 is revised as follows:

Class I mixed bicycle and pedestrian paths are proposed around the perimeter of Treasure Island, connecting to Class I bicycle-only bicycle paths in the open space areas. A **Class I mixed-use, two-way bicycle/pedestrian path** along the south side of Macalla Road would also connect to the east span of the Bay Bridge on Yerba Buena Island. A **Class II bicycle lane** also would be provided on the north side of Macalla Road for cyclists heading downhill (with traffic) from the Bay Bridge.

At the end of the next-to-last bullet on p. II.48, “paths” is changed to “routes”, as follows:

The walkways and bicycle routes would be designed to allow for possible future connections to other pedestrian and bicycle **paths/routes**.

A new sentence is added at the end of the first full paragraph on p. II.48:

A **Class I mixed-use, two-way bicycle pedestrian path** would be provided west of and parallel to Treasure Island Road south of the causeway, leading to a scenic overlook to be provided about 500 feet south of the intersection with Macalla Road.

The text in the last full paragraph and following paragraph on p. II.52, continuing to p. II.53, is corrected to read as follows:

The Proposed Project would continue to use the existing primary water supply. Water is provided by the SFPUC through a 10-inch-diameter steel pipe attached to the west span of the Bay Bridge. Water is pumped across the bridge by a pumping station located on Spear Street in San Francisco. The maximum output of the pumping station is 1,800, 1,500 gpm. The SFPUC chloramines the water prior to transmission, and the water does not require additional treatment on Treasure Island. A **standby booster chlorine station** is available at the water line entry point to Treasure Island for emergencies.

The supplemental (emergency)-water supply would continue to be provided by EBMUD, through a new 12-inch water main that is being constructed by Caltrans as part of the new east span of the Bay Bridge. **Capacity of the current service 12-inch main on the existing east span of the Bay Bridge.** A new 12-inch pipe would be constructed along North Gate Drive on Yerba Buena Island to connect the replacement **supplemental emergency** water supply line to the proposed new storage tanks (described below). The system has been designed to deliver approximately 1,800, 1,500 gpm during emergency situations, with a typical average annual flow of 64, 35 gpm, in keeping with current operations. The water would continue to be chloraminated by EBMUD prior to delivery. The system would only be used in emergencies when the water supply from San Francisco to the Islands is disrupted and for operational flows to maintain water quality.
The second full paragraph on p. II.61 is revised and a new footnote is added, as follows (deleted text is shown in strike through and new text is underlined):

The California Department of Housing and Community Development allows the use of grey water (water from sinks, showers, and similar sources, captured for local reuse) under certain circumstances.38 is not currently allowed. If changes are made in applicable State and local laws and regulations, individual residential buildings may be constructed with the necessary capture facilities and piping systems for grey water. Use of grey water is not part of the Proposed Project at this time; any future proposed use of grey water would conform to all applicable State and local requirements. Because it is not known where or whether these grey water sources would be used, they are not evaluated further in this EIR.

The new footnote for this text change is shown below, and subsequent footnotes in the section will be renumbered accordingly:

38 California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 5, Chapter 16A. See footnote regarding grey water on p. IV.K.19 in Section IV.K, Utilities and Service Systems.

The number of projects in the Climate Positive Development Program on EIR p. II.79 is corrected in the first sentence on the page, as follows:

In May 2009, the Proposed Project was selected as one of a total of 17 projects worldwide to join the Climate Positive Development Program, a joint initiative of the Clinton Climate Initiative, a project of the William J. Clinton Foundation, and the U.S. Green Building Council.

The fifth and seventh bulleted items under the heading “Phase 4 (Building Construction and Associated Infrastructure)” on EIR p. II.82 are revised as follows (the sixth bulleted item is shown for context):

- Development of the Cultural Park and museum around the existing Navy chapel, which would be retained;
- Renovation of Building 3 on Treasure Island;
- Development of the Senior Officers’ Quarters Historic District and landscaping improvements on Yerba Buena Island;

On EIR p. II.84, the tenth bullet is revised to read as follows (new text is underlined):

- Permits for fill and dredging in San Francisco Bay and improvements within the 100-foot shoreline band (San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission), which may include consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game or other agencies as directed by BCDC.
CHAPTER III, PLANS AND POLICIES

The last partial paragraph at the bottom of EIR p. III.12 is revised to delete references to the 2 acres on Yerba Buena Island and to correct the total acreage of Yerba Buena Island:

Treasure Island is composed of landfill placed on former tidelands and submerged lands. Upon conveyance to TIDA by the Navy, all 367 acres of conveyed land on Treasure Island (excluding the Job Corps campus), along with approximately 2 acres of tidelands on Yerba Buena Island, and all of the other tidal and submerged lands within the Project Area will be subject to the Tidelands Trust Doctrine and the statutory trust created by the Treasure Island Conversion Act of 1996 (the “Conversion Act”). The statutory trust created by the Conversion Act and Tidelands Trust Doctrine are collectively referred to as the “Tidelands Trust.” The approximately 37-acre Job Corps campus would not be subject to the Tidelands Trust so long as it remains in Federal ownership. Except for the approximately 2 acres of existing tidelands on Yerba Buena Island, none of the 150 acres of land above the mean high tide line on Yerba Buena Island is subject to the Tidelands Trust.

There is no change to Footnote 12, cited in the text above.

The following revisions are made to the second sentence in the paragraph under the heading “Bay Trail Plan” on p. III.12:

The Bay Trail is a planned multi-purpose recreational trail that, when complete, would encircle San Francisco Bay and San Pablo Bay with a continuous 500-mile network of bicycling and hiking trails; to date, 300 miles of the alignment have been completed.\footnote{Maureen Gaffney, Bay Trail Planner, San Francisco Bay Trail Project, letter communication, September 10, 2010.}

The new footnote for this text change is shown below, and subsequent footnotes in the section will be renumbered accordingly:

\footnote{Maureen Gaffney, Bay Trail Planner, San Francisco Bay Trail Project, letter communication, September 10, 2010.}

The last sentence of the first paragraph on p. III.13 is revised as follows:

Except for the approximately 2 acres of existing tidelands on Yerba Buena Island, currently none of the 150 acres of land on Yerba Buena Island is subject to the Tidelands Trust.

The last sentence of the second full paragraph on EIR p. III.14 is revised as follows:

The Tidelands Trust lands subject to the Exchange Agreement affect about 367 acres on Treasure Island and about 94 acres on Yerba Buena Island within the Development Plan Area and excludes the Jobs Corps campus on Treasure Island and the Coast Guard Station and Sector Facility and Caltrans properties on Yerba Buena Island.
CHAPTER IV, ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND IMPACTS

General

In the mitigation measures presented in Chapter IV, “project sponsor” is changed to “project sponsors” for consistency.

Section IV.A, Land Use and Land Use Planning

The third full paragraph on EIR p. IV.A.6 is revised as follows:

The U.S. Coast Guard maintains an active Station and Sector Facility that covers approximately 39.48 acres on the southeast side of Yerba Buena Island. This Station and Sector Facility includes housing, administrative facilities, buoy maintenance facilities, docks, storage, and a lighthouse that was built by the U.S. Army. The Station and Sector Facility is not part of the Project Area or the Development Plan Area and would not undergo any changes as part of the Proposed Project.

The paragraph under the heading “Adjacent Land Uses” on EIR p. IV.A.6 is revised as follows:

The U.S. Coast Guard maintains an active station that covers approximately 39 acres on the southeast side of Yerba Buena Island. This station includes housing, administrative facilities, buoy maintenance facilities, docks, storage, and a lighthouse that was built by the U.S. Army. The station is not part of the Project Area or the Development Plan Area and would not undergo any changes as part of the Proposed Project.

Table IV.A.1: Existing Land Uses on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island, on EIR p. IV.A.8, is revised as shown on the following page.

The paragraph under the heading “Community and Institutional Uses” on EIR p. IV.A.8 is revised as follows:

Community and institutional uses on Treasure Island include educational, religious, public service, and public works facilities. Educational facilities consist of a former elementary school, a portion of which is occupied by the Glide Foundation's YouthBuild Program, the San Francisco Sheriff’s Five Keys Charter School, and the San Francisco Police Department’s motorcycle training unit. Other educational facilities include the Life Learning Academy, the Treasure Island Clubhouse of the Boys and Girls Clubs of San Francisco, and a child development center. There is an existing chapel on the north side of California Avenue, in the southwest quadrant of the island. Public service facilities include a fire station, fire training academy, a police station, and a post office. The educational and public service facilities are concentrated in the interior of the island in the northwest quadrant. Existing public works facilities include two emergency power generators, steam plant substations, a wastewater treatment plant, and one water storage tank for both domestic and firefighting use.
## (Revised) Table IV.A.1: Existing Land Uses on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Treasure Island(^1) (Units or Acres(^2))</th>
<th>Yerba Buena Island (Units or Acres)</th>
<th>Total (Units or Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>908 units(^3) / 110 acres</td>
<td>97 units(^3) / 19 acres</td>
<td>1,005 units(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Institutional</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office and Retail</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space and Recreation Facilities</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^6)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$266</td>
<td>94103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. Total acreage on Treasure Island equals approximately 404 acres; totals shown above are rounded.
2. Does not include approximately 95 acres dedicated to parking and roads.
3. Approximately 725 units are available for occupancy.
4. Approximately 80 units are available for occupancy.
5. Approximately 805 total units are available for occupancy.
6. Includes the 37-acre Job Corps campus on Treasure Island, approximately 18 acres occupied by the California Department of Transportation, and approximately 48 acres occupied by the U.S. Coast Guard Station Station and Sector Facility on Yerba Buena Island.

Source: San Francisco Planning Department, 2005; Treasure Island Development Authority, 2010; and the U.S. Coast Guard, 2010.

The second sentence in the last paragraph on p. IV.A.9 is revised as follows:

TIHDI occupies the fitness center, and the YMCA operates the gymnasium.

The last paragraph on EIR p. IV.A.10 is revised as follows:

Unlike Treasure Island, Yerba Buena Island is a natural island that features steep slopes and dense vegetation. The island has been used by private parties and by the U.S. Army, Navy, and U.S. Coast Guard since the 1840s. Land uses on the island include residential, open space, and a portion of the Bay Bridge structure (see Figure IV.A.1).

The second full paragraph on EIR p. IV.A.12 is revised to delete the reference to the 2 acres on Yerba Buena Island:

The Conversion Act designates TIDA as the agency responsible for administering Tidelands Trust property on the Islands once the property is transferred to it by the Navy. Upon transfer, about 367 of the approximately 404 acres of land on Treasure Island would become subject to the Tidelands Trust; the 37 acres of land remaining under Federal jurisdiction on the Job Corps campus would not be subject to the Tidelands Trust. Except for approximately 2 acres of existing tidelands, the land on Yerba Buena Island transferred from the Navy to TIDA would not be subject to the Tidelands Trust upon transfer.

There is no change to Footnotes 18 and 19, cited in the text above.
The second paragraph on EIR p. IV.A.15 is revised as follows:

The Proposed Project, which includes Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island, consists of a total of up to 8,000 dwelling units, up to 140,000 sq. ft. of new commercial retail space, up to 100,000 sq. ft. of new office space, and up to 500 hotel rooms (see Table IV.A.2). Buildings 1, 2, and 3 on Treasure Island would be rehabilitated and converted to approximately 311,000 sq. ft. of commercial, retail, entertainment, and community services space. The existing chapel would be retained in its current location and continue to be used for general assembly and non-denominational religious activities. In addition, the Proposed Project would include approximately 300 acres of open space in the form of athletic fields, bicycle and pedestrian paths, parks, playgrounds, plazas, shoreline trails, stormwater wetlands, an approximately 20-acre Urban Agricultural Park, and wildlife habitat. Approximately 220 acres of open space would be on Treasure Island, and the remaining 80 acres would be on Yerba Buena Island.

The third full paragraph on EIR p. IV.A.21 is revised as follows:

The U.S. Coast Guard station and Sector Facility on the southern portion of Yerba Buena Island is an adjacent land use that is outside of the Project Area. The physical topography and separation of the U.S. Coast Guard station and Sector Facility would limit potential construction impacts on this facility. Construction activities would not result in the physical disruption or division of the U.S. Coast Guard facilities.

The sixth sentence of the first paragraph under Impact LU-3 on EIR p. IV.A.24 is revised as follows:

Existing buildings to be retained and reused as part of the Proposed Project include Historic Buildings 1, 2, and 3 and the existing chapel would be retained and adaptively reused as part of the Proposed Project, thus maintaining some of the existing land use character of the vicinity.

The first sentence of the third full paragraph on EIR p. IV.A.25 is revised as follows:

The only uses near the proposed Development Plan Area on Yerba Buena Island are the existing U.S. Coast Guard station and Sector Facility and the Bay Bridge span and structure on the southern portion of Yerba Buena Island.

The first sentence of the first paragraph under the subheading “Yerba Buena Island” on EIR p. IV.A.26 is revised as follows:

Currently, only approximately None of the 150 acres on Yerba Buena Island would be subject to the Tidelands Trust upon transfer.

The first full sentence at the top of EIR p. IV.A.28 is revised as follows:

The U.S. Coast Guard station and Sector Facility, which is outside of the Project Area, is expected to remain and continue to operate at its existing site on Yerba Buena Island.
Section IV.B, Aesthetics

The responses in Chapter 2 of this Comments and Responses document include revised and new figures for EIR Section IV.B, Aesthetics. These figures are listed below, along with the page number on which the figure may be found in this Comments and Responses document:

- Figure IV.B.1: Viewpoint Locations, on p. EIR IV.B.3 – see the revised figure in Section 2.4, Aesthetics, p. 2.4.41.
- Figure IV.B.2a: Viewpoint Aa – View from Pier 7 – see the new figure on p. 2.4.14.
- Figure IV.B.6a: Viewpoint Ea – View from the Berkeley Hills – see the new figure on p. 2.4.17.
- Figure IV.B.10: Proposed Representative Massing Diagram, on p. EIR IV.B.20 – see the revised figure in Section 2.6, Historic Resources, on p 2.6.9.
- Figure IV.B.11: Representative Rendering of the Ferry Terminal – see the new figure on p. 2.4.21.
- Figure IV.B.12: Representative Rendering of Marina Plaza – see the new figure on p. 2.4.22.
- Figure IV.B.13: Representative View of Clipper Cove Promenade – see the new figure on p. 2.4.23.
- Figure IV.B.14: Representative Rendering of Cityside Avenue and Shoreline Park – see the new figure on p. 2.4.24.
- Figure IV.B.15: Representative Rendering of Eastside Commons – see the new figure on p. 2.4.25.
- Figure IV.B.16: Representative Rendering of Typical Garden Street – see the new figure on p. 2.4.26.
- Figure IV.B.17: Island Center District Isometric View – see the new figure on p. 2.4.4.
- Figure IV.B.18: Cityside District Isometric View – see the new figure on p. 2.4.5.
- Figure IV.B.19: Eastside District Isometric View – see the new figure on p. 2.4.6.
- Figure IV.B.20: Nighttime View from Calhoun Terrace on Telegraph Hill – see the new figure on p. 2.4.32.
- Figure IV.B.21: Nighttime View from the Berkeley Marina – see the new figure on p. 2.4.33.

The first full paragraph on EIR p. IV.B.4 is revised as follows to introduce a new figure entitled “Figure IV.B.2a: Viewpoint Aa – View from Pier 7”:

San Francisco’s eastern waterfront affords panoramic vistas of the Bay, the Bay Bridge, and the East Bay Hills rising in the distance. See Figure IV.B.2: Viewpoint A – View from The Embarcadero at Rincon Park (Existing). In this view, the lawn of Rincon Park occupies the foreground. In the middleground are Herb Caen Way and the Bay water
The Bay Bridge bounds views to the southeast, directing views to the western slopes of Yerba Buena Island rising prominently in the distance (about 1.6 miles). The western and southern shoreline of Treasure Island is visible as a flat expanse to the north of Yerba Buena Island (left in this view). Because of their size, prominent location, and light color, Buildings 1 and 2 are recognizable in the distance. The East Bay Hills rise in the distant background (about 10 miles away). At the far left in the photograph is the Port of San Francisco’s pedestrian-access Pier 14.

As listed above, new Figure IV.B.2a is shown in this Comments and Responses document on p. 2.4.14.

EIR p. IV.B.9 is revised to insert a new discussion entitled “Views from the East Bay Hills” immediately after the discussion “Views from the East Bay Shoreline” after the second paragraph and to introduce a new figure entitled “Figure IV.B.6a: Viewpoint Ea – View from the Berkeley Hills Along Grizzly Peak Boulevard.

Views from the East Bay Hills

The scenic turnout along Grizzly Peak Boulevard is a popular public viewpoint in the Berkeley Hills, with panoramic distant vistas of the northern Bay Area region unobstructed by vegetation and structures. See Figure IV.B.6a: Viewpoint Ea – View from the Berkeley Hills (Existing). The foreground in this view is occupied by undeveloped foothills, and the East Bay flatlands beyond. The Bay is visible in the distance (about 4.8 miles away) as well as familiar features of the Bay including the Bay Bridge, Yerba Buena Island, and Treasure Island (about 8.5 miles away). On the opposite shore of the Bay rises the San Francisco skyline (about 11 miles away) and the hills of San Francisco. The Golden Gate Bridge (about 14.5 miles away) links San Francisco to the hills of Marin County. From this elevated vantage point, Bay water is visible separating Yerba Buena Island and Treasure Island from the San Francisco peninsula (unlike water-level East Bay shoreline locations, in which Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island are not clearly discernible as features distinct from San Francisco).

As listed above, new Figure IV.B.6a is shown in this Comments and Responses document on p. 2.4.17.

The last sentence of the second paragraph on EIR p. IV.B.19 is revised as follows to delete the term “neighborhood marker” as redundant and unnecessary:

Within two residential districts, the Cityside and Eastside Districts, individual blocks would consist primarily of a dense, low-rise podium (up to 70 feet) punctuated by mid-rise buildings (between 70 and 130 feet) and neighborhood high-rise towers (up to 240 feet) serving as neighborhood markers.
Chapter IX
3. DEIR Revisions

1. Changes in Response to Comments

The third paragraph on EIR p. IV.B.21 is revised as follows:

Proposed new construction on Treasure Island would adversely alter scenic vistas of San Francisco Bay from the eastern waterfront of San Francisco (see Figure IV.B.2: Viewpoint A – View from The Embarcadero at Rincon Park (Proposed), and Figure IV.B.2a: Viewpoint Aa – View from Pier 7 (Proposed)), and from Telegraph Hill (see Figure IV.B.3: View Point B – View from Telegraph Hill at Pioneer Park (Proposed)). From these vantage points new construction on Treasure Island would be a prominent new visual presence within scenic vistas of San Francisco Bay, occupying a wide expanse of an individual’s field of view.

The last paragraph on EIR p. IV.B.21 is revised as follows:

New construction on Treasure Island would not have a substantial adverse impact on scenic vistas from more distant off-site locations. From Twin Peaks, the proposed new construction on Treasure Island would not be prominent, if discernible at all. (See Figure IV.B.4: View Point C – View from Twin Peaks (Proposed).) It would be largely obscured beyond dense, high-rise development of Downtown San Francisco. From the hills of Marin, the proposed new construction on Treasure Island would not be a dominant visual presence in the context of panoramic scenic vistas of the Bay that include the San Francisco skyline, the Golden Gate Bridge, the Bay Bridge, Yerba Buena Island, and the East Bay Hills. (See Figure IV.B.5: View Point D – View from the Marin Headlands at Vista Point (Proposed).) Similarly, from the East Bay Hills the proposed new construction on Treasure Island would not be a dominant visual presence in the context of panoramic scenic vistas of the Bay that include the East Bay flatland and shoreline, the San Francisco skyline, the Golden Gate Bridge, the Bay Bridge, Yerba Buena Island, and the hills of Marin County. (See Figure IV.B.6a: View Point Ea – View from the Berkeley Hills (Proposed).) From this elevated location, Treasure Island would continue to be visibly discernible as a feature distinct from San Francisco.

The second full paragraph on EIR p. IV.B.24 is revised as follows to refer to (New) Figure IV.B.2a: Viewpoint Aa – View from Pier 7:

As described above and in Chapter II, Project Description, “Yerba Buena Island District,” p. II.22, new construction on Yerba Buena Island would be placed primarily on the sites of existing buildings and would be predominantly low-rise, stepping down hillsides. See (New) Figure IV.B.2a: Viewpoint Aa – View from Pier 7, on EIR p. IV.B.5a. Existing residential buildings that are now visible on Yerba Buena Island from San Francisco would be replaced by new residential buildings of comparable scale (some new buildings would be 1-2 stories taller than the existing buildings). A mid-rise building would be permitted in zone 4Y stepping down the north slope of the island facing Clipper Cove. Building height and placement limitations established by the Design for Development (see Figure II.5: Yerba Buena View Corridors, p. II.23, and Figure II.6b: Yerba Buena Island Maximum Height Limit Plan, p. II.27 in Chapter II, Project Description) would ensure that development would not rise above the ridgeline of Yerba Buena Island to substantially alter the existing visual character of the Yerba Buena Island landform as a scenic resource of San Francisco Bay. Proposed new development on Yerba Buena Island would not be substantially more prominent than existing development when viewed from locations around the Bay, if discernible at all.
A new paragraph is added after the third paragraph on EIR p. IV.B.25 to introduce perspective architectural renderings to present streetscape perspective renderings reproduced from the proposed Design for Development, to assist the reader in understanding the urban design intent for Treasure Island (new text is underlined):

Figure IV.B.9 (Proposed) shows the view toward Building 1 from the open area west of Building 1. Low, 20-foot-tall retail pavilions in the foreground would symmetrically flank this view of Building 1. High-rise towers would rise from beyond Building 1. Its low horizontal form, curved façade, and distinctive architectural features would contrast with nearby new construction.

Presented below are representative perspective renderings of proposed development on Treasure Island, reproduced from the proposed Design for Development. These figures illustrate the urban design intent for Treasure Island as viewed from key public gathering spaces on Treasure Island. See Figure IV.B.11: Representative Rendering of the Ferry Terminal; Figure IV.B.12: Representative Rendering of Marina Plaza; Figure IV.B.13: Representative Rendering of Clipper Cove Promenade; Figure IV.B.14: Representative Rendering of Cityside Avenue and Shoreline Park; Figure IV.B.15: Representative Rendering of Eastside Commons; and Figure IV.B.16: Representative Rendering of Typical Garden Street.

As part of the Proposed Project, a Design for Development would be adopted and implemented. The Design for Development is a regulatory document that would establish design standards and guidelines that would direct future development of the Project Area…

As listed above, new Figures IV.B.11, IV.B.12, IV.B.13, IV.B.14, IV.B.15 and IV.B.16 are shown in this Comments and Responses document on pp. 2.4.21, 2.4.22, 2.4.23, 2.4.24, 2.4.25, and 2.4.26, respectively.

The second full paragraph of EIR p. IV.B.26 is revised as follows to present new representative isometric images reproduced from the proposed Design for Development:

As a regulatory document, the proposed Design for Development is intended to ensure the enhancement of visual quality within the Project Area. It would inform the design and review of specific development projects within the Project Area. If the proposed Design for Development is adopted by the decision-makers, it would reflect the City’s long-term vision for the visual character and quality of the Project Area. Presented below for illustrative purposes are representative isometric renderings, reproduced from the proposed Design for Development. These figures illustrate the intent of the proposed Design for Development that buildings be sculpted and articulated to contribute visual interest, texture, and variety to the public realm. See Figure IV.B.17: Island Center District Isometric View; Figure IV.B.18: Cityside District Isometric View; and Figure IV.B.19: Eastside District Isometric View. Note however, that they do not illustrate any particular building design or specific placement. New construction within the Project Area would be subject to design review by TIDA for conformity with the Design for Development as specific designs are proposed in the future.
As listed above, new Figures IV.B.17, IV.B.18, and IV.B.19 are shown in this Comments and Responses document on pp. 2.4.4, 2.4.5, and 2.4.6, respectively.

The discussion of Impact AE-4, on EIR p. IV.B.27, is revised as follows to introduce and discuss two new figures entitled “Figure IV.B.20: Nighttime View from Calhoun Terrace on Telegraph Hill” and “Figure IV.B.21: Nighttime View from the Berkeley Marina:

**Impact AE-4: Implementation of the Proposed Project would increase the nighttime lighting requirements within the Development Plan Area, and would affect nighttime views of the Bay from public areas, and would increase potential sources of glare. (Less than Significant)**

Current levels of nighttime lighting within the Development Plan Area are relatively low, consistent with the relatively low intensity of existing land uses within the Development Plan Area. Current sources of nighttime light include exterior security lighting of buildings, yards, streets, parking lots, and light emitted from within occupied residential buildings. Given the distances to mainland locations around the Bay, the low-rise stature of buildings within the Development Plan Area, and a cover of vegetation, the Development Plan Area is not a prominent visual presence within nighttime views of the Bay from mainland locations around the Bay.

Implementation of the Proposed Project would increase the nighttime lighting requirements within the Development Plan Area. Lighting for the Proposed Project would include exterior lighting of streets, sidewalks, parking areas, public spaces, and building entrances. Light would also be emitted from the interiors of residential and non-residential buildings. The Proposed Project would also include a Sports Park located immediately north of the Eastside neighborhood. The Sports Park would include a range of sports facilities (e.g., for baseball, soccer, football, basketball, tennis, etc.). Nighttime use of the Sports Park would require elevated high-intensity outdoor lighting to illuminate the playing fields, creating the potential for spillover of intrusive amounts of light into nearby residential areas. The particular program and layout of the facility, the particular location and characteristics of Sports Park lighting, and of landscape screening around the facility have not been determined at this time.

New sources of nighttime lighting on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island would affect nighttime views of the Bay as seen from various public locations around the Bay. Figure IV.B.20: Nighttime View from Calhoun Terrace on Telegraph Hill, and Figure IV.B.21: Nighttime View from the Berkeley Marina, are representative renderings of nighttime views of Proposed Project within the Bay from San Francisco and the East Bay, prepared by an independent visual simulation consultant, Steelblue LLC.

The existing character of nighttime lighting as a feature of views of the Bay from these locations is consistent with the role of the central Bay as a regional center of population, commerce, industry and transportation. In nighttime views from San Francisco, the most prominent existing illuminated features include street lights and lighted buildings on Treasure Island, the Bay Bridge West Span, transportation infrastructure along the opposite shoreline, commercial and industrial activities in the East Bay flatlands including the Port of Oakland, and residences in the East Bay Hills. In nighttime views of the Bay from the East Bay, the most prominent illuminated features of the Bay include Treasure Island, the Bay Bridge East Span, the San Francisco skyline, and the Golden Gate Bridge.
Gate Bridge. Unlike daytime scenic views of this portion of the Bay (as described on EIR pp. IV.B.1-IV.B.11) in which dramatic topographic features around the Bay combine with recognizable built features, water, and sky to create readable and memorable scenic compositions characterized by spatial and geographic clarity, nighttime views of the Bay are not characterized by such clarity. Unlit features recede in prominence, while the prominence of illuminated features is elevated. As such, the character and enjoyment of nighttime views of the Bay are largely based on the visual effect of light sources and the play of light on water.

The proposed development on Treasure Island would be a prominent new illuminated presence within nighttime views of the Bay, rising from the Bay water and reflected in the Bay water adjacent to Treasure Island, particularly when viewed from San Francisco. However, viewed from the East Bay shoreline at the Berkeley Marina, against the background of San Francisco’s downtown skyline, the visual change from existing nighttime conditions would be less discernible. The perception of this change is largely subjective. Some viewers who have grown accustomed to existing nighttime visual conditions of the Bay may experience the change as an undesirable consequence of the Proposed Project. Other viewers may perceive the nighttime lighting of Proposed Project as a new visual resource of the Bay. Light originating from the Proposed Project and visible from mainland locations would not contribute substantially to existing ambient light conditions on the mainland that could affect human comfort or disrupt sleep. The impact of Project lighting on mainland locations and on nighttime views of the Bay would therefore be considered less than significant.

The potential for project impacts from nighttime lighting would be greatest for the existing residential uses that would remain (like the Job Corps site), and the new residential uses that would be constructed under the Proposed Project.

As listed above, new Figures IV.B.20 and IV.B.21 are shown in this Comments and Responses document on pp. 2.4.32 and 2.4.33, respectively.

The second complete paragraph on EIR p. IV.B.28 is revised as follows to augment the discussion of potential impacts related to glare:

The Proposed Project would not result in excessive glare that could substantially affect human comfort. The effect of glare, resulting from sunlight reflected off of building surfaces and reaching the eye of a viewer is a transitory phenomenon that changes with the position of the sun and the position of the viewer, time of year and atmospheric conditions. As such, the quality and intensity of reflected sunlight is always in flux. The perception of this phenomenon is largely subjective. Some viewers who have grown accustomed to reflected sunlight from buildings located in the East Bay Hills as seen from San Francisco, or viewers who have grown accustomed to reflections of sunlight from buildings located in San Francisco as seen from the East Bay, the North Bay or other parts of San Francisco, may experience the change in sunlight reflected off building surfaces within the Proposed Project area as an undesirable consequence of the Proposed Project. Other viewers may perceive the same change as a new visual resource of the Bay. Implementation of the Proposed Project could create excessive daytime glare if new buildings include highly reflective materials. The potential for excessive daytime glare would be greatest for receptors within the Development Plan Area and travelers on the Bay Bridge. The intensity of reflected daytime glare on mainland locations around
the Bay would be diffused by distance. The proposed Design for Development prohibits the use of reflective or mirrored glass in new construction. (Please see Guidelines T5.4.27 and T5.4.33 in Section T5.4, Pedestrian Scale, on p. 186, of the March 5, 2010 draft Design for Development. The guideline numbers and the page number cited above could change as part of an update to the proposed Design for Development.) New buildings within the Project Area would thus include transparent or lightly tinted glass rather than reflective glass, to minimize reflection of sunlight. Conformity with the Design for Development would ensure that the potential for daytime glare from project buildings would be less than significant.

Section IV.D, Cultural and Paleontological Resources

The last sentence of the first paragraph under the heading “Army Period” on EIR p. IV.D.6 is revised as follows:

In 1875, the Army Lighthouse Board (now the U.S. Coast Guard) constructed the lighthouse, lighthouse keeper’s residence and support buildings; these are still present at the southern end of the island outside of the Development Plan Area.

The second sentence of the last paragraph on EIR p. IV.D.27 is revised as follows:

Although the Navy has managed the portion of Yerba Buena Island under its control and Treasure Island (collectively, Naval Station Treasure Island, or “NSTI”) as a single facility since 1940, the two islands have different histories. Yerba Buena Island is a natural island that has been used by private parties and by the Army, Navy, and Coast Guard since the 1840s. Treasure Island is an artificial island, constructed in 1936-1937 in the rocky shoals north of Yerba Buena Island.

The second sentence of the first paragraph on p. IV.D.28 is revised as follows:

Troops were stationed on the southeastern part of the island, above a cove near the modern Coast Guard Station and Sector Facility.

The third sentence of the first paragraph on EIR p. IV.D.28 is revised as follows:

The context for historic architectural resources on Yerba Buena Island begins with the Army’s occupation of the island in 1867, when the Army asserted a claim and took possession of the island. Troops were stationed on the southeastern part of the island, above a cove near the modern Coast Guard Station. In 1875, the Army Lighthouse Board (now the U.S. Coast Guard) constructed the lighthouse and lighthouse keeper’s residence at the southern end of the island (these buildings still stand, but they are outside of the Development Plan Area)…
Chapter IX
3. DEIR Revisions
1. Changes in Response to Comments

Table IV.D.1: NRHP Listed Properties in the Development Plan Area, on EIR p. IV.D.31, is revised as follows:

(Revised) Table IV.D.1: NRHP Listed Properties in the Development Plan Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Number</th>
<th>Resource Name</th>
<th>Year Constructed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yerba Buena Island</td>
<td>Senior Officers’ Quarters Historic District: The Nimitz House (Quarters 1), six other senior officers’ quarters (Quarters 2-7), associated garages (Building 205, Building 230), family quarters (Building 83), and formal landscaping elements of the area.</td>
<td>1900 - 1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nimitz House (individually listed and a contributor to district)</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/267</td>
<td>Quarters 10 and its contributing garage (individually listed)</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Torpedo Assembly Building (individually listed)</td>
<td>1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasure Island</td>
<td>Administration Building, Building 1 (individually listed)</td>
<td>1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hall of Transportation, Building 2 (individually listed)</td>
<td>1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Palace of Fine and Decorative Arts, Building 3 (individually listed, Building 111 is identified as a component of Building 3)</td>
<td>1939</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table excludes Yerba Buena Island buildings that are south of the Bay Bridge. They are currently located on the U.S. Coast Guard Station and Sector Facility. They are not within the Development Plan Area and are not subject to study in this EIR Section.

Source: San Francisco Planning Department, 2005 EIR.

Figure IV.D.6: Height Plan Near Buildings 1, 2, and 3, on p. IV.D.59, is revised, as shown in Section 2.6, Historic Resources, of this Comments and Responses document on p. 2.6.19.

Section IV.E, Transportation

The second full paragraph on EIR p. IV.E.19 is revised as follows:

The Golden Gate Bridge, Highway, and Transportation District (“GGBHTD”) provides bus and ferry service between the North Bay (Marin and Sonoma Counties) and San Francisco. Within San Francisco, Golden Gate Transit bus lines 2, 4, 8, 18, 24, 26, 27, 38, 44, 54, 56, 58, 72, 73, 74, 76, 97, 10, 70, 80 and 101 operate on surface streets, with stops adjacent to the Transbay Terminal offering service to Marin and Sonoma Counties. Golden Gate Transit also operates ferry service between the Larkspur and Sausalito Ferry Terminals in Marin County and the San Francisco Ferry Building.

The last sentence of the third full paragraph on EIR p. IV.E.23 is revised as follows:

A temporary terminal, located on the block bounded by Main, Folsom, Beale and Howard Streets, opened in August 2010, and serves commuters during demolition and construction of the new Transit Center.
Chapter IX
3. DEIR Revisions
1. Changes in Response to Comments

The following new text is added and the following existing text is revised at the beginning of the
Regulatory Framework subsection on EIR p. IV.E.25:

**Federal, State, Regional**

There are no Federal, State, or regional transportation regulations applicable to the Proposed Project.

**State**

**Treasure Island Transportation Management Act**

AB 981, enacted in 2008, authorized the San Francisco Board of Supervisors to designate a board or agency to act as the transportation management agency for Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island. The Treasure Island Transportation Management Agency (“TITMA”) is the name of the agency designated in AB 981. AB 981 also authorizes the Board of Supervisors and the San Francisco County Transportation Authority, by a two-thirds majority of each body, to adopt a congestion pricing program for Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island and to set an initial congestion pricing fee structure based on recommendation by TITMA. AB 981 also authorizes TITMA, among other things, to establish parking fees, fines, and other parking-related revenues, to establish a transit pass fee structure and program, and to adopt amendments to the congestion pricing fee structure.

**Regional**

**San Francisco Bay Trail Plan**

Refer to Chapter III, Plans and Policies, for a description of the San Francisco Bay Plan and its application to the Proposed Project. The following information about the San Francisco Bay Plan is related to the Transportation analysis.

The 2005 Gap Analysis Study, prepared by ABAG for the entire Bay Trail area, attempted to identify the remaining gaps in the Bay Trail system; classify the gaps by phase, county, and benefit ranking; develop cost estimates for individual gap completion; identify strategies and actions to overcome gaps; and present an overall cost and timeframe for completion of the Bay Trail system. In the vicinity of the Project site, the 2005 Gap Analysis Study proposes to connect existing Bay Trail segments in downtown San Francisco with the trail on the eastern span of the Bay Bridge. The proposed trail would then connect to the existing trails in Oakland.

Figure IV.E.8: Proposed Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Street System, on EIR p. IV.E.31, is revised, as shown in Section 2.7, Transportation, of this Comments and Responses document on p. 2.7.13.

The first paragraph under the bulleted paragraph “Major Arterials” on p. IV.E.32 is revised as follows:

- On Treasure Island Road, a bicycle lane would be provided in the south and east-bound directions only (i.e., from Treasure Island towards the Bay Bridge only), with the exception that a Class II bicycle lane would be provided for a short segment in
the northbound direction from Macalla Road to Treasure Island, connecting the proposed bicycle lane in the downhill direction on Macalla Road with Treasure Island. A short section on Treasure Island Road near the existing Bay Bridge westbound on-ramp would have a 14-foot wide travel lane and a Class III bicycle route instead of a Class II bicycle lane. There would be sidewalks 10-foot Class I shared bicycle/pedestrian facilities provided on both sides of Treasure Island Road between Treasure Island and Macalla Road. In addition, the 10-foot Class I shared bicycle/pedestrian facility proposed on the west side of Treasure Island Road would extend from the Transit Hub on Treasure Island to the proposed lookout point south of the Macalla Road intersection. Otherwise, no sidewalks would be provided on the section of Treasure Island Road between Macalla Road and the Bay Bridge.

There is no change to footnote 10, cited in this text change.

The last dashed paragraph on p. IV.E.32, which continues at the top of p. IV.E.33, is revised as follows:

- Macalla Road would be reconfigured to provide (from south to north) a 16-foot two-way Class I shared bicycle/pedestrian path, an 11-foot travel lane allowing one-way vehicular traffic only, from the Bay Bridge northwesterly towards Treasure Island Road, a 2- to 3-foot buffer, and a 5- to 9-foot Class II bicycle lane in the downhill direction. Cyclists traveling downhill could use either the Class I facility or the Class II facility. Cyclists traveling in the uphill direction could use the Class I facility. Pedestrians traveling in either direction could use the Class I facility on the south side of Macalla Road. This street would provide one 11-foot wide travel lane, a five-foot Class II bicycle lane on the right-hand side, and a 6-foot wide contraflow bicycle lane on the left-hand side. A 5-foot wide sidewalk would also be provided on the left-hand side.

Figure IV.E.9: Proposed Transit Circulation Plan, on EIR p. IV.E.34, is revised, as shown in Section 2.1, Project Description, on p. 2.1.15 of this Comments and Responses document.

Figure IV.E.10: Conceptual Yerba Buena Island Pedestrian Circulation Plan, on EIR p. IV.E.37, is revised, as shown on p. 2.7.94 of this Comments and Responses document.

Figure IV.E.11: Proposed Bicycle Circulation Plan, on EIR p. IV.E.38, is revised, as shown on p. 2.7.75 of this Comments and Responses document.

The first sentence in the first full paragraph on EIR p. IV.E.39 is revised as follows (deleted text is shown in strike through, new text is underlined):

On Yerba Buena Island, the bicycle circulation network would consist of a two-way shared bicycle/pedestrian path west of Treasure Island Road leading to a scenic overlook about 500 feet south of the intersection with Macalla Road, and a one-way counterclockwise Class II bicycle lane loop around Treasure Island Road, Hillcrest Road, and Macalla Road, with connections to the planned bicycle/pedestrian path on the new Bay Bridge east span.
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The second full paragraph on EIR p. IV.E.39 is revised as follows:

In addition, a contra-flow 16-foot two-way shared Class II bicycle/pedestrian path lane would be provided on Macalla Road. The Macalla Road bicycle lane path would provide a shorter, yet steeper, alternative route from Treasure Island to the Bay Bridge. A 10-foot two-way shared Class I bicycle/pedestrian path would also be constructed on the west side of Treasure Island Road between Treasure Island and the new lookout point just south of the Macalla Road intersection, as well as on the east side of Treasure Island Road between Treasure Island and Macalla Road. Other streets on Yerba Buena Island would allow shared bicycle/auto use, but no exclusive bicycle right-of-way would be provided.

The last two sentences in the second bulleted paragraph on EIR p. IV.E.39 are revised as follows:

On the north side of this intersection, the shared path would continue on the south side of Macalla Road to its terminus at Treasure Island Road. End, and bicyclists destined for Treasure Island would need to cross Macalla Road at a new crosswalk. North of this crossing, Macalla Road would provide one travel lane northbound (toward Treasure Island) and would have a Class II bicycle lane in each direction, one being a contra-flow lane.

Figure IV.E.12: Proposed Hillcrest Road at South Gate Road Intersection Configuration, on EIR p. IV.E.40, is revised, as shown on p. 2.7.91 of this Comments and Responses document.

Figure IV.E.13: Proposed Macalla Road at Bay Bridge Westbound On-ramp Intersection, on p. EIR IV.E.41, is revised, as shown on p. 2.7.78 of this Comments and Responses document.

Figure IV.E.14: Proposed Treasure Island Road at Macalla Road Intersection Configuration, on EIR p. IV.E.42, is revised, as shown on p. 2.7.79 of this Comments and Responses document.

The text in first bulleted paragraph at the top of EIR p. IV.E.43 is revised as follows:

**Treasure Island Road at Macalla Road** – The proposed bicycle treatments at this intersection are shown on Figure IV.E.14: Proposed Treasure Island Road at Macalla Road Intersection Configuration. Bicyclists using Treasure Island Road to access the Class I two-way shared bike/pedestrian path contra-flow bicycle lane on Macalla Road from Treasure Island would need to turn left across the opposing direction of traffic on Treasure Island Road to access Macalla Road. The Proposed Project would provide a new five-foot wide bicycle-only left-turn lane from Treasure Island Road to Macalla Road adjacent to an 112-foot wide travel lane on Treasure Island Road and separated from oncoming traffic by an 115-foot median. The bicycle-only turn lane and wide median would facilitate the left turn maneuver, and provide a clear and safe route to access Macalla Road from Treasure Island Road.

The second and third bulleted items on the bottom of EIR p. IV.E.43 are revised as follows:

- Macalla Road contra-flow Class II downhill bicycle lane at intersecting cross-streets; and
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- Treasure Island Road/Macalla Road intersection.
  - Bicycle-only left-turn lane from Treasure Island Road to the contra-flow Class I bicycle lane path on Macalla Road; and
  - Bicycle-only section of median on Treasure Island Road at Macalla Road.

Figure IV.E.15: Proposed Treasure Island Road at Bay Bridge Westbound On-ramp (West Side) Intersection Configuration, on p. IV.E.44, is revised, as shown on p. 2.7.80 of this Comments and Responses document.

The following new sentence is added to the paragraph regarding “Congestion Pricing” on EIR p. IV.E.45:

Visitors to the Islands, high-occupancy vehicles, and Coast Guard-related vehicles would not be charged a congestion pricing fee.

Footnote 4 in Table IV.E.5: Person Trip Generation by Mode on EIR p. IV.E.60 is revised as follows:

Based on counts of peak hour vehicle traffic on the Islands and assumes that the existing trip generation of the Job Corps center on Treasure Island and at the Coast Guard Station and Sector Facility on Yerba Buena Island would remain the same.

In Mitigation Measure M-TR-1, Construction Traffic Management Plan, the following text is added to the first sentence of the last paragraph on EIR p. IV.E.69, continuing on p. IV.E.70:

The Plan shall disseminate appropriate information to contractors and affected agencies with respect to coordinating construction activities to minimize overall disruptions and ensure that overall circulation on the Islands is maintained to the extent possible, with particular focus on ensuring pedestrian, transit, and bicycle connectivity and access to the Bay and to recreational uses to the extent feasible.

The following item is added to the end of the bulleted list on p. IV.E.70 as an item required as part of M-TR-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan:

- Require contractors to notify vendors that STAA trucks larger than 65 feet exiting from the eastbound direction of the Bay Bridge may only use the off-ramp on the east side of Yerba Buena Island.

The second sentence of the first full paragraph on p. IV.E.81 is revised as follows:

Primary access between the Coast Guard Station and Sector Facility and the eastbound on-ramp is via South Gate Road (which connects with North Gate Road).

The last sentence of the last paragraph on EIR p. IV.E.81 is revised as follows:

In addition, the longest potential queue the Coast Guard vehicles would have to wait in would be about one-tenth of a mile, based on the distance between the places such vehicles access the main YBI circulation route and the Bay Bridge. Accordingly, the
Proposed Project would not be expected to substantially affect access to the Coast Guard Station and Sector Facility.

The second paragraph on EIR p. IV.E.100 is revised as follows to clarify that SFMTA is the implementing agency of Mitigation Measure M-TR-24:

Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-24 would only be triggered if the extent of actual vehicle queuing impacts the proposed Muni line 108 Treasure Island on Treasure Island Road and creates delays for Muni buses accessing the westbound transit-only on-ramp. As such, throughout the life of the project, the TITMA, in consultation with SFMTA and using SFMTA’s methodology, shall monitor the length and duration of potential queues on Treasure Island Road and the associated delays to Muni service. If the queues between First Street and the westbound on-ramp on the west side of Yerba Buena Island result in an operational delay to Muni service equal to or greater than the prevailing headway during the AM, PM or Saturday peak periods, SFMTA, in consultation with TITMA, shall implement a southbound transit-only lane between First Street on Treasure Island and the transit and emergency vehicle-only westbound Bay Bridge on-ramp. The implementation of a transit-only lane would be triggered if impacts are observed over the course of six months at least 50 percent of the time during the AM, PM, or Saturday peak periods.

The second bulleted item on the bottom of EIR p. IV.E.100 is revised as follows:

- Elimination of the proposed southbound Class II bicycle lane on Treasure Island Road and a small portion of Hillcrest Road south of the intersection with Macalla Road. The Class I facility on Treasure Island Road connecting Treasure Island and the proposed new lookout point, just south of the Macalla Road intersection, would remain. Bicyclists who use the Class I path to the lookout point and continue on Treasure Island Road toward Hillcrest Road would have to share the lane with traffic, similar to other roadways where bicycle lanes are not provided. Bicyclists would still be able to use Class I bicycle paths and Class II bicycle lanes proposed on Macalla Road to connect between the Islands and the bicycle path on the new east span of the Bay Bridge.

The second paragraph in Impact TR-33 on EIR p. IV.E.108 is revised as follows:

On Yerba Buena Island, a one-way Class II bicycle lane would be provided on Treasure Island Road and Hillcrest Road, which would continue as a loop around South Gate Road and Macalla Road, back to Treasure Island Road. Although Macalla Road is one-way northbound for vehicles, a contra flow Class II bicycle lane would also be provided from Treasure Island Road to South Gate Road, continuing on South Gate Road to its intersection with Hillcrest Road, and the Class I path connecting to the new Bay Bridge eastern span path, although portions of this facility near the bridge and ramps connections are proposed to be constructed separately by the Ramps Project and the Bay Bridge eastern span replacement project, separated from traffic by a two-foot buffer with painted chevrons. As a result, Macalla Road would provide a Class II bicycle lanes path in each direction connecting Treasure Island Road and the Bay Bridge for bicycle traffic in each direction, as well as a Class II bicycle lane specifically for bicycle traffic traveling in the downhill direction from the Bay Bridge toward Treasure Island.
The last paragraph on p. IV.E.108, which continues on to p. IV.E.109, is revised as follows:

There would be one primary bicycle route from the Bay Bridge to Treasure Island, on Macalla Road, either via the Class I or Class II facilities provided on that roadway. There would be two primary routes from Treasure Island to the Bay Bridge. The Class I facility on Macalla Road would be the most direct (although steeper) route to the Bay Bridge from Treasure Island. Bicyclists who opt for a longer, but less steep route from Treasure Island to the Bay Bridge would use the one-way Class II bicycle lane on Treasure Island Road and Hillcrest Road. At the intersection of Hillcrest Road and South Gate Road, bicyclists would be able to enter the Bay Bridge bicycle/pedestrian path providing access to the East Bay. Bicyclists traveling on Macalla Road to access the Bay Bridge bicycle path would use the Class II bicycle lanes on Macalla Road, and South Gate Road between Treasure Island and the Bay Bridge westbound ramps intersection at Hillcrest Road and South Gate Road, where the Class I facility would intersec the Bay Bridge eastern span facility. Between that intersection and the Bay Bridge bicycle path, which begins at the intersection of Hillcrest Road and South Gate Road, bicyclists and pedestrians would use a 10-foot shared pathway on the west side of the street, which would continue along South Gate Road and loop around onto the bridge.

The third sentence in the first full paragraph on EIR p. IV.E.109 is revised as follows:

At Macalla Road and the Bay Bridge westbound ramps, treatments would include a Class II bicycle-only lanes in each the downhill direction between the Bay Bridge westbound ramps and Treasure Island Road.

The first full sentence in the first partial paragraph on p. IV.E.110 is revised as follows:

Cyclists would continue to have a Class II contra flow facility connecting Treasure Island and the Bay Bridge, via Treasure Island Road (eastern side) and Macalla Road.

The first paragraph on EIR p. IV.E.112 is revised to add mention of the new pedestrian connection to the new overlook viewing area, as follows:

On Yerba Buena Island, sidewalks would be built on most public streets, except on Treasure Island Road, south of Macalla Road, where grading constrains the width of the right-of-way along roadways and a pedestrian path would be constructed as part of a two-way, mixed-use bike/pedestrian facility along Treasure Island Road to a scenic overlook about 500 feet south of the intersection with Macalla Road. In addition to sidewalks, several trails through the open spaces and development areas would be constructed on Yerba Buena Island.

A new sentence is added at the end of the first paragraph on p. IV.E.112:

A new Class I shared bicycle/pedestrian facility would also be constructed on Macalla Road and South Gate Road providing pedestrian connections between Treasure Island and the Bay Bridge eastern span bicycle/pedestrian facility.
The first paragraph on EIR p. IV.E.139 is revised as follows:

…Some centralized off-street parking is proposed as part of the Project and is likely to be built even if individual buildings do not provide parking. Market analysis conducted for TICD indicated that providing less than one parking space per residential unit could affect the financeability of the development program, the marketability of the homes, and livability of the Islands, and make the project economically infeasible. In addition, parking fees for non-residential uses would be a substantial portion of the funding supporting transit facilities and other features of the Proposed Project’s TDM Plan. With no off-street commercial parking, there would not be sufficient funds to support the entire TDM Plan and transit services, and the Proposed Project would be infeasible.

There is no change to footnote 37, cited in the text above.

Section IV.F, Noise

Figure IV.F.1: Noise Measurement Locations, on p. IV.F.5, is revised, as shown in Section 2.7, Transportation, of this Comments and Responses document on p. 2.7.11.

The references to impacts to residents on the Coast Guard property in the third and fourth full paragraphs on EIR p. IV.F.21 are deleted and other revisions to these paragraphs are made, as shown below:

Although these significant traffic noise level increases would not expose existing or future residents to noise levels in excess of compatibility standards (discussed in Impact NO-6), they would affect future residential receptors in the Cityside District, the Island Center District, and the Yerba Buena Island District, particularly, future residents of early phases who would not have been exposed to the full extent of the operational noise environment prior to full buildout. The traffic noise level increases would also affect students at the Job Corps campus and Life Learning Academy, and residents on the Coast Guard property who would have been exposed to the pre-operational noise environment. Therefore, permanent increases in ambient noise levels are considered to be potentially significant due to noise created by project-generated traffic.

Measures available to address significant traffic noise increases in the Job Corps campus, Life Learning Academy, and Coast Guard areas or the future residential areas are limited. For example, the construction of continuous noise barriers at curbside along the entire length of the identified roadways would not be feasible because such a barrier would block vehicle access to properties and conflict with the aesthetic character of the neighborhoods. All proposed new dwelling units would be multi-family structures. Multi-family structures and hotels proposed as part of the Project would be required to design interior dwelling spaces to achieve an interior noise standard of 45 dBA as required by Title 24. Noise-reducing building techniques to attain these standards could include use of increased insulation and installation of building materials and windows with a high sound transmission class. Consequently, this impact would primarily result in a significant noise increase to exterior areas only (e.g., balconies, and public gathering areas).
The following text is added to EIR p. IV.F.21 as a new second paragraph, to provide a discussion of traffic noise impacts at the Coast Guard residences:

To examine the potential impacts from traffic noise increases to Yerba Buena Island receptors near eastbound Bay Bridge on- and off-ramps, a noise modeling analysis was conducted. It is estimated that the roadway center of the eastbound ramps is as close as 200 feet from the Hillcrest Road residences, taking into account elevation changes. While roadside noise levels would increase by 7.1 dBA (from 52.7 dBA to 59.8 dBA) from increased eastbound on- and off-ramp traffic with the Proposed Project, the full impact of this increase would not be realized by local receptors because of the existing contribution of traffic noise from the Bay Bridge (66 dBA). Addition of the existing (66 dBA) noise level plus the future noise level from the eastbound ramps with the Proposed Project (59.8 dBA) results in an increase of 0.9 dBA. This is considered a less-than-significant noise impact on residences on Hillcrest Road. This impact would be reduced in the Enhanced Transit Scenario and the Reduced Development Alternatives because ramp volumes would be reduced compared to the Proposed Project.

Section IV.G, Air Quality

Mitigation Measures M-AQ-2, on EIR pp. IV.G.29-IV.G.30, and M-AQ-3 on p. IV.G.36, are revised as indicated below. These changes have been made in accordance with recommendations in the BAAQMD comment letter. The text changes do not alter the findings of significance for Impacts AQ-2 or AQ-3, either prior to or after mitigation.

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2: Construction Exhaust Emissions

TIDA shall require project sponsors to implement combustion emission reduction measures, during construction activities, including the following measures:

- The contractor shall keep all off-road equipment well-tuned and regularly serviced to minimize exhaust emissions, and shall establish a regular and frequent check-up and service/maintenance program for equipment.
- Off-road diesel equipment operators shall be required to shut down their engines rather than idle for more than five minutes, unless such idling is necessary for proper operation of the equipment. Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.

TIDA shall require that, to the extent feasible, project sponsors also engage in early implementation of the following combustion emission reduction measures, during construction activities:

- To the extent feasible, the project shall utilize EPA Tier 3 engine standards or better at the start of construction for all off-road equipment, or utilize Retrofit Emission Control Devices which consist of diesel oxidation catalysts, diesel particulate filters or similar retrofit equipment control technology verified by the California Air Resources Board (“CARB”) (http://www.arb.ca.gov/diesel/verdev/verdev.htm), to the extent that EPA Tier 3 equipment or similar retrofit equipment control technology is commercially available.
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- To the extent feasible, the project applicant shall utilize EPA Tier 4 engine standards or better for 50 percent of the fleet at construction initiation, increasing to 75 percent by 2015, and 100 percent by 2020, to the extent that EPA Tier 4 equipment is commercially available.
- To the extent feasible, the project applicant shall utilize 2010 or newer model-year haul trucks, to the extent that they are commercially available.
- Diesel-powered generators for construction activity shall be prohibited as a condition of construction contracts for each Major Phase, unless TIDA has made a finding in writing in connection with the Major Phase that there are no other commercially available alternatives to providing localized power.

[There is no change to footnote 39 on EIR p. IV.G.29, cited in the above text.]

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3
At the submission of any Major Phase application, TIDA shall require that an Air Quality consultant review the proposed development in that Major Phase along with existing uses and uses approved in prior Major Phases to determine whether the actual project phasing deviates materially from the representative phasing plan. If the Air Quality consultant determines the possible impact of the actual phasing could result in a significant impact on any group of receptors, then TIDA shall require that the applicant implement in connection with that Major Phase best management practices to the extent that TIDA determines feasible to reduce construction emissions in accordance with Mitigation Measures M-AQ-1, M-AQ-2, and M-AQ-4. TIDA shall also determine whether Tier 3 or Tier 4 engines, non-diesel powered generators, or year 2010 or newer haul trucks are commercially available for that phase and, if so, require the use of such engines or haul trucks.

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-5, on EIR p. IV.G.42, is revised as indicated below to address compliance of proposed ferries with State emissions regulations. These text changes do not alter the findings of significance for Impact AQ-5, either prior to or after mitigation.

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-5: Ferry Particulate Emissions

All ferries providing service between Treasure Island and San Francisco shall meet applicable California Air Resources Board regulations. Additionally, all ferries shall be equipped with diesel particulate filters or an alternative equivalent technology to reduce diesel particulate emissions. If diesel particulate filters are operated at the proper temperatures, they are reported to achieve up to 90 percent reduction in particulate emissions. However, because the Water Emergency Transit Authority would operate the ferry service, implementation of this measure is outside the jurisdiction of the City and is not assured.

The Proposed Project already includes substantial Transportation Demand Measures. Public transit improvements and further measures to reduce motor vehicle emissions, which alone would be significant, are not available. ROG emissions would result primarily from use of consumer products and architectural coating applications by future residents (non-construction) which could not feasibly be mitigated. Consequently,
regional emissions of ROG, NOx and PM10 would be significant and unavoidable under the applicable 1999 BAAQMD Guideline thresholds. Additionally, emissions of PM2.5 would be significant and unavoidable under the 2010 BAAQMD thresholds.

VOLUME 2

CHAPTER IV, ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND IMPACTS (continued)

Section IV.J, Recreation

The first sentence of the first full paragraph on p. IV.J.5 is revised as follows:

Yerba Buena Island is an approximately 450-160-acre island in the middle of San Francisco Bay. 16

Footnote 16 on EIR p. IV.J.5 is revised as follows:

16 The Caltrans right-of-way for the Bay Bridge takes up about 18 acres of land area. The U.S. Coast Guard owns and operates a 3948-acre facility south of the Bay Bridge. The Coast Guard Property is not included in the Project Area.

Item No. 9 in Table IV.J.1: Proposed Parks and Open Space, on EIR p. IV.J.13, is revised as follows:

(Revised) Table IV.J.1: Proposed Parks and Open Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parks and Open Space</th>
<th>Description of Use</th>
<th>Acres (approximate)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treasure Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Cultural Park</td>
<td>Plaza designed to connect the Cityside District with the Transit Hub and Clipper Cove; includes potential site for a museum or other cultural institution and the existing chapel, which would be retained</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the seventh line from the top on p. IV.J.16, “paths” is changed to “facilities”, as follows:

Pedestrian and bicycle paths facilities would continue on Yerba Buena Island to connect to the new pedestrian and bicycle path on the new east span of the Bay Bridge.

The first paragraph under Impact RE-1 on EIR pp. IV.J.16-IV.J.17, is revised as follows:

Development of the parks and recreational facilities would require construction activities, which could vary depending on the location and type of work. Existing structures on identified park sites would require demolition, except for the existing chapel on the site of the proposed Cultural Park. The chapel would be retained in its current location. Sites would be cleared and graded, and utilities (electrical, water, sanitary sewer, and storm drainage), hardscape (e.g., concrete, asphalt, stone, walls, sport-court and play area surfacing, decking/boardwalks), and site furnishings (e.g., benches, picnic tables, drinking fountains, play equipment, fencing, artwork, lighting) would be installed. New structures (e.g., restrooms, picnic/shade shelters, kiosks, pavilions, overlooks, piers)
would be constructed or existing structures would be renovated. If sites are proposed to
include cultural or educational institutions or other buildings, such as a museum or an
environmental education center, developable pads would be constructed. Site planting
would include installation of irrigation systems and would focus on re-vegetation and
restoration of native plant communities, where possible. The natural open space on
Yerba Buena Island would be managed under a Habitat Management Plan ("HMP"), and
construction activities in these areas would generally be limited to those for revegetation,
creation of trails, removal of invasive species, and other low-impact activities.

Section IV.K, Utilities and Service Systems

The second sentence of the last paragraph on p. IV.K.1 is revised as follows:

The eastern side of the island, including the Coast Guard station Station and Sector Facility, has a gravity sewer system that drains to a pump station under the Bay Bridge at the eastern tip of Yerba Buena Island.

The following text is added after the third paragraph (which discusses solids processing) on EIR p. IV.K.2 under the heading, “Existing Wastewater Treatment”:

By about May 2011, the SFPUC plans to replace the anaerobic digestion process for solids with a stabilization process using lime (i.e., calcium carbonate). The lime will be added as a slurry (i.e., lime and water mixture). Typically, lime is added to untreated biosolids to raise the pH to 12 or higher, with the dosage dependent on type and concentration. The lime stops or reduces the microbial reactions that can lead to odor production. Lime can also inactivate pathogens, and may be less expensive than traditional anaerobic digestion. The lime slurry will discharge into and out of a double-walled, high-density, polyethylene, chemical tank with a capacity of approximately 5,000 gallons. Transport off site would be by truck, similar to existing solids transport off the Islands.

The new footnote for this text change, to be added at the bottom of p. IV.K.2, is shown below, and subsequent footnotes in this section will be renumbered accordingly:

5 Email between Michael Marten, SFPUC, and Michael Tymoff, Mayor’s Office of Economic and Workforce Development, forwarded to Turnstone Consulting on November 30, 2010.

The following new sentences are added at the end of the second full paragraph on p. IV.K.9, regarding the proposed wastewater system:

Utility service to the Coast Guard Station and Sector Facility would be maintained throughout buildout of the Proposed Project. Certain modifications to the piping connecting to the proposed replacement pump station could be necessary. Details would be worked out during the design process.
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The third paragraph on p. IV.K.19 is revised and a new footnote is added, as follows:

The California Department of Housing and Community Development allows the use of grey water (water from sinks, showers, and similar sources, captured for local reuse) in residential buildings under certain circumstances.\footnote{California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 5, Chapter 16A, available via Oasis Design (web site), “California Graywater Standard: Chapter 16A Nonpotable Water Reuse Systems,” (with link to PDF of official text), available at http://www.oasisdesign.net/greywater/law/california/currentcode/, accessed Nov. 7, 2010. A few highlights are: (1) A gray water system limited to reuse of clothes washer water does not require a permit. Section 1603A.1.1. (2) “Simple systems” with a discharge of 250 gallons per day or less require a construction permit, unless exempted by the local enforcing agency. Section 1603A.1.2. (3) “Complex systems” are all other systems and may have more restrictions on them than the first two types of systems. Section 1603A.1.3.} is not currently allowed. If changes are made in applicable State and local laws and regulations, individual residential buildings may construct the necessary capture facilities and piping systems for grey water. Use of gray water is not part of the Proposed Project at this time; any future proposed use of grey water would conform to all applicable state and local requirements. Because it is not known where or whether these grey water sources would be used, they are not evaluated further in this EIR.

The new footnote for this text change is shown below, and subsequent footnotes in the section will be renumbered accordingly:

The second paragraph on EIR p. IV.K.47 is revised as follows:

Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island have two sources of water. The primary supply is provided by the SFPUC’s water distribution system in San Francisco. An emergency back-up supply for emergency use is provided by EBMUD.

The third paragraph on EIR p. IV.K.47 is revised as follows (note that a few additional technical edits are included):

Water from the SFPUC system is delivered to Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Island through a 10-inch-diameter steel pipe attached to the west span of the Bay Bridge. Water is pumped across the bridge by a pumping station located on Spear Street in San Francisco. The station contains four pumps, each rated at 900 gallons per minute (“gpm”). The station can run a maximum of two pumps at a time for a maximum output of 1,800 gpm. The SFPUC chloramines this water prior to transmission; additional treatment on Treasure Island is not required. A standby booster chlorine station is available for emergencies where the pipeline touches down on Yerba Buena Island. The SFPUC provides water for the Job Corps campus and the Coast Guard Station and Sector Facility.
The first and fifth sentences in the fourth paragraph on EIR p. IV.K.47 are revised to read as follows (the first five sentences are provided here for context):

The back-up emergency water supply is provided by EBMUD through a 12-inch-diameter, ductile iron, main pipeline connected to an EBMUD water meter at Beach Street in Emeryville Oakland. From the water meter, the 12-inch main is owned and maintained by the Navy. The main delivers water to a pump station located below the eastern end of the existing Bay Bridge in Oakland. Water is then pumped through a 12-inch-diameter steel pipe attached to the east span of the Bay Bridge. This water supply charges the fire hydrants on the Bridge and is connected to the existing water tanks on Yerba Buena Island for an emergency back-up supply.

The first sentence in the last partial paragraph on EIR p. IV.K.47 is revised as follows:

As described above, SFPUC and EBMUD furnishes potable water to existing water tanks on Yerba Buena Island.

The last three sentences in the last paragraph on EIR p. IV.K.51 and the first two sentences in the first paragraph on EIR p. IV.K.52 are revised as follows:

The back-up An emergency water supply to Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Island would be provided by a new 12-inch-diameter pipeline on the new east span of the Bay Bridge, connected to a new SFPUC pump station near the eastern base of the Bridge. The new system would be capable of delivering up to 1,800 gpm of potable water to the EBMUD connection point on Beach Street in Oakland. The water would be chloraminated by EBMUD prior to delivery, as with the existing back-up emergency supply.

The redundant water source from EBMUD provides a back-up emergency water source to the Project Area. If either the SFPUC or EBMUD system were to be taken offline for maintenance, power interruptions, or damage due to an earthquake, the other source EBMUD would continue to be capable of supplying 1,800 gpm to meet peak demands for the Proposed Development Project on an emergency basis.

The following text is added to EIR p. IV.K.52 as a new third paragraph:

Water service to the Coast Guard Station and Sector Facility would be maintained throughout the buildout of the Proposed Project. Certain modifications to the piping for connections of the water pipes would be necessary. Details would be worked out during the design process. TIDA and the Coast Guard have agreed that they would enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The MOU would include (among other things) a process for the Coast Guard to notify TIDA when it is considering modernization projects, so that modifications for increased utility demand can be coordinated. Among other things, the MOU would also address construction coordination to ensure uninterrupted utility delivery and service.
Footnote 97 on p. IV.K.52 is revised as follows:

97 EBMUD currently provides 220 mgd of water to approximately 1.3 million people as well as industrial, commercial, and institutional customers in its 331-square-mile service area. The existing and proposed water demand for the Redevelopment Plan Project Area is small in relation to EBMUD's total delivery. EBMUD is not the water supply purveyor for the Proposed Project.

The fifth paragraph on EIR p. IV.K.71 is expanded as follows:

The submarine cable from Treasure Island to Yerba Buena Island terminates at the Yerba Buena Island Main Substation. From here, power is distributed to Yerba Buena Island via a combination of poles and underground facilities. The Coast Guard Station and Sector Facility obtains its electrical power from a tie-in to the power delivered to Yerba Buena Island by this submarine cable.

The following sentence is added to the last full paragraph on p. IV.K.72:

The Coast Guard Station and Sector Facility obtains its wired (land-based) telecommunications services from the same connections to the mainland.

The second heading on p. IV.K.76 is changed as follows:

Distribution System on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island

The following new text is inserted as new third and fourth paragraphs at the top of p. IV.K.78, above the heading “Electricity Supply”:

Electrical service to the property line of the Coast Guard Station and Sector Facility would be maintained during buildout of the Proposed Project. Certain modifications to the connections may be necessary. Details would be worked out during the design process.

TIDA and the Coast Guard have agreed that they would enter into a construction coordination Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The MOU would include (among other things) a process for the Coast Guard to notify TIDA when it is considering modernization projects, so that utility-demand modifications can be coordinated. Regarding future electrical demand, the Coast Guard has no details for its future expansion or modernization plans at this time. Modernization plans may be more energy intensive, since new technology often requires more power than older equipment. However, because no modernization projects are currently defined, it is too speculative to estimate a future increase in electricity use for the Coast Guard.

The new footnote for this text change, to be added at the bottom of p. IV.K.78, is shown below, and subsequent footnotes in this section will be renumbered accordingly:

147 This information is based on the results of a meeting between TIDA, TICD, and U.S. Coast Guard representatives held on October 29, 2010.
The following sentence is added after the fifth full paragraph on p. IV.K.79, at the end of the discussion in the subsection entitled “Proposed Natural Gas Infrastructure”:

The Coast Guard does not currently have natural gas service, so the Proposed Project would not need to maintain service during construction. The Proposed Project would continue to provide natural gas service to Yerba Buena Island to serve the new development. If in the future, the U.S. Coast Guard wishes to add natural gas service for the Coast Guard facilities on Yerba Buena Island, the service could tie in to the supply lines on Yerba Buena Island.

The following is inserted after the first partial paragraph on p. IV.K.80, above the heading “Project Impacts”:

The Coast Guard Station and Sector Facility is updating its telecommunications and computer systems. Land-based telecommunications services to the property line of the Coast Guard Station and Sector Facility would be maintained during buildout of the Proposed Project. Certain modifications to the connections may be necessary. Details would be worked out during the design process. As discussed above on p. IV.K.78, TIDA and the Coast Guard have agreed that they would enter into a construction coordination Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The MOU would include (among other things) a process for the Coast Guard to notify TIDA when it is considering modernization projects, so that utility-demand modifications can be coordinated.

Section IV.L, Public Services

The last sentence on p. IV.L.25 and the paragraph at the top of p. IV.L.26 are revised as follows:

The new school would likely serve pre-kindergarten (preschool), elementary, and middle school students; high school students would most likely continue to attend schools in other parts of San Francisco. For planning purposes, about 48 preschool aged children were estimated. The remaining 1,647 students were distributed evenly by grade. Currently, as shown in Table IV.L.1, a total of approximately 1,695 school-age children would live on the Islands following full build-out of the Project. As of 2009, approximately 320 students live on the Islands.

The new footnote for this text change, to be added to p. IV.L.26, is shown below, and subsequent footnotes in the section will be renumbered accordingly. There are no other changes to the footnotes on this page.

Table IV.L.1: Public School Enrollment at Project Buildout Compared to SFUSD Capacity, on p. IV.L.27, is revised, as shown on the following page.
(Revised) Table IV.L.1: Public School Enrollment at Project Buildout Compared to SFUSD Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Preschool / Elementary School (Grades Preschool-5 K-5)</th>
<th>Middle School (Grades 6-8)</th>
<th>High School (Grades 9-12)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Area (estimated)</td>
<td>808 385</td>
<td>380 390</td>
<td>507 520</td>
<td>1,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030 Citywide Enrollment¹</td>
<td>33,036</td>
<td>16,518</td>
<td>22,024</td>
<td>71,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 SFUSD Capacity</td>
<td>29,260</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>17,575</td>
<td>63,835²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030 Projected Shortfall</td>
<td>3,776</td>
<td>4,818</td>
<td>4,449</td>
<td>7,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Treasure Island School Capacity³</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
¹ Categories may not add up to total due to rounding.
² Total includes capacity for 5,300 students in varying grade levels in alternative schools and public charter schools.
³ Based on combined average size of elementary and middle schools within SFUSD. See Comparison of Number of Students Living in Each SF City Planning Neighborhood with Elementary and Middle School Capacity, found at http://portal.sfusd.edu/data/epc/Comparison%20of%20Number%20of%20Students%20Living%20in%20Each%20SF%20City%20Planning%20Nhood.pdf, accessed June 20, 2010.


Section IV.M, Biological Resources

The following text is added to the second full paragraph on EIR p. IV.M.2:

The San Francisco Bay-Delta is the second largest estuary in the United States and supports numerous aquatic habitats and biological communities. The estuary’s populations of fish and wildlife have changed markedly in the past 150 years, with losses due to over-harvest, habitat loss and degradation, introduced species, pollutants, and the modification of freshwater flows. It encompasses 479 square miles, including shallow mudflats. San Francisco Bay is divided into four main basins: South Bay, Central Bay, San Pablo or North Bay, and Suisun Bay. This assessment focuses on the Central Bay, which is located between the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge (“Bay Bridge”) and the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge and connects to the Pacific Ocean through the Golden Gate. The regional setting for purposes of this evaluation includes both the shallow water habitats around San Francisco Bay – the “baylands”³ and the waters of the Bay itself.

Footnote 15 on EIR p. IV.M.4 is clarified as follows to provide a more specific citation:

¹⁵ San Francisco Planning Department, 2005, op.cit., Section 3.8, Biological Resources, and specifically pp. 3-94.
The second full paragraph on EIR p. IV.M.11 is clarified to read:

The most common large mobile invertebrate organisms in the Central Bay include
blackspotted shrimp (*Crangon nigromaculata*), California bay shrimp (*Crangon franciscorum*), smooth shrimp (*Lissocragon stylirostris*), Dungeness crab (*Metacarcinus magister*), and the slender rock crab (*Cancer gracilis*). Although other species of shrimp are present in the Central Bay, their numbers are substantially lower when compared to the number of California smooth bay and blackspotted shrimps present.\(^{29,30}\)

New footnote 30 is added to this page, as follows, and subsequent footnotes will be renumbered accordingly:


The third full paragraph on EIR p. IV.M.11 is revised as follows:

The bottom, or demersal, fish community reported to inhabit the area surrounding Treasure Island comprises more than 6545 species. The bay pipefish (*Syngnathus leptorhynchus*), bay goby (*Lepidogobius Lepidus*), spiny dogfish shark (*Squalus acantbias*), eulachon (*Thaleichthys pacificus*), speckled sanddab (*Citharichthys stigmaeus*), prickly sculpin (*Cottus asper*), shokha goby (*Tridentiger barbatus*), shiner perch (*Cymatogaster aggregata*), white seaperch (*Phanerodon furcatus*), planfin midshipmen (*Porichthys notatus*), minnows, Chinook salmon (*Onchorynchhus tshawytscha*), and brown smoothhound (*Mustelus luteus*) English sole (*Parophrys vetulus*), plainfin midshipman (*Porichthys notatus*), Pacific staghorn sculpin (*Leptocottus armatus*), shiner perch (*Cymatogaster aggregata*), white croaker (*Genyonemus lineatus*), longfin smelt (*Spirinchus thaleichthys*), cheekspot goby (*Ilypnus gilberti*), and brown rockfish (*Sebastes auriculatus*) are the dominant taxa of this community, accounting for approximately 9496 percent of the fish present (see Table IV.M.1).

Table IV.M.1 on page IV.M.12-IV.M.13 is revised as shown on the following three pages.

The following text is added to the partial paragraph at the top of p. IV.M.15, before the last sentence in the paragraph:

The waters of San Francisco Bay, including those surrounding Treasure Island, are typically characterized as being turbid because of local watershed runoff, inflow from the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and constant resuspension of bottom sediments from tidal and wind action.\(^{44}\) As a result, light penetration is greatly affected by turbidity levels and as a result is generally limited to the upper meter of water.\(^{45}\) As a consequence, plankton abundance and productivity is typically lower than nearby coastal waters and less turbid estuaries and embayments. Unlike the North and South Bays, the Central Bay is the least affected by introduced exotic species.
### (Revised) Table IV.M.1: Benthic Fish Community Composition and Abundance Indices for Combined Shallow and Deep Water Sites near Treasure Island,¹
Based on Otter Trawl Data, 2000–2008 (fish per hectare)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species²</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>% Comp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Syngnathus leptocirrhus</td>
<td>bay-pipefish</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>435</td>
<td><strong>20.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lepidogobius lepidus</td>
<td>bay goby</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>307</td>
<td><strong>18.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squalus acanthias</td>
<td>spiny dogfish</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>329</td>
<td><strong>15.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thalassichthys pacificus</td>
<td>eulachon</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>217</td>
<td><strong>10.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citharichthys stigmaeus</td>
<td>speckled sanddab</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>217</td>
<td><strong>9.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottus asper</td>
<td>prickly sculpin</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>243</td>
<td><strong>9.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tridentiger barbatus</td>
<td>shokihaze goby</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td><strong>3.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parophrys vetulus</td>
<td>English sole</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>217</td>
<td><strong>14.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralichthys floridana</td>
<td>plainfin midshipman</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>213</td>
<td><strong>14.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leptocottus armatus</td>
<td>Pacific staghorn sculpin</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>86</td>
<td><strong>5.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cymatogaster aggregata</td>
<td>shiner perch</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td><strong>1.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralichthys floridana</td>
<td>white seaperch</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>21</td>
<td><strong>4.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralichthys floridana</td>
<td>plainfin midshipman</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20</td>
<td><strong>4.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralichthys floridana</td>
<td>unidentified minnow</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td><strong>0.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oncorhynchus tschawytscha</td>
<td>Chinook salmon</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>0.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustelus longirostris</td>
<td>brown smoothhound</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td><strong>0.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leptocottus armatus</td>
<td>Pacific staghorn sculpin</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td><strong>0.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastes auriculatus</td>
<td>brown rockfish</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td><strong>0.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
(Revised) Table IV.M.1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species^2</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>% Comp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genyonemus lineatus</td>
<td>white croaker</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artedius fenestratus</td>
<td>padded sculpin</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parophrys vetulus</td>
<td>English sole</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirinchus thaleichthys</td>
<td>longfin smelt</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bopyrus gilberti</td>
<td>cheekspot goby</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastes auriculatus</td>
<td>brown rockfish</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microgadus proximus</td>
<td>Pacific tomcod</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomcina macroepidea</td>
<td>bigscale logperch</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypnos gilberti</td>
<td>cheekspot goby</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alosa sapidissima</td>
<td>American shad</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sardinops sagax</td>
<td>Pacific sardine</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lampetra tridentata</td>
<td>Pacific lamprey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poeciliichthys melanostictus</td>
<td>sandsole</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ameiurus nebulosus</td>
<td>brown bullhead</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ictalurus punctatus</td>
<td>channel catfish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirinchus thaleichthys</td>
<td>longfin smelt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synodus lucioceps</td>
<td>California lizardfish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syngnathus leptorhynchos</td>
<td>bay pipefish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tridentiger trigonocephalus</td>
<td>chameleon goby</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citharichthys sordidus</td>
<td>Pacific sandab</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species2</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>% Comp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pholis ornate</td>
<td>saddleback gunnel</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artedius notospilotus</td>
<td>bonyhead sculpin</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphurus atricaudus</td>
<td>California tonguefish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralichthys californicus</td>
<td>California halibut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperprosopon ellipticum</td>
<td>silver surfperch</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iparis pulchellus</td>
<td>showy snailfish</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustelus henlei</td>
<td>brown smoothhound</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1  CDFG/IEP trawl data, Stations 109, 110, 211, 212, and 214.
2 Additional fish species that occurred in trawls at less than significant numbers include: walleye surfperch, big skate, broadnose sevengill shark, western brook lamprey, black bullhead, yellowtail rockfish, yellowfin goby, white seaperch, sea bass, longjaw mud sucker, black rockfish, starry flounder, sealead sculpin, queenfish, Pacific sand lance, lingcod, black perch, sand sole, pygmy poacher, Pacific sardine, whitebait smelt, topsmelt, American shad, white sturgeon, unidentified rockfish, yellowtail rockfish, diamond turbot, curlfin sole, buffalo sculpin, barred surfperch, slipskin snailfish, hornedhead turbot, vermilion rockfish, tubesnout, California tonguefish, arrow goby, yellow snake eel, Dover sole, delta smelt, barred surfperch, cabezon, Sacramento pikeminnow, bat ray, snake prickleback, hybrid sole, wakasagi, Pacific lamprey, pompano, unidentified river lamprey, rubberlip seaperch, kelp greenling, unidentified snailfish, pile perch, dwarf perch, threadfin shad, spiny dogfish, night smelt, spotfin surfperch, threespine stickleback, one spot fringehead, striped bass, striped seaperch, bonyhead sculpin, Pacific sanddab, threadfin shad, and green sunfish, bocaccio, Pacific pompano, thornback, brown Irish lord, green sturgeon, shimofuri goby.


New footnotes 44 and 45, shown below, are added to the bottom of p. IV.M.15, and subsequent footnotes will be renumbered accordingly:


The first sentence in the first full paragraph on EIR p. IV.M.15 is revised to correct one Latin species name:

Central Bay meroplankton, including macrozooplankton and micronekton, is dominated by the ctenophore *Pleruobrachia bachei*, the isopod *Synidotea laticauda*, the shrimps (*Palaemon macrodactylus*, *Crangon franciscorum*, and *C. n nigricauda*), the mysid *Neomysis kadiakensis*, and the medusa *Polyorchis* spp.45

A second note is added to Table IV.M.2 on EIR p. IV.M.16, with the note designation added to “Species” at the head of the first column in the table. The new note reads as follows:

2 Additional fish species that were present in the trawls at less than significant numbers include: white croaker, longfin smelt, American shad, Chinook salmon, white seaperch, plainfin midshipman, bay goby, whitebait smelt, bat ray, threadfin shad, California halibut, Pacific staghorn sculpin, Pacific tomcod, big skate, speckled sanddab, English sole, surf smelt, brown smoothhound, Pacific electric ray, barred surfperch, threespine stickleback, diamond turbot, leopard shark, river lamprey, yellowfin goby, striped bass, starry flounder, cheekspot goby, bay pipefish, queenfish, lingcod, white seabass, pile perch, unidentified rockfish, kelp greenling, black perch, and redtail surfperch.

The following text is added to EIR p. IV.M.18, after the list of species known or presumed to nest on Treasure Island:

In addition, the San Francisco Breeding Bird Atlas lists 22 species as confirmed or probable breeding birds on Treasure Island.

- Double-crested cormorant
- Pelagic cormorant
- Brandt’s cormorant
- Black-crowned night-heron
- Killdeer
- Western gull
- Mourning dove
- Anna’s hummingbird
- Allen’s hummingbird
- Common raven
- Chestnut-backed chickadee
- Bushtit
- American robin
- *Sitta canadensis*, Red-breasted nuthatch
- European starling
- White-crowned sparrow
- Song sparrow
- Red-winged blackbird
- Brewer’s Blackbird
- House finch
- American goldfinch
- House Sparrow

The last sentence in the second full paragraph on p. IV.M.19 is revised as follows:

Harbor seals forage throughout the Bay-Delta and in nearshore coastal waters feeding on schooling fish such as smelt, anchovies, and herring, rockfish, sculpin, perch, and midshipmen, along with squid and mysid shrimp, most of which are common inhabitants in the waters surrounding the Islands.

As noted in a comment, footnote 69 on p. IV.M.23 incorrectly cites USFWS 1987 and should instead cite Herbold, B. and P.B. Moyle, 1989. Footnote 69 is revised as follows:
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3.44
The special status designations in the EIR on p. IV.M.24, in the second column of Table IV.M.3, are revised to delete SC/SC and changed to read “T/C” for green sturgeon and “–/T” for longfin smelt to reflect current protected species status.

The last bullet item on EIR p. IV.M.33 is revised to read:

Green Sturgeon, September 8, 2008 October 9, 2009.

A new sentence is added to the partial paragraph at the top of EIR p. IV.M.44 and a new footnote is added:

...Island sediment from reaching Bay waters and causing significant effects on resident offshore biological resources. Additionally, strict adherence to the dredging work windows established by the USACE Long Term Management Strategy (“LTMS”) would be required.

New footnote 103 is added to that page, and subsequent footnotes will be renumbered accordingly:


The text of the Mitigation Measure M-BI-1c on p. IV.M.46 is clarified as follows:

Removal of trees or demolition of buildings showing evidence of bat activity shall occur during the period least likely to impact the bats as determined by a qualified bat biologist (generally between February 15 and October 15 for winter hibernacula and between August 15 and April 15 for maternity roosts). If active day or night roosts are found, the bat biologist shall take actions to make such roosts unsuitable habitat prior to tree removal or building demolition. A no-disturbance buffer of 100 feet shall be created around active bat roosts being used for maternity or hibernation purposes. A reduced buffer could be provided for on a case-by-case basis by the bat biologist, at a distance to be determined in consultation with CDFG and based on site-specific conditions. Bat roosts initiated during construction are presumed to be unaffected, and no buffer would necessary.

The first paragraph of EIR Mitigation Measure M-BI-1d on p. IV.M.46 is revised as follows:

To avoid conflicts with wildlife on Yerba Buena Island and the remaining natural habitats on Yerba Buena Island, the Islands’ Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions, TIDA Rules and Regulations, and/or other similar enforceable instruments or regulations, shall prohibit off-leash dogs outside of designated, enclosed, off-leash dog parks on Yerba Buena Island and the feeding of feral cats on both islands. Building tenants shall be
provided with educational materials regarding these restrictions, rules, and/or regulations. Non-resident pet owners and the public using the Islands shall be alerted to these restrictions, rules, and/or regulations through appropriate signage in public areas.

The first sentence of the last paragraph on EIR p. IV.M.48 is revised as follows:

As discussed above, conformance to new stormwater control regulations and the application of routine construction and deconstruction Best Management Practices (BMPs), such as filter berms, silt fences, straw bales, storm drain inlet protection and vegetated buffers, are expected to constrain any additional sedimentation and movement of potentially contaminated materials through existing and future storm drains; thus, impacts on SAV beds would be less than significant.

To following text is added to Mitigation Measure M-BI-2c on EIR p. IV.M.49:

**Prior to** Within three to six months of the initiation of construction activities that might affect SAV beds, and not less frequently than biennially (every two years) thereafter, all eelgrass beds shall be surveyed or otherwise identified, including their proximity and potential impact from ongoing or pending onshore or offshore construction activities identified. All TIDA staff in charge of overseeing construction for the Proposed Project, and all construction contractors and subcontractors involved in Project construction activities in Bay waters that are within a quarter mile of Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island, along Treasure Island’s shoreline, or involved in transporting materials and supplies by water to either Island shall be required to undergo thorough initial environmental training. This training shall present information on the locations of all eelgrass beds, the kinds of construction and vessel transit activities that can impact eelgrass beds, all mitigation measures that contractors must adhere to so that any disturbance or damage to eelgrass beds may be avoided and the beds protected and who to notify in the event of any disturbance. Any work barges or vessels engaged in construction activities shall avoid transiting through and avoid anchoring in any eelgrass beds located around Treasure Island. TIDA personnel responsible for overseeing Project contractors, as well as all Project contractor and subcontractor management personnel, shall ensure that all boat operators and work crews are aware of eelgrass bed locations and the requirement to avoid disturbing them.

The first sentence in the second paragraph under the heading “Offshore” on EIR p. IV.M.56 is revised as follows:

The proposed Development Program on Treasure Island and portions of Yerba Buena Island, as outlined in Chapter II, Project Description, has the potential to adversely alter intertidal and subtidal marine habitat (including designated Essential Fish Habitat) located along Treasure Island’s shoreline and nearshore regions of the Bay as well as Bay waters.

The last sentence in the first full paragraph on EIR p. IV.M.59 is revised to read:

Green sturgeons are known to feed upon opossum shrimps (*Neomysis mercedis* and *N. awatchensis*), the amphipod *Corophium*, the annelid worms, the bay shrimp *Crangon franciscorum*, the isopod *Synidota liticsud*, the Asian clam *Corbula amurensis*, and the gastropod *Olivella baetica*. 
Footnote 159 on p. IV.M.63 is revised to read as follows:

159 Water Emergency Transportation Authority, Final Program Environmental Impact Report Expansion of Ferry Transit Service in the San Francisco Bay Area, June 2003, pp. 3.4–10 to 3.4-22. This information is incorporated by reference and summarized in the text above.

Section IV.N, Geology and Soils

Figure IV.N.2: Areas of Proposed Geotechnical Improvements, on EIR p. IV.N.26, is revised, as shown in Section 2.6, Historic Resources, of this Comments and Responses document on p. 2.6.10.

To clarify that the improvements and ferry service would provide for both access to and egress from the Islands, the fifth and sixth sentences in the first paragraph in Impact GE-6 on EIR p. IV.N.31 are revised as follows:

In addition, Macalla Road, which is not a viaduct, could become temporarily two-way to be more available for emergency access and egress purposes. If the viaduct were to become unusable due to a major earthquake, access to transportation to and from Treasure Island would be available via ferry service, included as part of the Proposed Project.

Section IV.O, Hydrology and Water Quality

The second sentence of the first full paragraph on p. IV.O.4 is revised as follows:

One small area of Yerba Buena Island near the Coast Guard station and Sector Facility, on the eastern side of the island, contains sediments that hold groundwater.

The following text is inserted on EIR p. IV.O.20, immediately prior to the heading, “Local”:

Regional

San Francisco Bay Plan

The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission has promulgated the San Francisco Bay Plan in order to support environmental protection of San Francisco Bay in consideration of the Bay as a valuable natural asset (see Chapter III, Plans and Policies, pp. III.9-III.12). The following policies contained in the Bay Plan are relevant to water quality:

Water Quality Policy 1: Bay water pollution should be prevented to the greatest extent feasible. The Bay’s tidal marshes, tidal flats, and water surface area and volume should be conserved and, whenever possible, restored and increased to protect and improve water quality. Fresh water inflow into the Bay should be maintained at a level adequate to protect Bay resources and beneficial uses.
Chapter IX
3. DEIR Revisions

1. Changes in Response to Comments

Water Quality Policy 2: Water quality in all parts of the Bay should be maintained at a level that will support and promote the beneficial uses of the Bay as identified in the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board’s Water Quality Control Plan, San Francisco Bay Basin and should be protected from all harmful or potentially harmful pollutants. The policies, recommendations, decisions, advice and authority of the State Water Resources Control Board and the Regional Board, should be the basis for carrying out the Commission’s water quality responsibilities.

Water Quality Policy 3: New projects should be sited, designed, constructed and maintained to prevent or, if prevention is infeasible, to minimize the discharge of pollutants into the Bay by: (a) controlling pollutant sources at the project site; (b) using construction materials that contain nonpolluting materials; and (c) applying appropriate, accepted and effective best management practices, especially where water dispersion is poor and near shellfish beds and other significant biotic resources.

Water Quality Policy 6: To protect the Bay and its tributaries from the water quality impacts of nonpoint source pollution, new development should be sited and designed consistent with standards in municipal stormwater permits and state and regional stormwater management guidelines, where applicable, and with the protection of Bay resources. To offset impacts from increased impervious areas and land disturbances, vegetated swales, permeable pavement materials, preservation of existing trees and vegetation, planting native vegetation and other appropriate measures should be evaluated and implemented where appropriate.

The first sentence of the first paragraph on EIR p. IV.O.38 is revised as follows:

Near-surface groundwater is located in many portions of the Development Plan Area, including all of Treasure Island and low-lying portions of Yerba Buena Island (e.g., near the Coast Guard Station and Sector Facility).

The last sentence of the last paragraph on EIR p. IV.O.48 is revised as follows:

Because the Proposed Project encompasses many low-lying areas, in particular all of Treasure Island and some low-lying areas along the western flank of Yerba Buena Island near the existing U.S. Coast Guard Station and Sector Facility, a substantial portion of the Project Area, at current elevations and without future improvements, could potentially be at risk of inundation due to future potential sea level rise.

The second sentence of the first paragraph on EIR p. IV.O.49 is revised as follows:

For instance, if no action were taken, under a 55-inch sea level rise scenario, shorefront areas along the existing Treasure Island perimeter would be inundated during a mean higher high water (“MHHW”) tidal event, and areas surrounding the U.S. Coast Guard Station and Sector Facility on Yerba Buena Island could also become inundated.
Section IV.R, Agricultural Uses and Forest Land

The sixth sentence of the first paragraph on p. IV.R.1 is revised as follows:

Yerba Buena Island has a U.S. Coast Guard Station and Sector Facility (about 39-48 acres) and a portion of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge (about 18 acres).

CHAPTER VII, ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The third sentence of the first paragraph on p. VII.5 is revised as follows:

The U.S. Coast Guard also requested approximately 39-48 acres plus water area and the Federal Highway Administration (“FHWA”) requested approximately 18 acres for facilities on Yerba Buena Island.

The last sentence of the second full paragraph on EIR p. VII.6 is revised as follows:

The U.S. Coast Guard would continue to occupy 39-48 acres on the south and east sides of Yerba Buena Island.

The second paragraph on EIR p.VII.57 is revised as follows:

Similar to the Proposed Project, under conditions without and with the Ramps Project, vehicle queues extending from the Bay Bridge on-ramps at Yerba Buena Island would impact Muni line 108-Treasure Island and AC Transit bus operations. Under conditions with the Ramps Project, queues would impact AC Transit bus operations; however, queues would not significantly impact Muni line 108 Treasure Island bus operations. With implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-24 (Transit and Emergency Vehicle Only Lane) identified in Section IV.E, Transportation, for the Proposed Project (p. IV.E.100), the impact on Muni line 108-Treasure Island operations under conditions without the Ramps Project would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

As a result of the revisions and expansion of the reduced parking alternative, the following new alternative is added to Chapter VII, Alternatives, as Alternative D, Reduced Parking Alternative, beginning on EIR p. VII.72. Section VII.D, Alternatives Considered But Rejected, is redesignated E, and subsections D.1 and D.2 are redesignated E.1 and E.2. Subsection D.3, Reduced Parking Alternative, on pp. VII.75 – VII-76, is deleted, as it is replaced with the new alternative presented on pp. 3.50-3.77, and subsections D.4 and D.5 are redesignated E.3 and E.4. Section E, Environmentally Superior Alternative, is redesignated F. Other minor revisions are made in the text of the Alternatives Chapter to reflect the addition of this alternative. The new text for Alternative D is not underlined to make it easier to read.
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Revisions to Chapter VII - D. Reduced Parking Alternative

[New text for Chapter VII]

D.3 REDUCED PARKING ALTERNATIVE

During the public scoping process for EIR preparation, the Planning Department received comments on the Notice of Preparation of an EIR suggesting that the maximum amount of off-street parking for the Proposed Project be reduced. Comments included suggestions to analyze a range of parking spaces lower than one space per residential unit, ranging from 0.75 to 0.25 spaces per unit.

The Reduced Parking Alternative would reduce the maximum amount of off-street parking that could be provided on the Islands. As described on p. II.50 of the Project Description in “Parking,” the Proposed Project would permit up to approximately 10,120 off-street parking spaces to serve the proposed residential, commercial, and recreational uses. This would consist of one parking space per dwelling unit, roughly 2 spaces per 1,000 sq. ft. of commercial space, and 0.8 space per hotel room, with additional parking to serve the proposed open space and Clipper Cove Marina. The approximately 10,120 off-street parking spaces would be the maximum amount of parking permitted by the proposed Redevelopment Plan; individual developers could choose to provide less parking on any given parcel.

Based on the suggestions received during public comment on the Notice of Preparation, a Reduced Parking Alternative was developed, with a maximum amount of parking for the Proposed Project reduced to 0.75 parking space per residential unit, 0.2 space per 1,000 sq. ft. of commercial space, 0.3 spaces per marina slip, and 0.1 space per hotel room. If the amount of parking for open space and recreational uses were to remain unchanged at 700 spaces, this Reduced Parking Alternative would reduce the maximum overall amount of off-street parking by about 3,850 spaces, for a total of 6,270 off-street spaces. Other commenters suggested providing 0.5 parking spaces or 0.25 spaces per residential unit. These suggestions would reduce the maximum amount of overall parking by 4,000 and 6,000 spaces respectively if commercial, marina and hotel parking ratios were to remain as in the Proposed Project, and by more if the non-residential parking were also reduced.

The Reduced Parking Alternative was not considered for further study in the EIR because TIDA and the City and County of San Francisco concluded that it could exacerbate significant traffic impacts and would be financially infeasible.

Fees from commercial parking in the Proposed Project would be used to fund the proposed transit improvements and service. Removing or reducing this source of revenue planned to be used to support construction of the ferry quay and subsidize the on-island shuttles and off-island ferry and bus transit service would make the proposed level of transit service economically infeasible. Adequate and easily accessible transit is necessary to encourage residents to forgo automobile
usage; if reductions in funding based on reduced commercial parking were to lead to reductions in transit service, some residents may shift to automobile use, making more severe the significant traffic and air quality impacts identified for the Proposed Project. Without funding for the proposed transit improvements and service this alternative would not meet key objectives of the project sponsors, such as implementing a land use program with high-density, compact residential and commercial development located within walking distance of a Transit Hub to maximize use of public transit, and emphasizing transit-oriented development while discouraging automobile use through a comprehensive transportation demand management program.

In addition, less than one parking space per residential unit could adversely affect the marketability of the units, thus further reducing the financial feasibility of the alternative. While the Proposed Project would provide a robust system of public transportation, this service is proposed to be focused on two or three primary destinations: downtown Oakland, downtown San Francisco, and potentially the San Francisco Civic Center area. Some prospective residents would not be able to easily reach their place of employment via public transit either because their workplace would not be located near transit or because reaching the workplace would be considered inconvenient and time-consuming due to the need for multiple transfers. Others may find that the lack of transportation flexibility would make it difficult to carry out typical living activities besides journey-to-work, such as shopping for desired goods not available on the Islands or engaging in off-island activities that end when frequent transit service is no longer available, or other leisure activities. If a meaningful number of prospective residents are discouraged from considering living on the Islands due to the reasons above, the overall demand for homes on the Islands would be depressed leading to lower sale prices. This loss of revenue would likely render the Reduced Parking Alternative financially infeasible.

D. REDUCED PARKING ALTERNATIVE

DESCRIPTION

The Reduced Parking Alternative would reduce the maximum total amount of off-street parking that could be provided on the Islands. The alternative would provide a maximum of 0.5 parking spaces per residential unit, for a total of 4,000 parking spaces available to residents on an Islands-wide basis. It would provide a maximum of 1 parking space per 1,000 sq. ft. of commercial/flex space in Buildings 1, 2, and 3 and for office uses, and a maximum of 0.4 parking spaces per hotel room. Retail parking would continue to be provided at a maximum of 2 spaces per 1,000 sq. ft., as in the Proposed Project. The amount of parking for open space uses and the marina and Sailing Center would also remain as in the Proposed Project. On-street parking, all of which would continue to be metered spaces, would remain at 1,035 spaces because the on-street parking supply is a function of the layout of the street network, which was not assumed to change. On-street parking spaces represent less than 10 percent of the overall supply. Taken together, the
reduction in parking ratios for the above listed land uses in the Reduced Parking Alternative would reduce the total number of off-street parking spaces by about 4,030, from about 9,646 in the Proposed Project to about 5,616 spaces.

As with the Proposed Project, the parking supply discussed within this section refers to the Islands-wide maximums for individual uses, and as with the Proposed Project, there are no parking minimums for individual uses. Table VII.19: Proposed Parking Supply Ratios and Supply by Land Use, compares, by land use, the amount of parking in the Proposed Project with the Reduced Parking Alternative. The Reduced Parking Alternative’s parking supply would be about one-half of that generally required by the City’s Planning Code for similar land uses. However, there are some areas of San Francisco, such as Downtown (e.g., the Rincon Hill and South of Market areas), the Eastern Neighborhoods, North Beach, and the Market/Octavia neighborhood, among others, where other public and private on-street and off-street parking facilities supplement parking provided by individual developments; these neighborhoods have parking maximums lower than required generally in other parts of the City. For comparison purposes, Table VII.20 summarizes a variety of different parking requirements from the City’s Planning Code, both generally for the City and for neighborhoods with unique requirements. However, it is important to note that supplemental parking facilities would not be permitted on Treasure Island under the proposed Design for Development, because the 1:1 residential parking ratio represents an Islands-wide cap, unlike the other San Francisco neighborhoods noted above.

Land uses would remain the same as in the Proposed Project, except that fewer parking spaces would be permitted to be constructed for residential and hotel uses and less parking would be permitted to be constructed for certain commercial uses. The numbers, types, and sizes of buildings would not change substantially with the alternative; some buildings might have fewer basement levels for parking, and some buildings that might have included above-ground parking wrapped by residential or commercial uses might not include parking. As in the Proposed Project, stand-alone parking garages with no other uses included were not proposed for off-street parking; any above-ground parking garages in residential or mixed-use buildings would be required to be wrapped by active commercial or residential uses, and parking would not be visible from public rights-of-way. Also as in the Proposed Project, parking would not be required to be included in buildings; therefore, while more buildings might be constructed with no parking in the Reduced Parking Alternative, some also might be constructed with no parking in the Proposed Project, as there are no parking minimums on either a building or Islands-wide basis.

---

1 Treasure Island + Yerba Buena Island Design For Development, Draft dated March 5, 2010, Section 6.1.2, p. 204.
### (New) Table VII.19: Proposed Parking Supply Ratios and Supply by Land Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>Reduced Parking Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>Supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>8,000 d.u.</td>
<td>1 space/d.u.</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel (Treasure Island)</td>
<td>450 Rooms</td>
<td>0.4 spaces/room</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel (Yerba Buena Island)</td>
<td>50 Rooms</td>
<td>0.8 spaces/room</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>207,000 square feet/1,000 sq ft</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>2/1,000 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space (Athletic Fields)</td>
<td>40 acres</td>
<td>5.1/acre</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space (Other)</td>
<td>260 acres</td>
<td>1/acre</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>400 slips</td>
<td>0.59/slip</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flex</td>
<td>202,000 square feet</td>
<td>1/1,000 sq ft</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>100,000 square feet/1,000 sq ft</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1/1,000 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police/Fire</td>
<td>30,000 square feet</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>105,000 square feet</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>48,500 square feet</td>
<td>Street parking</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Park/Museum</td>
<td>75,000 square feet</td>
<td>Street parking</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street Parking Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General On-Street Parking</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. Includes 22 ksf food production/industrial/manufacturing, 150 ksf entertainment, and 30 ksf community/office uses.
2. Consistent with *San Francisco Planning Code* for neighborhoods in San Francisco without specific and unique requirements except that Treasure Island parking requirements are a maximum and thus, not required, whereas Planning Code requirements are a minimum. See (New) Table VII.20 for comparison of parking requirements for various land uses in several districts in San Francisco.
3. Hotel rate is the same as or less than the rate for hotels in Neighborhood Commercial District, *San Francisco Planning Code*.
4. Lower than permitted in *San Francisco Planning Code* for comparable neighborhoods, which permits up to 2 spaces per 1,000 square feet and up to 4 spaces per 1,000 square feet above 20,000 square feet. (Retail parking rates were not adjusted between the Proposed Project and the Reduced Parking Alternative, as explained in footnote 9).
5. Consistent with *Parking Generation*, Third Edition, Institute of Transportation Engineers. As somewhat unique land uses compared to retail, hotel, housing, and office uses, parking rates for the open space and marina uses were not adjusted from standard rates.
6. Consistent with *San Francisco Planning Code* rate for Office uses, although for flex space, in addition to office space, uses could include entertainment and some production, distribution, and repair uses, some of which have higher and some of which have lower parking rates than included in the *San Francisco Planning Code*.
7. Parking for police/fire and school facilities expected to be provided separately within the respective sites. Neither parking demand nor supply for these uses is included in this analysis.
8. These uses would share from the available pool of 1,035 on-street parking listed under the general on-street parking.
9. Although requested by some commenters, the retail rate was not adjusted in the Reduced Parking Alternative because the rate included in the Proposed Project is already 50 percent lower than what is permitted by the *San Francisco Planning Code*.

**Source:** TICD, 2009; Fehr & Peers, 2010
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(New) Table VII.20: San Francisco Off-Street Parking Required or Permitted as Accessory for Select Districts and Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Permitted or Required Parking(^1)</th>
<th>Parking Permitted with Planning Commission Approval</th>
<th>Parking Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citywide Parking (except as below)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>1 space / unit</td>
<td>.75 space/unit</td>
<td>.75 space/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office(^2)</td>
<td>2.0 spaces/1,000 square feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (&lt;5,000 square feet)</td>
<td>None required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (between 5,000 and 20,000 square feet)</td>
<td>2.0 spaces/1,000 square feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (for each 1,000 square feet in excess of 20,000)</td>
<td>4.0 spaces/1,000 square feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail devoted to handling bulky merchandise (&gt;5,000 square feet)</td>
<td>1.0 space/1,000 square feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant, bar, nightclub, pool hall, dance hall, bowling alley, or other similar enterprise (&gt;5,000 square feet)</td>
<td>5.0 spaces/1,000 square feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial Districts (C-3)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>.25 space/unit</td>
<td>.75 space/unit</td>
<td>.75 space/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units (with at least 2 bedrooms and at least 1,000 square feet)</td>
<td>.25 space/unit</td>
<td>1.0 space/unit</td>
<td>1.0 space/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-residential uses</td>
<td>None required</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 Percent of Gross Floor Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Van Ness and Market DTR Special Use District</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>.25 space/unit</td>
<td>.50 space/unit</td>
<td>.50 space/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Commercial Transit (NCT)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>.5 space/unit</td>
<td>.75 space/unit</td>
<td>.75 space/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td>None required</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0 space / 1,500 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Transit-Oriented (RTO)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>.75 space/unit</td>
<td>1 space/unit</td>
<td>1 space/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td>None permitted</td>
<td>None permitted</td>
<td>None permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rincon Hill DTR District</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>.50 space/unit</td>
<td>1.0 space/unit</td>
<td>1.0 space/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastern Neighborhoods: Mixed Use General, Mixed Use Office, and Mixed Use Residential</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>.25 space/unit</td>
<td>.75 space/unit</td>
<td>.75 space/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units (with at least 2 bedrooms and at least 1,000 square feet)</td>
<td>.25 space/unit</td>
<td>1.0 space/unit</td>
<td>1.0 space/unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table VII.20 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Minimum Parking Requirement</th>
<th>Maximum Parking Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>None required</td>
<td>7 Percent of Gross Floor Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (where any portion of the parcel is less than ¼ mile from Market, Mission, Third, and Fourth Streets, except grocery stores &gt;20,000 gross square feet)</td>
<td>1.0 space / 1,500 square feet</td>
<td>1.0 space / 1,500 square feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eastern Neighborhoods: Urban Mixed Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Minimum Parking Requirement</th>
<th>Maximum Parking Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>.75 space/unit</td>
<td>.75 space/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units (with at least 2 bedrooms and at least 1,000 square feet)</td>
<td>1.0 space/unit</td>
<td>1.0 space/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1.0 space/1,000 square feet</td>
<td>1.0 space/1,000 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (where the entire parcel is greater than ¼ mile from Market, Mission, Third, or Fourth Streets)</td>
<td>2.0 spaces/1,000 square feet</td>
<td>2.0 spaces/1,000 square feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

1. Parking rates shown for “Citywide” are minimum parking requirements. Parking rates shown for other special districts are parking maximums.
2. Section 151 of the Planning Code makes a distinction between several different types of office. The rate presented here is for the “Other Business Office” category and is intended to illustrate the rate that is most commonly applied. Please refer to Planning Code Sections 151 and 151.1 for details or rates for other types of office use.
3. Retail grocery stores with over 20,000 square feet of occupied floor area are permitted 1 space/500 square feet and can receive Planning Commission Authorization for up to 1 space/250 square feet.

Source: San Francisco Planning Code

The Reduced Parking Alternative would provide the same base transit service, with the Muni line 108 - Treasure Island bus service at existing headways, new bus service to the East Bay at approximately 10 minute peak headways, and ferry service to San Francisco at approximately 50 minute headways. Fare-free shuttle service throughout the Islands would be provided and would be available to residents and visitors as described for the Proposed Project. Bicycle and pedestrian networks on the Islands would remain the same as in the Proposed Project. Utilities and infrastructure included in the Proposed Project would be the same in the Reduced Parking Alternative. Geotechnical stabilization would occur in the same manner and in the same locations as in the Proposed Project. The Reduced Parking Alternative would require all of the same approval actions as those listed for the Proposed Project on pp. II.83 – II.84.

The Proposed Project’s basic objectives include: a) to implement a land use program with high-density, compact residential and commercial development located within walking distance of an intermodal Transit Hub to maximize walking, bicycling, and use of public transportation and to minimize the use and impacts of private automobiles; b) to provide high-density, mixed-income housing consistent with transit-oriented development; c) to create a circulation and transportation system that emphasizes transit-oriented development, discourages automobile use, and supports and promotes the use of public transportation; d) to create a development that is financially...
feasible, that allows for the delivery of infrastructure, public benefits, and affordable housing subsidies; and that is able to fund the Proposed Project’s capital costs and ongoing operation and maintenance costs relating to the redevelopment and long-term operation of the project site; and e) construct a high-quality development project that is able to attract investment capital and construction financing and produce a reasonable return on investment.

The Reduced Parking Alternative would not meet some of these basic project objectives. In particular, the project sponsors believe that the Reduced Parking Alternative would not “create a development that is financially feasible, that allows for the delivery of infrastructure, public benefits, and affordable housing subsidies; and that is able to fund the Proposed Project’s capital costs and ongoing operation and maintenance costs relating to the redevelopment and long-term operation of the project site.” In addition, the project sponsors believe that the Reduced Parking Alternative would not result in “a high-quality development project that is able to attract investment capital and construction financing and produce a reasonable return on investment.” The alternative would not “minimize the…impacts of private automobiles” more than would the Proposed Project, as significant traffic impacts identified for the Proposed Project would not be substantially reduced. Therefore the alternative would not be more effective at meeting this basic project objective than would the Proposed Project.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

Transportation

The Reduced Parking Alternative would include the same transportation improvements as the Proposed Project, as described in Section IV.E, Transportation, beginning on p. IV.E.30, with the exception of the reduced parking program as described above. The Reduced Parking Alternative would include the same roadway network as the Proposed Project, and the developed area would be on the same footprint. With the Reduced Parking Alternative, the total number of off-street parking spaces would be up to about 5,615 compared with up to about 9,646 spaces included in the Proposed Project. Both alternatives would include 1,035 on-street parking spaces. All other uses would be the same as those for the Proposed Project.

Methodology

A number of comments requested a Reduced Parking Alternative be analyzed and suggested that such an alternative would likely reduce transportation impacts by reducing automobile trips. This section summarizes the available methodologies for assessing the effects of reduced parking supplies on peak hour vehicle trip generation based on a literature review conducted by the EIR preparers. Additional discussion of the travel demand methodology for the Reduced Parking Alternative is included in the memorandum titled Supplemental Transportation Analysis for
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Reduced Parking Alternative Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Island EIR, February 25, 2011 (“Supplemental Transportation Analysis memorandum”).

Comments suggested reductions to both residential and non-residential parking supply. As the effects of residential and non-residential parking supply on travel demand are somewhat independent with respect to the Proposed Project, each is discussed separately below.

Residential Parking Supply

As part of the transportation analysis effort for the Proposed Project, a literature review was conducted on the effects that parking supply has on trip generation (documented in Fehr & Peers letter to Planning Department dated February 15, 2010) to determine whether independent research has established a direct correlation between parking supply and vehicle trip generation. Although reducing parking supplies may be an effective land use strategy, particularly in areas well-served by transit like Downtown or the Market/Octavia area of San Francisco, where public and private on-street and off-street parking facilities supplement parking provided by individual uses, there is inadequate data to accurately predict and quantify reductions in vehicle trip generation associated with the individual effect of reduced parking supply.

One of the reports included in the literature review, published by the Transit Cooperative Research Program (“TCRP”), a cooperative effort of the Federal Transit Administration, the Transportation Research Board, and the Transit Development Corporation, Inc., TCRP Report 128 – Effects of TOD on Housing, Parking, and Travel (“TCRP Report”), did identify relationships between residential parking supply and peak hour trip generation, although the identified relationships are statistically very weak. In fact, it is precisely because these relationships are very weak that transportation engineers and planners who study them do not commonly use them in forecasting travel demand. Because of the weak linkages in the study, caution should be exercised in using them to make major land use or policy decisions. However, in light of the public comments received on the Draft EIR, the City elected to analyze the potential effects of a reduced parking supply on trip generation based on the data available from the TCRP Report, even though the limitations of that study and generally low confidence in the data are acknowledged.

---

2 Fehr & Peers, February 25, 2011, Letter to San Francisco Planning Department, Supplemental Transportation Analysis for Reduced Parking Alternative: Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan EIR (hereinafter cited as “Supplemental Transportation Analysis memorandum, 2/25/11”). A copy of this document is available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in Case File No. 2007.0903E.

3 Supplemental Transportation Analysis memorandum, 2/25/11.

The equations in the TCRP Report predict some reduction in peak hour vehicle trip generation based on reductions in residential parking supply. Generally, as residential parking supply ratios decrease from 1 space per dwelling unit to 0.5 spaces per dwelling unit, the TCRP Report’s equations predict a vehicle trip reduction for residential uses of 24 percent daily, 30 percent in the AM peak hour, and 16 percent in the PM peak hour. Although the TCRP report does not include data regarding Saturday peak hour travel demand, Fehr & Peers derived relationships and applied the weekday data from the TCRP Report to Saturday peak hour travel demand. The result of this analysis suggests a 10 percent reduction in Saturday peak hour residential travel demand associated with the reduced residential parking.

However, the City does not believe it would be appropriate to rely on the TCRP Report’s predictive equations to quantify trip reductions for a number of reasons outlined in the Supplemental Transportation Analysis memorandum. Specific reasons described in the memorandum are:

- The relationships are described in the TCRP report itself as “fairly weak;”
- The relationships are derived primarily from areas with parking supplies higher than what is proposed in the Reduced Parking Alternative, which may mean that the TCRP data is not entirely applicable to the Reduced Parking Alternative; and
- The sites that were surveyed to derive the relationships were not consistent with respect to density, land use diversity, and other variables that may have a greater effect on trip generation, which suggests that other factors may be affecting the relationships and not exclusively parking supply.

Thus, for the reasons stated above, the City has concluded that it would not be appropriate to assume that the trip reductions predicted by the TCRP Report’s equation would materialize, and therefore, the Reduced Parking Alternative could not be relied upon to reduce traffic impacts. The trip generation assumptions for the Proposed Project included in the EIR already account for many of the more influential factors noted in the TCRP Report, such as the project’s density, development scale, diversity of uses, and design of its street network (collectively referred to as the 4D’s throughout the EIR).

However, the City also acknowledges that despite the lack of conclusive data demonstrating a link between parking supply and trip generation, it is possible that such a link could exist for the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project is unique in a number of respects from other projects. The Proposed Project is located on two islands and isolated from other peripheral parking lots and garages. The Proposed Project uses an Islands-wide cap on parking supply, rather than the building-by-building parking limits that are more commonly found in parking codes that seek to restrict parking supply. (All of the parking ratios in the current San Francisco Planning Code that

---

5 Refer to the Transportation Impact Study in Appendix C of the EIR for additional discussion of the 4Ds.
are summarized in (New) Table VII.20 are applied on a building-by-building basis.) Together, these factors mean that parking supply restrictions on the Islands may produce different results from those in many downtown San Francisco projects. In downtown San Francisco, for example, individual buildings have limitations on parking supply, but there are other nearby free-standing parking facilities, surface lots, or street parking that can serve the building occupants, allowing some residents who do not have parking in their building to secure parking in another location. This would not be possible on the Islands, as constructing any additional reservoirs of parking exceeding the Islands-wide maximums would not be permitted, no additional parking would be available on the periphery or in an adjacent neighborhood, and all on-street parking would be priced for short-term usage by both residents and visitors. While the City acknowledges it is possible that the unique conditions of the Proposed Project might make it more likely that the reductions in parking supply would influence vehicle trip generation, the City does not have data to support this conclusion. Further, there are not adequate examples in the United States of neighborhoods located on islands with the mix of land uses, proximity to transit supply, and regional connectivity characteristics similar to the Proposed Project from which additional studies could be performed or data could be obtained.

While the City is not able to rely on trip reductions in its impact analysis, the analysis of the Reduced Parking Alternative includes a discussion as to how the reduced parking supply might affect the travel behavior and resulting impacts discussed in the EIR. The quantification of potential reductions associated with the Reduced Parking Alternative included in the discussion below is not meant to suggest a confident forecast of travel behavior changes that may be expected due to a reduced parking supply, nor does the City intend to use the quantification for the purposes of evaluating travel demand for future projects. Rather, the purpose of the discussion is meant to illustrate how reductions in trip generation might affect the impacts concluded for the Proposed Project, if in fact, they were to materialize, despite limited empirical evidence.

In the absence of other independent, verifiable data, the City relied on the TCRP Report’s predicted traffic generation reductions as the basis for this discussion.

Non-Residential Parking Supply

Comments also requested that the Reduced Parking Alternative examine the effects of reduced parking supply for non-residential uses. In response, as discussed earlier in this section, the Reduced Parking Alternative includes reductions to maximum parking supply rates for Flex, Hotel, and Office uses compared to the rates in the Proposed Project. No adjustments to the Retail parking rate are proposed as part of the Reduced Parking Alternative, because unlike other uses, the rate proposed as part of the Proposed Project is already 50 percent lower than the minimum generally required by the San Francisco Planning Code for buildings greater than
20,000 square feet. As a result, the Reduced Parking Alternative includes maximum parking supply rates for Residential, Hotel, Retail, Flex, and Office uses that are approximately 50 percent lower than the minimum generally required by the San Francisco Planning Code.

As shown in Appendix D2 to the Project’s Transportation Impact Study, the Flex, Hotel, and Office components of the Proposed Project generate relatively small amounts of vehicle trips, compared to the Proposed Project as a whole. Combined, these uses generate 15 percent of the project’s total vehicle trip generation in the AM peak hour and 11 percent in the PM peak hour. Therefore, even if reductions to parking supplies for these non-residential uses were to result in a reduction in peak hour vehicle trip generation, the overall effect to the number of vehicle trips generated onto and off of the Islands would be relatively small.

However, in response to numerous comments on the subject, the literature review conducted for the Proposed Project also looked for studies that examine the links between non-residential parking supply and vehicle trip generation. No studies were found that identified such links specifically and exclusively for non-residential parking supply. However, a few more comprehensive studies were found that identified the total vehicle trip reductions that have been observed associated with a number of different travel demand management strategies (including parking supply reductions) individually and combined. These studies suggest that there are limits as to how much total vehicle trip reduction can be achieved, and that the Reduced Parking Alternative, including vehicle trip reductions associated with residential parking reductions, would meet or exceed those limits, even without accounting for non-residential parking reductions.

One of the more exhaustive studies on the effectiveness of various strategies at reducing vehicle trip generation was a report prepared by Fehr & Peers for the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (“CAPCOA”), Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures – A Resource for Local Government to Assess Emission Reductions from Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures. The CAPCOA report summarized a number of other studies, including one conducted by Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates that specifically discussed the general relationship between parking supply and vehicle trip generation. Although not specific to non-residential parking supply, the Nelson\Nygaard study could be applied to the non-residential uses for purposes of assessing the effects on vehicle trip generation of the Reduced Parking Alternative. The Nelson\Nygaard study developed a model that uses the ITE Parking Generation handbook as the baseline figure for parking supply. The Nelson\Nygaard study assumes data in the ITE research to represent unconstrained demand (or, the parking demand in a typical, auto-oriented, suburban setting), since ITE parking rates are based on suburban development and have tended to

---

overestimate the demand for parking in more urbanized areas. However, the literature suggests no reductions to trip generation associated with reductions in parking supply should be taken once trip generation forecasts are below 50 percent of typical rates as suggested by ITE. That is, once the forecast of trip generation rates has been reduced by 50 percent by virtue of the high-density, mixed-use, or transit-oriented characteristics of the project, as compared to standard ITE trip generation rates, no data supports further reductions beyond 50 percent by virtue of constraining the parking supply available to the project.

In the case of both the Reduced Parking Alternative and the Proposed Project, the reductions already taken to account for the Proposed Project’s characteristics (density, diversity of uses, robust transit supply, and reductions to residential parking supply exceed 50 percent of the unadjusted ITE trip generation forecasts. For example, as shown in Table IV.E.4: Person-Trip Generation by Land Use, on p. IV.E.58 of the EIR, in the PM peak hour the combined effect of adjustments made for the projects’ density, diversity of uses, etc. (collectively, the 4D’s) is 39 percent. As shown on Table IV.E.5: Person-Trip Generation by Mode, on p. IV.E.60 of the EIR, 25 percent of the trips coming to or leaving the Islands would be by transit. This represents 15 percent of total trips (internal and external) generated during the PM peak hour. The combined effect of the 4D’s and the reduction associated with transit is 54 percent (39 percent associated with the 4D’s and 15 percent associated with transit use). Therefore, since the analysis has already included reductions of more than 50 percent due to other features of the Proposed Project, the data suggests additional trip reductions should not be taken as a result of non-residential parking supply reductions; and, as noted earlier, even if reductions to vehicle trip generation were to materialize, the effect would be relatively small since the affected uses generate a relatively small portion of overall vehicle trips associated with the Proposed Project. In summary, although the Reduced Parking Alternative includes reductions to the parking supply for the flex, hotel, and office uses, no associated reductions were made to the trip generation associated with these uses.

**Travel Demand**

As described above, the potential changes to trip generation associated with the reduction in parking supply included in the Reduced Parking Alternative have been quantified. Overall, except for the accounting for reduced parking supply as described above, the methodology for assessing travel demand of the Reduced Parking Alternative was the same as that used for the Proposed Project. Table VII.21 summarizes the project travel demand for the Proposed Project and the Reduced Parking Alternative that would occur if the reduction in vehicle trips associated with the reduced parking supply implied by the TCRP Report data presented above were to materialize. The TCRP Report does not quantify whether the reduced automobile trip generation would result from a net decrease in total person-trips or whether all of the trips that would no longer be made by auto would still be made during the peak hours, but via different mode. To be
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(New) Table VII.21: Person-Trip Generation by Mode – Proposed Project and Reduced Parking Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peak hour</th>
<th>Person-Trip Generation</th>
<th>Total Vehicle-Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ferry</td>
<td>Bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Reduced Parking Alternative |      |      |      |       |                        |
| AM         | 948  | 991 | 2,714| 3,296 | 1,277                  |
| PM         | 1,003| 1,125| 4,711| 4,850 | 2,255                  |
| Saturday   | 580  | 754 | 5,647| 5,743 | 2,728                  |

Notes:
1  This analysis assumes no external pedestrian or bicycle trips onto or off of the Islands. With construction of the new east span bicycle/pedestrian path, it is possible that some bicycle trips may occur. However, this number is not likely to affect the overall conclusions of this study. Further, the potential new bicycle facility on the west span of the Bay Bridge is still in the Project Study Report (PSR) phase, and is not assumed to be in place in this analysis.
2  Vehicle-trips include passenger vehicles and vans. Refer to EIR for discussion of methodology for calculating net vehicle trip generation increases.
3  Includes internal bicycle and pedestrian trips, and a relatively small number of internal auto trips (e.g., between Yerba Buena Island and Treasure Island).

Source: Fehr & Peers 2010

Conservative, this analysis assumes the total person trip-generation would not change; instead there would be a shift from auto use to bus and ferry use, resulting in a decrease in vehicle trips but an increase in transit trips. The allocation of those new transit trips between buses and ferries was done using the same methodology as that of the Proposed Project, based on the type of land use generating the trips (in this case, residential) and the type of trips generated by that land use during the peak hours (50 percent work and 50 percent non-work). In this case, all of the additional peak-hour transit trips were residential, which are more likely to be work trips than the average trip generated by the project. Because work and non-work trips have different propensities to choose buses or ferries, the ferry and bus ridership did not increase proportionally to the ferry and bus ridership of the Proposed Project. The data presented in Table VII.21 are for the same base transit service proposed by the Project, without expanded transit service as proposed in Mitigation Measure M-TR-27. Table VII.22 compares the same information under conditions with Mitigation Measure M-TR-2 in place. The percentage reduction in vehicle trips

7 Mitigation Measure M-TR-2 would increase peak period ferry service from 50 minute frequencies to as much as 15-minute frequencies. It would increase peak period frequencies on the 108-Treasure Island bus route from 15 minutes to between 5 and 7 minutes. It would also create a new bus route to another location in San Francisco, such as the Civic Center area, with frequencies as low as 12-minutes during peak periods. Bus service to the East Bay would not be affected.
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(New) Table VII.22: Person-Trip Generation by Mode – Proposed Project and Reduced Parking Alternative (With Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peak hour</th>
<th>Person-Trip Generation¹</th>
<th>Total Vehicle-Trips²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ferry</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project (With M-TR-2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>1,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>1,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>1,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Parking Alternative (With M-TR-2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>1,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>1,369</td>
<td>1,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>1,223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
¹ This analysis assumes no external pedestrian or bicycle trips onto or off of the Islands. With construction of the new east span bicycle/pedestrian path, it is possible that some bicycle trips may occur. However, this number is not likely to affect the overall conclusions of this study. Further, the potential new bicycle facility on the west span of the Bay Bridge is still in the Project Study Report (PSR) phase, and is not assumed to be in place in this analysis.
² Vehicle-trips include passenger vehicles and vans. Refer to EIR for discussion of methodology for calculating net vehicle trip generation increases.
³ Includes internal bicycle and pedestrian trips, and a relatively small number of internal auto trips (e.g., between Yerba Buena Island and Treasure Island).

Source: Fehr & Peers 2010

associated with congestion pricing has not been re-analyzed because the change would be very small. Instead, the trip generation forecasts assume the same percentage reduction to total vehicle trip generation associated with congestion pricing for the Proposed Project would apply to the Reduced Parking Alternative.

For conditions without Mitigation Measure M-TR-2, compared to the Proposed Project, there would be 336 fewer vehicle trips during the weekday AM peak hour (a reduction of 21 percent), 207 fewer vehicles during the PM peak hour (a reduction of 8 percent), and 133 fewer vehicle trips during the Saturday peak hour (a reduction of 5 percent). Also, compared to the Proposed Project there would be 677 more person-trips by ferry or bus during the AM peak hour, 413 more ferry/bus trips during the PM peak hour, and 266 more ferry/bus trips during the Saturday peak hour. Although the number of internal trips is expected to be the same between the Proposed Project and the Reduced Parking Alternative, the increased transit ridership in the Reduced Parking Alternative may result in an increased number of bicycle and pedestrian trips on the Islands.

For conditions with Mitigation Measure M-TR-2, compared to the Proposed Project, there would be 312 fewer vehicle trips during the weekday AM peak hour (a reduction of 25 percent), 156
fewer vehicles during the PM peak hour (a reduction of 8 percent), and 118 fewer vehicle trips during the Saturday peak hour (a reduction of 5 percent). Also, compared to the Proposed Project, there would be 518 more person-trips by transit during the AM peak hour, 313 more ferry/bus trips during the PM peak hour, and 234 more ferry/bus trips during the Saturday peak hour.

Construction Impacts

Construction activities associated with the Reduced Parking Alternative would be similar and only somewhat reduced due to the slightly lesser amount of overall construction as compared to the Proposed Project. Mitigation Measure M-TR-1, a Construction Management Program, described in Section IV.E, Transportation, beginning on p. IV.E.69, would minimize the alternative’s contribution to construction-related traffic impacts. However, some disruption and increased delays could still occur even with implementation of M-TR-1, and, as with the Proposed Project, construction-related traffic impacts would remain significant and unavoidable (Impact TR-1).8

Operational Impacts

Traffic

During the peak study periods, the Reduced Parking Alternative would reduce peak hour vehicle trips by approximately 336 trips in the AM peak hour (from 1,613 to 1,277), 207 trips in the PM peak hour (from 2,462 to 2,255), and 133 trips in the Saturday peak hour (from 2,861 to 2,728). Because the analysis assumes that these reductions would be to residential trip generation, they would most likely occur in the peak direction of travel during each peak hour, since travel associated with the Proposed Project would be highly influenced by the residential component.

The Draft EIR included an analysis of the traffic impacts of the Reduced Development Alternative. The person trip generation under the Reduced Development Alternative and under the Reduced Parking Alternative is summarized in Table VII.23, below. As this table shows, the vehicle trip generation for the Reduced Parking Alternative is predicted to be very similar to that of the Reduced Development Alternative, described in Chapter VII, Alternatives as Alternative B, Reduced Development Alternative, beginning on EIR p. VI.15. Further analysis was performed to confirm that the overall geographic distribution of these vehicle trips would also be very similar.9

---

8 The identification of an impact number (i.e., Impact TR-1) refers to the enumeration of impacts in the EIR associated with the Proposed Project. It is provided to facilitate the comparison of impacts of the Reduced Parking Alternative to the Proposed Project. However, the traffic impacts of the Reduced Parking Alternative would be most similar to the impacts of the Reduced Development Alternative.

9 Supplemental Transportation Analysis memorandum, 2/25/11.
(New) Table VII.23: Person-Trip Generation by Mode – Reduced Development Alternative and Reduced Parking Alternative (Without Implementation of M-TR-2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peak hour</th>
<th>Person-Trip Generation</th>
<th></th>
<th>Vehicle-Trips</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ferry</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Development Alternative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>2,748</td>
<td>2,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>4,652</td>
<td>4,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>5,321</td>
<td>5,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Parking Alternative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>2,714</td>
<td>3,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>4,711</td>
<td>4,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>5,647</td>
<td>5,743</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. This analysis assumes no external pedestrian or bicycle trips onto or off of the Islands. With construction of the new east span bicycle/pedestrian path, it is possible that some bicycle trips may occur. However, this number is not likely to affect the overall conclusions of this study. Further, the potential new bicycle facility on the west span of the Bay Bridge is still in the Project Study Report (PSR) phase, and is not assumed to be in place in this analysis.
2. Vehicle-trips include passenger vehicles and vans. Refer to EIR for discussion of methodology for calculating net vehicle trip generation increases.
3. Includes internal bicycle and pedestrian trips, and a relatively small number of internal auto trips (e.g., between Yerba Buena Island and Treasure Island).

Source: Fehr & Peers 2010

Due to the similarity in vehicle trip generation between the Reduced Development Alternative and the Reduced Parking Alternative, it is possible to use the traffic impact analysis from the Reduced Development Alternative to understand the possible impacts for the Reduced Parking Alternative. Accordingly, if the trip reductions associated with the Reduced Parking Alternative were to materialize, traffic impacts would be nearly identical to those described in the Reduced Development Alternative. Thus, for comparison purposes, the discussion below summarizes the results of the transportation impact analysis conducted for the Reduced Development Alternative, as presented on pp. VII.20 – VII.33, above.

The Reduced Parking Alternative could result in similar significant and unavoidable impacts related to extensive queues and vehicle delays as the Reduced Development Alternative (summarized in Tables VII.4: Ramp Junction Analysis – Existing, Existing plus Proposed Project, and Existing plus Reduced Development Alternative, and Table VII.5: Maximum On-Ramp Queues and Average Delays – Existing plus Project and Existing plus Reduced Development Alternative Conditions, on pp. VII.23 and VII.24), at the following study ramp locations:

- At the eastbound off-ramp on the west side of Yerba Buena Island during the PM peak hour (Impact TR-2);
3. DEIR Revisions

1. Changes in Response to Comments

Revisions to Chapter VII - D. Reduced Parking Alternative

- Under conditions without the Ramps Project, at the two westbound on-ramps during the AM, PM and Saturday peak hours (Impact TR-3); and
- Under conditions with the Ramps Project, at the ramp meter at the westbound on-ramp on the east side of Yerba Buena Island during the AM and PM peak hours (Impact TR-4).

Similar to both the Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative, under conditions without and with the Ramps Project, the Reduced Parking Alternative would result in less-than-significant impacts at the eastbound on-ramp and eastbound off-ramp on the east side of Yerba Buena Island, and the westbound off-ramp on the east side of Yerba Buena Island (Impact TR-5). Similarly, under conditions without and with the Ramps Project, the Reduced Parking Alternative would also result in a significant impact on queuing at the Bay Bridge toll plaza during the weekday AM peak hour (Impact TR-6), and on San Francisco streets approaching the Bay Bridge during the PM peak hour (Impact TR-7).

Table VII.6: Intersection Levels of Service – Existing and 2030 Cumulative Conditions, on pp. VII.25 – VII.26, presents the comparison of intersection Levels of Service (“LOS”) for Existing plus Project and Existing plus Reduced Development Alternative conditions. Since the Reduced Parking Alternative would be nearly identical to the Reduced Development Alternative in terms of traffic impacts, similar to the Reduced Development Alternative, the Reduced Parking Alternative would result in significant impacts at eight study intersections (compared with nine for the Proposed Project).  

- Similar to the Reduced Development Alternative, the Reduced Parking Alternative would result in project-specific impacts at six signalized study intersections that operate at LOS D or better under Existing conditions and would deteriorate to LOS E or LOS F under Existing plus Project conditions, or that operate at LOS E under Existing conditions and would deteriorate to LOS F under Existing plus Project conditions (First/Market, First/Mission, First/Folsom, First/Harrison/I-80 Eastbound On-Ramp, Bryant/Fifth/I-80 Eastbound On-Ramp, Fifth/Harrison/I-80 Westbound Off-Ramp) (Impacts TR-8 through TR-13).
- Similar to the Reduced Development Alternative, the Reduced Parking Alternative would have less-than-significant contributions at four signalized study intersections that operate at LOS E or LOS F under Existing conditions and that would continue to operate at LOS E or LOS F under Existing plus Project conditions (First/Howard, Essex/Harrison/I-80 Eastbound On-Ramp, The Embarcadero/Harrison, and Second/Folsom) (Impacts TR-14 and TR-15).
- Similar to the Reduced Development Alternative, the Reduced Parking Alternative would have less-than-significant contributions at five signalized study intersections that would operate at LOS D or better under Existing plus Project conditions (Impact TR-16).

---

10 The project-specific impact at Second/Folsom would be less-than-significant under the Reduced Development Alternative and, therefore, under the Reduced Parking Alternative.
Similar to the Reduced Development Alternative, the Reduced Parking Alternative would contribute considerably to two uncontrolled study intersections that operate poorly under Existing conditions, resulting in a project-specific impact (Folsom/Essex and Bryant/Sterling) (Impacts TR-17 and TR-18).

As with the Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative, the traffic impacts at ramps and intersections would be minimized but not eliminated with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-2 (Expanded Transit Service) as discussed in Section IV.E, Transportation, pp. IV.E.74 – IV.E.75. This mitigation measure would reduce vehicle trip generation and would reinforce the proposed TDM practices included as part of the Reduced Parking Alternative, including ramp metering, congestion pricing, etc. As with the Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative, because of uncertainties regarding sources for full funding to implement M-TR-2, its feasibility is uncertain and the impacts that could be mitigated by implementation of M-TR-2 are assumed to remain significant and unavoidable. Aside from increasing the availability of transit service, as proposed by Mitigation Measure M-TR-2, there do not appear to be other proven and/or feasible techniques that are not already part of the Proposed Project that would achieve a substantial increase in transit ridership.

In sum, the Reduced Parking Alternative could potentially have traffic impacts similar to the Reduced Development Alternative, which would be similar to those of the Proposed Project except for one intersection, Second/Folsom (Impact TR-14). That intersection would experience a significant and unavoidable impact with mitigation under the Proposed Project, but the impact could be less-than-significant without mitigation under the Reduced Development Alternative and the Reduced Parking Alternative. However, as noted above, the City has very low confidence in the predictions of the TCRP data, and because of the uncertainty in the estimates, the City cannot reliably conclude that reductions in impacts would occur.

Transit Impacts

The Reduced Parking Alternative transit conditions assume implementation of Project-related transit improvements as described in Section IV.E., Transportation, p. IV.E.94. If travel demand characteristics of the Reduced Parking Alternative shown in Table VII.23 were to materialize, transit ridership in the Reduced Parking Alternative would exceed what was projected for the Proposed Project. Table VII.24 presents the transit ridership and capacity utilization information for the Reduced Parking Alternative (with the base level of transit). As shown in Table VII.24, similar to the Proposed Project, the Reduced Parking Alternative would have a significant impact on transit capacity for Muni service between the Islands and San Francisco because Muni’s transit capacity utilization standard of 85 percent would be exceeded. This was also identified as a significant impact associated with the Proposed Project (Impact TR-19, p. IV.E.95). However, the impact would be exacerbated with the Reduced Parking Alternative, since transit demand...
### (New) Table VII.24: Transit Ridership and Capacity Utilization – Existing plus Project and Existing plus Reduced Parking Alternative (Prior to Implementation of M-TR-2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Existing plus Project</th>
<th></th>
<th>Existing plus Reduced Parking Alternative</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Rider-ship</td>
<td>% Utilization</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AM Peak Hour</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC Transit EB 2</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC Transit WB 2</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muni EB Bus Service from SF 3</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muni WB Bus Service to SF 3</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>152%</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry EB</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry WB</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PM Peak Hour</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC Transit EB</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC Transit WB</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muni EB Bus Service from SF</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>204%</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muni WB Bus Service to SF</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>171%</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry EB</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry WB</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saturday Peak Hour</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC Transit EB</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC Transit WB</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muni EB Bus Service from SF</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>174%</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muni WB Bus Service to SF</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>169%</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry EB</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry WB</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

- N/A = Not Applicable
- **Bold** indicates capacity utilization exceeds the 85 percent capacity utilization standard for Muni line 108-Treasure Island, and the 100 percent capacity utilization standard for new ferry and AC Transit service. Exceedance of the capacity utilization standard is considered a significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-2 would result in adequate transit capacity reducing the impacts to less than significant levels.
- 2 New AC Transit bus service between the Islands and downtown Oakland at 10-minute peak headways.
- 3 Muni line 108-Treasure Island service at 15-minute headways during peak periods.
- 4 New ferry service between Treasure Island and San Francisco at 50-minute peak headways.

**Source:** Fehr & Peers 2010
would increase. Similar to the Proposed Project, implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-2 would increase transit capacity and ridership; however, the capacity increases would be far greater than the ridership increases, and with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-2, the capacity would be adequate to serve projected demand. However, as explained in Section IV.E, Transportation, implementation of M-TR-2 is uncertain, and therefore, the impacts to Muni capacity utilization would remain significant and unavoidable.

Similar to the Proposed Project, impacts on the new AC Transit bus service and ferry serving the Islands, and impacts on other AC Transit, BART, Golden Gate Transit, SamTrans and other ferry lines would be less than significant (Impacts TR-20, TR-21, and TR-23). As presented in Table IV.E.18 on p. IV.E.98, the Muni downtown San Francisco screenlines are not expected to operate near their capacity utilization threshold of 85 percent under conditions with the Proposed Project. The additional transit riders that would occur with the Reduced Parking Alternative would not be enough to cause the downtown screenlines to exceed capacity utilization thresholds and therefore, the Reduced Parking Alternative’s impacts to the downtown screenlines would be less than significant (Impact TR-22).

As with the Proposed Project and Reduced Development Alternative, some transit impacts would result from increased traffic congestion at the approaches to the Bay Bridge on-ramps at Yerba Buena Island (Impacts TR-24, TR-25, TR-26, and TR-27). As noted earlier, if reductions in vehicle trip generation associated with the Reduced Parking Alternative were to materialize, traffic impacts would be nearly identical to the Reduced Development Alternative. Thus, similar to the Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative, under conditions with and without the Ramps Project, vehicle queues extending from the Bay Bridge on-ramps at Yerba Buena Island may impact Muni line 108-Treasure Island and AC Transit bus operations during the AM, PM and Saturday peak hours, causing delays to bus service. With implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-24 (Transit and Emergency Vehicle Only Lane) described in Section IV.E, Transportation, on p. IV.E.100, the impact on Muni operations would be reduced to a less-than-significant level (Impacts TR-24 and TR-26). Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-24 would improve operations for AC Transit buses destined for the eastbound on-ramp. However, because this improvement would extend only to the transit and emergency vehicle-only westbound on-ramp on the west side of Yerba Buena Island, and because sufficient right-of-way is not available to extend a transit-only lane beyond the transit and emergency vehicle-only westbound on-ramp, AC Transit vehicles would continue to experience congestion between the transit and emergency vehicle-only westbound on-ramp and the eastbound on-ramp. Therefore, similar to the Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative, the impact on AC Transit operations would remain significant and unavoidable (Impacts TR-25 and TR-27).
Similar to the Proposed Project, implementation of the Reduced Parking Alternative would result in less-than-significant impacts to the existing and proposed ferry services on the San Francisco Bay (Impact TR-28).

As with the Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative, transit impacts would occur from traffic congestion delay in downtown San Francisco with the Reduced Parking Alternative. The transit delay conditions with the Reduced Parking Alternative would affect the same lines as the Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative (27-Bryant, 30X-Marina Express, and 47-Van Ness), resulting in significant and unavoidable impacts (Impacts TR-29 through TR-31). As with the Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative, the Reduced Parking Alternative would not adversely affect operations of Golden Gate Transit or SamTrans bus lines (Impact TR-32).

Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-2 would reduce, but not eliminate, traffic impacts at the study intersections, and therefore, the transit delay impacts of the Reduced Parking Alternative on the Muni lines would remain significant and unavoidable.

In summary, the Reduced Parking Alternative would have the same number of significant transit-related impacts as the Proposed Project, although the severity of the impacts may be somewhat different. If automobile trip generation reductions associated with reduced parking supply were to materialize, the significant impacts due to transit ridership increases would be more severe than the Proposed Project and the significant impacts due to traffic congestion would be less severe than the Proposed Project (and comparable to those of the Reduced Development Alternative). However, as noted earlier in the discussion of traffic impacts, the City has very low confidence in the predictions of the TCRP data, and because of the uncertainty in the estimates, the City cannot reliably conclude that differences in the severity of impacts would occur.

**Bicycles**

The Reduced Parking Alternative bicycle trips would be accommodated within the proposed street network on the Islands and on mainland San Francisco, and similar to the Proposed Project, impacts related to bicycle accessibility would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required (Impacts TR-33 and TR-34). Also, as with the Proposed Project, implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-24 would result in the removal of the proposed bicycle lane on a portion of Treasure Island and Hillcrest Roads to accommodate a transit-only lane (Mitigation Measure M-TR-24 would only be implemented if queues on Treasure Island Road materialize and substantially affect transit operations); however, cyclists would continue to have a continuous Class I shared bicycle and pedestrian facility connecting Treasure Island and the Class I shared bicycle and pedestrian facility currently under construction on the Bay Bridge east span, from the
intermodal transit hub to Treasure Island Road across the causeway and continuing along Macalla Road on Yerba Buena Island.

As discussed in the methodology section above and presented in Table VII.20, the analysis assumes that the reduction in vehicle traffic would manifest itself entirely in a mode shift to transit. It is possible that a small portion of the mode shift would be to bicycle instead of to transit; however, given the lack of a bicycle connection to San Francisco, the only travelers this mode shift would affect would be those traveling between the Proposed Project and the East Bay. Further, it is likely that an increase in bicycling would not be so substantial as to affect the analysis of other modes.

**Pedestrians**

The pedestrian network and improvements would not change materially between the Proposed Project and the Reduced Parking Alternative. Generally, similar to the Proposed Project, the pedestrian environment would be improved compared to existing conditions. As such, the Reduced Parking Alternative would not create potentially hazardous conditions for pedestrians (Impact TR-35). Although the data is uncertain, if the travel characteristics of the Reduced Parking Alternative materialized as summarized in Table VII.21, the Reduced Parking Alternative would result in more pedestrian trips near the Ferry Building in San Francisco than the Proposed Project because there would be increased ferry ridership.

Further, the increased transit ridership may result in an increase in bicycle and pedestrian trips on the Islands. However, the on-island bicycle and pedestrian circulation network would remain adequate to serve expected demands.

Compared to the Proposed Project, the Reduced Parking Alternative would result in 307 more ferry trips during the AM peak hour, 181 more ferry trips during the PM peak hour, and 107 more ferry trips during the Saturday peak hour. With implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-2 there would be even more pedestrian trips since the increased transit service would attract more riders.

As shown in Table VII.25, these pedestrians would be accommodated at the crosswalks in the vicinity of the Ferry Building, most of which were projected to operate at LOS C or better under the Proposed Project. Under the Reduced Parking Alternative, the crosswalk at Market Street across from the Ferry Building is projected to operate at LOS D, which is still considered acceptable. Therefore, impacts related to pedestrians would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required (Impact TR-36).
(New) Table VII.25: Pedestrian Crosswalk Levels of Service – Existing plus Project and Existing plus Reduced Parking Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crosswalk</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Saturday Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing plus Project</td>
<td>Existing plus Reduced Parking Alternative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing plus Project</td>
<td>Existing plus Reduced Parking Alternative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing plus Project</td>
<td>Existing plus Reduced Parking Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Trips</td>
<td>Density</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Project Trips</td>
<td>Density</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Project Trips</td>
<td>Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Street</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry Bldg (North)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Street</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Chee Way</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Street</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Street</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry Bldg (North)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Street</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Chee Way</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Street</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Street</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Chee Way</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1 Since the intersections of The Embarcadero with Washington Street and Mission Street each have two crosswalks, the north and south legs of each intersection were averaged.
2 The Ferry Building hosts a farmers market on Saturdays.
3 Density measured in square feet per pedestrian

**Source:** Fehr & Peers 2011

**Loading**

Similar to the Proposed Project, development associated with the Reduced Parking Alternative would be subject to the freight loading space requirements to accommodate the loading demand, and would be designed to minimize impacts on autos, transit, bicyclists and pedestrians and to ensure that loading activities do not result in hazardous conditions. The Reduced Parking Alternative impacts related to loading operations would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required (Impact TR-37).
Emergency Access

The Reduced Parking Alternative impacts on emergency access would be the same as for the Proposed Project. Local police and fire facilities would provide first response to incidents on the Islands, and existing emergency routes would be maintained in their existing locations or rerouted as necessary. Similar to the Proposed Project, impacts to emergency access would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required (Impact TR-38).

Cumulative Conditions

The Reduced Parking Alternative would result in similar construction activities to that of the Proposed Project. As with the Proposed Project, given the overall magnitude of development, the project’s prolonged construction period, and the lack of certainty of timing of other construction projects on the Islands, the Reduced Parking Alternative would also result in significant contributions to cumulative construction-related traffic impacts (Impact TR-39).

Overall, if vehicle trip generation reductions associated with the Reduced Parking Alternative were to materialize as described in this section, 2030 Cumulative Conditions traffic operational impacts would be nearly identical to those described for the Reduced Development Alternative. In those circumstances, under 2030 Cumulative conditions, as with the Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative, the Reduced Parking Alternative would contribute to significant cumulative traffic impacts at the following locations:

- At the eastbound off-ramp on the west side of Yerba Buena Island (Impact TR-40);
- Under conditions without the Ramps Project, at the two westbound on-ramps (Impact TR-41); and
- Under conditions with the Ramps Project, at the ramp meter at the westbound on-ramp at the east side of Yerba Buena Island (Impact TR-42).

Similar to the Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative, the Reduced Parking Alternative would result in less-than-significant impacts at the eastbound on-ramp and eastbound off-ramp on the east side of Yerba Buena Island, and the westbound off-ramp on the east side of Yerba Buena Island (Impact TR-43).

Similar to the Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative, the Reduced Parking Alternative would also result in a significant impact on queuing at the Bay Bridge toll plaza during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, and on San Francisco streets approaching the Bay Bridge during the weekday AM and PM and Saturday peak hours (Impacts TR-44 and TR-45).

Table VII.6, on pp. VII.25 – VII.26, includes the comparison of intersection LOS for 2030 Cumulative plus Proposed Project and 2030 Cumulative plus Reduced Development Alternative.
conditions. The Reduced Parking Alternative would be nearly identical to the Reduced Development Alternative in terms of vehicular trip generation and therefore, would result in the same significant impacts at study intersections as the Reduced Development Alternative and the Proposed Project. Although the Reduced Development Alternative had one fewer project-related impacts than the Proposed Project, the Reduced Development Alternative, and therefore the Reduced Parking Alternative, would have the same number of cumulative impacts as the Proposed Project.

- Similar to the Reduced Development Alternative and the Proposed Project, the Reduced Parking Alternative would result in project-specific impacts at six signalized study intersections that operate at LOS D or better under Existing conditions and would deteriorate to LOS E or LOS F under Existing plus Project conditions, or that operate at LOS E under Existing conditions and would deteriorate to LOS F under Existing plus Project conditions. Because the Reduced Parking Alternative would result in significant project-related impacts at these intersections, it would also result in cumulative impacts at these six intersections (First/Market, First/Mission, First/Folsom, First/Harrison/I-80 Eastbound On-Ramp, Bryant/Fifth/I-80 Eastbound On-Ramp, Fifth/Harrison/I-80 Westbound Off-Ramp) (Impacts TR-46 through TR-51).

- Similar to the Reduced Development Alternative and the Proposed Project, the Reduced Parking Alternative would contribute considerably to critical movements at one study intersection that would operate at LOS E or LOS F under 2030 Cumulative plus Reduced Parking Alternative conditions, resulting in a project impact (Second/Folsom). (Impact TR-52)

- Similar to the Reduced Development Alternative and the Proposed Project, the Reduced Parking Alternative would have less-than-significant contributions at seven study intersections that would operate at LOS E or LOS F under 2030 Cumulative No Project conditions (Fremont/Howard, Fremont/Folsom, Fremont/I-80 Westbound Off-Ramp/Harrison, First/Howard, Essex/Harrison/I-80 Eastbound On-Ramp, Second/Bryant, and The Embarcadero/Harrison). (Impact TR-53).

- Similar to the Reduced Development Alternative and the Proposed Project, the Reduced Parking Alternative would contribute considerably to significant cumulative impacts at two uncontrolled study intersections (Folsom/Essex and Bryant/Sterling) (Impacts TR-54 and TR-55).

As with the Proposed Project and the Reduced Development Alternative, the Reduced Parking Alternative’s contribution to cumulative traffic impacts at ramps and intersections would be lessened, but not eliminated, with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-2.

Under 2030 Cumulative conditions, implementation of the Reduced Parking Alternative would have transit impacts similar to those of the Proposed Project, although transit ridership would be higher than under conditions with the Proposed Project. Similar to the Proposed Project, ridership under this alternative would also exceed the capacity of the Muni screenline between the Islands and Downtown San Francisco. Impacts to this screenline would be the same as identified for Existing plus Reduced Parking Alternative conditions, and summarized in Table VII.21. The
Reduced Parking Alternative would also add more transit trips to the standard Muni downtown San Francisco screenlines than the Proposed Project; however, the increase is not expected to be severe enough such that ridership demand would exceed capacity, and cumulative impacts on the standard downtown San Francisco screenlines would be less than significant (Impact TR-56). The Reduced Parking Alternative’s contributions to cumulative transit trips on AC Transit, BART, Golden Gate Transit, SamTrans, Caltrain, and other ferry routes would not increase demand in excess of available capacity (Impact TR-57). Transit impacts would result from traffic congestion delay in downtown San Francisco and would affect the same lines as the Proposed Project and Reduced Development Alternative would (10-Townsend, 27-Bryant, 30X-Marina Express, and 47-Van Ness) (Impacts TR-58 through TR-61). While implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-2 (Expanded Transit Service) would somewhat reduce delays at the downtown study intersections, the impact on transit would remain significant and unavoidable. Increased traffic congestion delay in downtown San Francisco would not affect operations of Golden Gate Transit or SamTrans bus lines (Impact TR-62).

Parking Information

Similar to the Proposed Project, development associated with the Reduced Parking Alternative would be subject to parking space maximums; however, those maximums would be substantially lower than the Proposed Project. As summarized in Table VII.19, the Reduced Parking Alternative would include 6,651 parking spaces, including 4,000 off-street spaces for residential uses, 1,616 off-street spaces for non-residential uses, and 1,035 on-street parking spaces. If travel behavior materialized as summarized in Table VII.21, although the overall demand for spaces would be less than the Proposed Project, parking shortfalls associated with the Reduced Parking Alternative would likely exceed those projected for the Proposed Project.11

As with the Proposed Project, implementation of the reduced parking supply maximums would result in secondary physical impacts caused by increased traffic congestion and a mode shift to transit that would exacerbate the degree to which capacity utilization standards were exceeded on Muni line 108-Treasure Island. As with the Proposed Project, impacts on the transit capacity utilization would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-2. However, because implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-2 is uncertain, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

11 Since parking supply is reduced for residential units by 50 percent, there would also have to be a reduction in residential trip generation of 50 percent to maintain the same parking shortfall. Since trip generation is not expected to decrease by as much as the parking supply is decreasing, the shortfall under the Reduced Parking Alternative would be greater than under the Proposed Project.
Chapter IX
3. DEIR Revisions
1. Changes in Response to Comments
Revisions to Chapter VII - D. Reduced Parking Alternative

Aesthetics

Off-street parking facilities constructed in mixed-use or residential buildings as part of development in the Reduced Parking Alternative would continue to be wrapped by residential or commercial uses and not be readily visible from public rights-of-way, as with the Proposed Project. Land uses would be the same as the Proposed Project, and heights and densities would also be the same. The numbers, types, and sizes of buildings would not change substantially with the alternative. Therefore, the visual impacts identified for the Proposed Project in Section IV.B, Aesthetics, would not change with the Reduced Parking Alternative.

Noise

As discussed under “Transportation” above, the City has very low confidence that traffic would be substantially reduced if less parking were provided on the Islands. If there were a reduction in vehicle trips as a result of reducing the amount of parking provided, there would be a slight reduction in traffic noise compared to operational traffic noise levels estimated for the Proposed Project in Section IV.F, Noise, in Impact NO-3. The reduction in daily vehicle traffic would not be more than approximately 10 percent. A reduction in traffic volumes of about 10 percent would not reduce the significant noise impacts identified in Impact NO-3 to less-than-significant levels, because the change in noise levels would continue to be 5 dBA or greater (see Table IV.F.6 on p. IV.F.23). Other operational noise impacts would remain the same as those identified for the Proposed Project. Construction noise impacts would not change with the Reduced Parking Alternative, and would remain significant and unavoidable. Mitigation measures identified for the Proposed Project would be applicable to the Reduced Parking Alternative.

Air Quality

As discussed under “Transportation,” the City has very low confidence that traffic would be substantially reduced if less parking were provided. If there were a reduction in vehicle trips as a result of reducing the amount of parking available, there would be a slight reduction in emissions of criteria pollutants compared to emissions from motor vehicles in the Proposed Project. Reducing motor vehicle emissions by approximately 10 percent would not reduce any of the significant air quality impacts identified in Impact AQ-5 and shown in Table IV.G.5 on p. IV.G.41, as the emissions from other sources would continue to be the same as for the Proposed Project. A reduction of over 50 percent in motor vehicle emissions would be required to reduce the significant impacts of PM 2.5 emissions to less-than-significant levels, and substantially greater reductions in motor vehicle emissions would be necessary to reduce the other significant air quality impacts to less-than-significant levels. A reduction of 50 percent in motor vehicle emissions would not be achieved under the Reduced Parking Alternative. The possible reduction in vehicle trips with reduced parking would not substantially change the amount of diesel
particulate emissions, as few of the trips removed would be in diesel-fueled vehicles. Construction air emissions would not change substantially with the Reduced Parking Alternative. Therefore, the air quality impacts identified as significant and unavoidable in the analysis of the Proposed Project would continue to be significant and unavoidable with the Reduced Parking Alternative, and mitigation measures identified for the Proposed Project would be applicable to the Reduced Parking Alternative.

Greenhouse Gases

As described for noise and air emissions, greenhouse gas (“GHG”) emissions might be reduced somewhat with the Reduced Parking Alternative if the alternative were to result in reductions in vehicle trips. Motor vehicle emissions are the largest single source of CO2e during operation of the Proposed Project (see Tables IV.H.3 and IV.H.4 on pp. IV.H.36 and IV.H.37); however, reductions of 10 percent in motor vehicle emissions would not make a substantial difference in the overall amount of annual CO2e emissions and therefore would not substantially change the emissions per year per service population presented on p. IV.H.45. The Proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact on GHG emission, as discussed in Impact GHG-1 on pp. IV.H.44 and IV.H.45. Therefore the Reduced Parking Alternative, if it were to result in fewer vehicle trips, would not cause a significant impact to be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

Other Topics

The Reduced Parking Alternative would have essentially the same impacts as the Proposed Project in the areas of Land Use, Population and Housing, Cultural Resources, Wind and Shadow, Recreation, Utilities, Public Services, Biological Resources, Geology and Soils, Hydrology and Water Quality, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Agricultural Resources, and Minerals and Energy Resources. Any mitigation measures identified in the subsections of Chapter IV covering these topics would be applicable to the Reduced Parking Alternative.

Conclusion

Overall, the Reduced Parking Alternative would have the same significant impacts as those identified for the Proposed Project except for a possible reduction in one significant traffic impact from significant and unavoidable with mitigation to less-than-significant. In addition, the project sponsors believe that the reduction in parking would undermine the market acceptance of the alternative, yielding a reduced rate of return that is commercially infeasible and a reduction in funding available to support transit services that make this alternative infeasible.

[End of new text for Chapter VII]
3.2 STAFF-INITIATED CHANGES

VOLUME 1

SUMMARY

The last sentence of the first full paragraph on p. S.4 is revised as follows:

A transitional housing program would be established to assist qualifying households in residence at the time the DDA is executed who continuously remain residents of the Islands to have the opportunity to continue living on the Islands if they choose.

The third sentence of the paragraph under the heading “General Plan and Planning Code Amendments” on EIR p. S.5 is revised to clarify General Plan and Planning Code amendments proposed for the Project as follows:

The General Plan would be amended by adding a new Area Plan for the Redevelopment Plan Project Area and would to reference the plans, policies, land use controls, and design standards set forth in the Area Plan and the Design for Development;

The second sentence under Mitigation Measure M-CP-1 in Table S.1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures on EIR p. S.7 is revised as follows:

The project sponsors shall retain the services of a qualified an archaeological consultant from the pool of qualified archaeological consultants maintained by the Planning Department archaeologist having expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archaeology.

Text is added to the fourth sentence of the first paragraph under “Archaeological Testing Program” (Mitigation Measure M-CP-1) in Table S.1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures on EIR p. S.8 as follows:

The purpose of the archaeological testing program will be to determine, to the extent possible, the presence or absence of previously undiscovered archaeological resources and to identify and to evaluate whether any archaeological resource encountered on the site constitutes an historical resource under CEQA.

Text is added to the second indented item after the second paragraph under “Archaeological Testing Program” (Mitigation Measure M-CP-1) in Table S.1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures on EIR p. S.8 as follows:

(B) A data recovery program shall be implemented, unless the ERO determines that the archaeological resource is of greater interpretive than research significance and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible, in which case interpretive reuse shall be required.
The first paragraph under “Archaeological Data Recovery Program” (Mitigation Measure M-CP-1) in Table S.1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures starting on EIR p. S.9 is revised as follows:

The archaeological data recovery program shall be conducted in accord with an archaeological data recovery plan (“ADRP”). The archaeological consultant, project sponsors, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the ADRP prior to preparation of a draft ADRP. The archaeological consultant shall submit a draft ADRP to the ERO. The ERO shall review the draft ADRP to ensure adherence to this mitigation measure and the standards and requirements set forth in the ARDTP. The ADRP shall identify how the proposed data recovery program will preserve the significant information the archaeological resource is expected to contain. That is, the ADRP will identify what scientific/historical research questions are applicable to the expected resource, what data classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions. Data recovery, in general, should be limited to the portions of the resource that could be adversely affected by the proposed project. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be applied to portions of the archaeological resources if non-destructive methods are practical.

The following correction is made to the last sentence of Mitigation Measure M-CP-6, which starts on p. S.12:

TIDA shall not approve the design proposal for Building 1 unless it makes a finding that any such alterations, when taken together with the alterations and additions to Building 1 itself, comply with the Secretary’s Standards.

The following correction is made to the last sentence of Mitigation Measure M-CP-7 in Table S.1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures on EIR p. S.13:

TIDA shall not approve the design proposal for Building 1 unless it makes a finding that any such new construction, when taken together with the alterations and additions to Building 1 itself, comply with the Secretary’s Standards.

The second bulleted item under Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a in Table S.1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures on EIR p. S.24 is revised as follows:

- Use construction equipment with lower noise emission ratings whenever possible, particularly for air compressors;

Mitigation Measure M-BI-2b in Table S.1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures on EIR p. S.37 is revised as follows:

**Mitigation Measure M-BI-2b: Seasonal Limitations on Construction Work.**

Construction work on the Islands’ shoreline shall be conducted between the months of March 1 and November 30 to avoid any disturbance to herring spawning occurring in SAV surrounding Treasure Island.
In Table S-1: Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures, Mitigation Measure M-BI-4b is corrected to add a missing page reference in the first complete sentence at the top of p. S.40:

Mitigation Measure M-TR-2, p. IV.E.X74, would reduce this impact to less-than-significant levels; however, as stated in Section IV.E, because full funding for the measure is not assured, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure M-GE-5 in Table S.1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures on EIR p. S.41 is revised as follows:

**Mitigation Measure M-GE-5: Slope Stability.** New improvements proposed for Yerba Buena Island shall be located at a minimum of 100 feet from the top of the existing slope along Macalla Road unless a site-specific geotechnical evaluation of slope stability indicates a static factor of safety of at least 1.5 and a seismic factor or safety of 1.1 are present or established geotechnical stabilization measures are implemented to provide that level of safety. Any geotechnical recommendations regarding slope stability made in site specific geotechnical investigations for the site shall be incorporated into the specifications for building on that site.

Mitigation Measure M-HZ-1 in Table S.1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures starting on EIR p. S.42 is revised as follows:

**Mitigation Measure M-HZ-1: Soil and Groundwater Management Plan**
Prior to issuance of a building or grading permit for any one or more parcels, there shall be regulatory approval by DTSC or RWQCB for the proposed land use the applicant shall demonstrate that its construction specifications for each parcel shall include implementation of a Soil and Groundwater Management Plan (“SGMP”) prepared by a qualified environmental consulting firm and reviewed and agreed to by DTSC and RWQCB. For parcels transferred from the Navy under a Lease in Furtherance of Conveyance (LIFOC), or Early Transfer (FOSET) or parcels where conditionally recommended transferred by under a FOST which specifies that additional remediation of petroleum contamination is necessary or additional remediation is necessary to meet the proposed land use, all additional or remaining remediation on those parcels shall be completed as directed by the responsible agency, DTSC or RWQCB, prior to commencement of construction activities unless (i) those construction activities are conducted in accordance with the requirements of any applicable land use covenant, lease restriction or deed restriction and in accordance with the Site Health and Safety requirements of the SGMP, or (ii) those construction activities are otherwise given written approval by either DTSC or RWQCB, in cases such as constructing infrastructure improvements. Parcels transferred under a Lease in Furtherance of Conveyance, shall not change site occupancy or usage until all remediation is completed as determined by DTSC or RWQCB. Where necessary, additional remediation shall be accomplished by the project sponsors prior to issuance of any building or grading permits in accordance with any requirements set by the overseeing agency, either DTSC or RWQCB. The SGMP shall be present on site at all times and readily available to site workers.

Mitigation Measure M-HZ-10 in Table S.1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures starting on EIR p. S.45 is revised as follows:
Mitigation Measure M-HZ-10: Soil Vapor Barriers. Proposed building plans on parcels with vapor barriers are necessary due to the presence of residual contamination that have volatile components (such as chlorinated solvents (PCE and TCE) or certain petroleum hydrocarbons), the applicant shall demonstrate either that the building plans shall include DTSC-approved vapor barriers to be installed beneath the foundation for the prevention of soil vapor intrusion, or that DTSC has determined that installation of vapor barriers is not necessary. Specifically, building plans coinciding with IR Sites 21 and 24 shall contain vapor barriers that are reviewed and approved by DTSC prior to issuance of building permit.

The last sentence in the first paragraph under “D. Wastewater Wetlands Variants” on EIR p. S.51 is revised as follows:

Effluent that is not recycled would be disinfected with ultraviolet light after tertiary treatment in the wetland, and then discharged through the existing outfall.

The first sentence in the second paragraph under “D. Wastewater Wetlands Variants” on EIR p. S.51 is revised as follows:

Under Wastewater Wetland Variant D2, effluent would undergo microfiltration and ultraviolet light disinfection.

The first paragraph under “Summary of Project Alternatives” on EIR p. S.53 is revised as follows:

Three Four alternatives are evaluated in this EIR: A. No Project Alternative; B. Reduced Development Alternative, and C. No Ferry Service Alternative, and D. Reduced Parking Alternative. Table S.3, p. S.58, shows a comparison of the potential environmental impacts that may result from the alternatives to those of the Proposed Project.

Table S.3: Comparison of Project and Alternative Impacts, starting on EIR p. S.58, is revised to include the new Reduced Parking Alternative as follows:
### IV.A. Land Use and Land Use Planning

| Impact LU-1: Construction of the Proposed Project would not physically divide an established community or have a substantial adverse impact on the character of the vicinity. *(Less than Significant)* | No Impact | Less than Significant | Less than Significant | Less than Significant |
| Impact LU-2: Operation of the Proposed Project would not physically divide an established community. *(Less than Significant)* | No Impact | Less than Significant | Less than Significant | Less than Significant |
| Impact LU-3: Implementation of the Proposed Project would not have a substantial adverse impact on the character of the vicinity. *(Less than Significant)* | No Impact | Less than Significant | Less than Significant | Less than Significant |
| Impact LU-4: Operation of the Proposed Project would not have a substantial adverse impact on the character of land uses subject to the Tidelands Trust Doctrine. *(Less than Significant)* | No Impact | Less than Significant | Less than Significant | Less than Significant |
| Impact LU-5: The Proposed Project, when combined with other cumulative projects, would not disrupt or divide an existing community or substantially change the land use character in the vicinity. *(Less than Significant)* | No Impact | Less than Significant | Less than Significant | Less than Significant |

### IV.B. Aesthetics

<p>| Impact AE-1: Development under the Proposed Project would adversely alter scenic vistas of San Francisco and San Francisco Bay from public vantage points along the eastern shoreline of San Francisco, Telegraph Hill, the East Bay shoreline, and from the Bay Bridge east span. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable)</em> | No Impact | Significant and Unavoidable | Significant and Unavoidable | Significant and Unavoidable |
| Impact AE-2: The Proposed Project would affect existing features that are considered scenic resources on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island. <em>(Less than Significant)</em> | No Impact | Less than Significant | Less than Significant | Less than Significant |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED PROJECT</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic / Impact</td>
<td>No Project Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact AE-3: New construction on Treasure Island would alter the existing visual character and visual quality of the Project Area. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact AE-4: Implementation of the Proposed Project would increase the nighttime lighting requirements within the Development Plan Area, and would affect nighttime views of the Bay from public areas, and would increase potential sources of glare. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact AE-5: The Proposed Project would not contribute cumulatively to impacts related to aesthetics when considered with nearby projects. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.C. Population and Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact PH-1: The Proposed Project would induce substantial direct temporary population growth during project construction. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact PH-2: The Proposed Project would not displace substantial numbers of people and/or existing housing units or create demand for additional housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact PH-3: The Proposed Project would not induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact PH-4: The Proposed Project would not induce substantial cumulative growth in an area either directly or indirectly. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.D. Cultural and Paleontological Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact CP-1: Project construction activities could disturb significant archaeological resources, if such resources are present within the Project Area. <em>(Less than Significant with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact CP-2: Project construction activities could disturb human remains, if such resources are present within the Project Area. <em>(Less than Significant with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROPOSED PROJECT

### ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic / Impact</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Development Alternative</th>
<th>No Ferry Service Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Parking Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact CP-3</strong>: Project construction activities could disturb paleontological resources. <em>(Less than Significant with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact CP-4</strong>: Disturbance of archaeological and paleontological resources, if encountered during construction of the Proposed Project, could contribute to a cumulative loss of significant historic and scientific information. <em>(Less than Significant with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact CP-5</strong>: Reuse and rehabilitation of historical resources under the Proposed Project could impair the significance of those historical resources. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact CP-6</strong>: Alterations to the contributing landscape areas of Buildings 1, 2, and 3 could impair the significance of those historical resources. <em>(Less than Significant with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact CP-7</strong>: New construction within the contributing landscapes of Buildings 1, 2, and 3 could impair the significance of those historical resources. <em>(Less than Significant with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact CP-8</strong>: Demolition of Building 111, a component of Building 3, would not impair the significance of the Building 3 historical resource. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact CP-9</strong>: Demolition of the Damage Control Trainer would impair the significance of an historical resource. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact CP-10</strong>: Demolition of NSTI resources on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island could impair the significance of historical resources. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact CP-11</strong>: Proposed new construction outside of the contributing sites of Buildings 1, 2, and 3 could impair the significance of those historical resources. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROPOSED PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic / Impact</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Development Alternative</th>
<th>No Ferry Service Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Parking Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact CP-12:</strong> Proposed new construction within and adjacent to the Senior Officers’ Quarters Historic District could impair the significance of historical resources. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact CP-13:</strong> The Proposed Project would not contribute cumulatively to impacts on historic architectural resources when considered with nearby projects. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV.E. Transportation – Construction

| Impact TR-1: Construction of the Proposed Project would occur over a long period of time, and would result in significant impacts on the transportation and circulation network. *(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)* | No Impact | Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation | Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation | Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation |

### IV.E. Transportation – Traffic

<p>| Impact TR-2: Implementation of the Proposed Project would contribute to existing LOS E operating conditions during the weekday PM peak hour, and result in significant impacts during the Saturday peak hour at the westbound off-ramp (west side of Yerba Buena Island). <em>(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)</em> | No Impact | Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation | Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation | Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation |
| Impact TR-3: Under conditions without the Ramps Project, implementation of the Proposed Project would result in significant impacts at the two westbound on-ramps. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)</em> | No Impact | Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation | Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation | Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation |
| Impact TR-4: Under conditions with the Ramps Project, implementation of the Proposed Project would result in a significant impact during the AM and PM peak hours at the ramp meter at the westbound on-ramp (east side of Yerba Buena Island). <em>(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)</em> | No Impact | Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation | Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation | Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation |
| Impact TR-5: Under conditions without and with the Ramps Project, implementation of the Proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts at three ramp locations. <em>(Less than Significant)</em> | No Impact | Less than Significant | Less than Significant | Less than Significant |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED PROJECT</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic / Impact</td>
<td>No Project Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-6</strong>: Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in a significant impact on queuing at the Bay Bridge toll plaza during the weekday AM peak hour, with and without the Ramps Project. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-7</strong>: Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in a significant impact on queuing on San Francisco streets approaching Bay Bridge during the weekday PM peak hour, under conditions with and without the Ramps Project. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-8</strong>: Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in a significant project impact at the signalized intersection of First/Market. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-9</strong>: Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in a significant project impact at the signalized intersection of First/Mission. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-10</strong>: Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in a significant project impact at the signalized intersection of First/Folsom. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-11</strong>: Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in a significant project impact at the signalized intersection of First/Harrison/I-80 Eastbound On-Ramp. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-12</strong>: Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in a significant project impact at the signalized intersection of Bryant/Fifth/I-80 Eastbound On-Ramp. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-13</strong>: Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in significant project impacts at the signalized intersection of Fifth/Harrison/I-80 Westbound Off-Ramp. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PROPOSED PROJECT

### ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic / Impact</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Development Alternative</th>
<th>No Ferry Service Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Parking Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact TR-14: Implementation of the Proposed Project would contribute substantially to existing LOS E conditions at the signalized intersection of Second/Folsom, resulting in a project impact. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact TR-15: Implementation of the Proposed Project would have less than significant impacts at three signalized study intersections that operate at LOS E or LOS F under Existing Conditions. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact TR-16: Implementation of the Proposed Project would have less than significant impacts at five signalized study intersections that would operate at LOS D or better under Existing plus Project Conditions. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact TR-17: Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in significant impacts at the uncontrolled study intersection of Folsom/Essex. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact TR-18: Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in a significant impact at the uncontrolled study intersection of Bryant/Sterling. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV.E. Transportation – Transit

| Impact TR-19: Implementation of the Proposed Project would exceed the available transit capacity of Muni’s 108-Treasure Island bus line serving the Islands. *(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)* | No Impact | Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation | Less than Significant | Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation |
| Impact TR-20: Implementation of the Proposed Project would not exceed the transit capacity of the proposed new AC Transit bus line serving the Islands. *(Less than Significant)* | No Impact | Less than Significant | Less than Significant | Less than Significant |
| Impact TR-21: Implementation of the Proposed Project would not exceed the transit capacity of the proposed new ferry line serving Treasure Island. *(Less than Significant)* | No Impact | Less than Significant | No Impact | Less than Significant |
### PROPOSED PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic / Impact</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Development Alternative</th>
<th>No Ferry Service Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Parking Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-22</strong>: Implementation of the Proposed Project would add transit trips to the San Francisco downtown screenlines; however, this would not increase demand in excess of available capacity. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-23</strong>: Implementation of the Proposed Project would add transit trips to AC Transit, BART, Golden Gate Transit, SamTrans, Caltrain and other ferry lines; however, this would not increase demand in excess of available capacity. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-24</strong>: Implementation of the Proposed Project without the Ramps Project would result in queues extending from the westbound Bay Bridge at Yerba Buena Island on-ramps which would impact Muni line 108-Treasure Island operations. <em>(Less than Significant with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-25</strong>: Implementation of the Proposed Project without the Ramps Project would impact AC Transit operations on Hillcrest Road between Treasure Island and the eastbound on-ramp to the Bay Bridge. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-26</strong>: Implementation of the Proposed Project with the Ramps Project would result in significant impacts to Muni line 108-Treasure Island operations. <em>(Less than Significant with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-27</strong>: Implementation of the Proposed Project with the Ramps Project would impact AC Transit operations on Treasure Island Road and Hillcrest Road between Treasure Island and the eastbound on-ramp to the Bay Bridge. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-28</strong>: Implementation of the Proposed Project would not impact operations of the existing or proposed ferry services on San Francisco Bay. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chapter IX

3. DEIR Revisions

2. Staff-Initiated Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED PROJECT</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic / Impact</td>
<td>No Project Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-29:</strong> The Proposed Project would increase congestion in downtown San Francisco, which would increase travel times and would impact operations of the Muni 27-Bryant bus line. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-30:</strong> The Proposed Project would increase congestion in downtown San Francisco, which would increase travel times and would impact operations of the Muni 30X-Marina Express bus line. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-31:</strong> The Proposed Project would increase congestion in downtown San Francisco, which would increase travel times and would impact operations of the Muni 47-Van Ness bus line. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-32:</strong> The Proposed Project would increase congestion in downtown San Francisco during the PM peak hour; however, it would not impact operations of Golden Gate Transit or SamTrans bus lines. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV.E. Transportation – Bicycles

| Impact TR-33: The Proposed Project would not create potentially hazardous conditions for bicyclists on the Islands and would provide more bicycle accessibility to the site than currently exists. *(Less than Significant)* | No Impact | Less than Significant | Less than Significant | Less than Significant |
| Impact TR-34: Implementation of the Proposed Project would not create potentially hazardous conditions for bicyclists or otherwise substantially interfere with bicycle accessibility on mainland San Francisco. *(Less than Significant)* | No Impact | Less than Significant | Less than Significant | Less than Significant |

### IV.E. Transportation – Pedestrians

| Impact TR-35: The Proposed Project would not create potentially hazardous conditions for pedestrians and would provide better pedestrian accessibility to the site than currently exists. *(Less than Significant)* | No Impact | Less than Significant | Less than Significant | Less than Significant |
## PROPOSED PROJECT ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic / Impact</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Development Alternative</th>
<th>No Ferry Service Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Parking Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-36</strong>: Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in substantial overcrowding of public crosswalks near the Ferry Building, and pedestrian facilities would continue to operate at acceptable levels. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV.E. Transportation – Loading</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-37</strong>: The Proposed Project would not result in a loading demand during the peak hour of loading activities that could not be accommodated within the proposed on-site loading supply or within on-street loading zones. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV.E. Transportation – Emergency Access</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-38</strong>: Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in significant emergency access impacts. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV.E. Transportation – Cumulative Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-39</strong>: Construction of the Proposed Project would occur over a long period of time, and would contribute to cumulative construction impacts in the Project vicinity. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-40</strong>: Implementation of the Proposed Project would contribute to significant cumulative traffic impacts at the eastbound off-ramp (west side of Yerba Buena Island). <em>(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-41</strong>: Under conditions without the Ramps Project, implementation of the Proposed Project would contribute to significant cumulative impacts at the two westbound on-ramps. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-42</strong>: Under conditions with the Ramps Project, implementation of the Proposed Project would result in a significant cumulative impacts during the AM and PM peak hours at the ramp meter at the westbound on-ramp (east side of Yerba Buena Island). <em>(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROPOSED PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic / Impact</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Development Alternative</th>
<th>No Ferry Service Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Parking Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-43:</strong> Under 2030 Cumulative plus Project conditions without and with the Ramps Project, implementation of the Proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts at three ramp locations. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-44:</strong> Implementation of the Proposed Project would contribute to significant cumulative queuing impacts at the Bay Bridge toll plaza during the AM and PM peak hours, whether or not the Ramps Project are implemented. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-45:</strong> Implementation of the Proposed Project would contribute to significant cumulative queuing impacts on San Francisco streets approaching the Bay Bridge during the weekday AM and PM and Saturday peak hours, whether or not the Ramps Project was implemented. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-46:</strong> Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in significant project and cumulative impacts at the intersection of First/Market. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-47:</strong> Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in significant project and cumulative impacts at the intersection of First/Mission. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-48:</strong> Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in significant project and cumulative impacts at the intersection of First/Folsom. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-49:</strong> Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in significant project and cumulative impacts at the intersection of First/Harrison/I-80 Eastbound On-Ramp. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Chapter IX

3. DEIR Revisions

2. Staff-Initiated Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED PROJECT</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic / Impact</td>
<td>No Project Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-50</strong>: Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in significant project and cumulative impacts at the intersection of Bryant/Fifth/I-80 Eastbound On-Ramp. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-51</strong>: Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in significant project and cumulative impacts at the intersection of Harrison/Fifth/I-80 Westbound Off-Ramp. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-52</strong>: Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in significant project and cumulative impacts at the intersection of Second/Folsom. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-53</strong>: Implementation of the Project would have less than significant impacts at seven study intersections that would operate at LOS E or LOS F under 2030 Cumulative Plus Project conditions. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-54</strong>: Implementation of the Proposed Project would contribute to significant cumulative impacts at the uncontrolled study intersection of Folsom/Essex. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-55</strong>: Implementation of the Proposed Project would contribute to significant cumulative impacts at the uncontrolled study intersection of Bryant/Sterling. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-56</strong>: The Proposed Project’s contribution to cumulative transit trips to the downtown screenlines would not increase demands in excess of available capacity. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact TR-57</strong>: The Proposed Project’s contributions to cumulative transit trips on AC Transit, BART, Golden Gate Transit, SamTrans, Caltrain and other ferry lines would not increase demands in excess of available capacity. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PROPOSED PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Development Alternative</th>
<th>No Ferry Service Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Parking Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Impact TR-58:** The Proposed Project would contribute to cumulative congestion in downtown San Francisco, which would increase travel time and would impact operations of the Muni 27-Bryant bus line. *(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact TR-58</th>
<th>No impact</th>
<th>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</th>
<th>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</th>
<th>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Impact TR-59:** The Proposed Project would contribute to cumulative congestion in downtown San Francisco, which would increase travel time and would impact operations of the Muni 30X-Marina Express bus line. *(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact TR-59</th>
<th>No impact</th>
<th>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</th>
<th>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</th>
<th>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Impact TR-60:** The Proposed Project would contribute to cumulative congestion in downtown San Francisco, which would increase travel time and would impact operations of the Muni 47-Van Ness bus line. *(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact TR-60</th>
<th>No impact</th>
<th>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</th>
<th>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</th>
<th>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Impact TR-61:** The Proposed Project would contribute to cumulative congestion in downtown San Francisco, which would increase travel time and would impact operations of the Muni 10-Townsend bus line. *(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact TR-61</th>
<th>No impact</th>
<th>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</th>
<th>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</th>
<th>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Impact TR-62:** The Proposed Project would contribute to cumulative congestion in downtown San Francisco during the PM peak hour, however would not impact operations of Golden Gate Transit or SamTrans bus lines. *(Less than Significant)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact TR-62</th>
<th>No impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant</th>
<th>Less than Significant</th>
<th>Less than Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Impact TR-63:** Implementation of the Proposed Project parking supply maximums would exacerbate the exceedance of the capacity utilization standard on Muni’s 108-Treasure Island bus line serving the Islands. *(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact TR-63</th>
<th>No impact</th>
<th>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant</th>
<th>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### IV.F. Noise

**Impact NO-1:** Project-related construction activities would increase noise levels above existing ambient conditions. *(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact NO-1</th>
<th>No impact</th>
<th>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</th>
<th>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</th>
<th>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### PROPOSED PROJECT

#### ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic / Impact</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Development Alternative</th>
<th>No Ferry Service Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Parking Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact NO-2</strong>: Construction activities could expose persons and structures to excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact NO-3</strong>: Project-related traffic would result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above existing ambient noise levels. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact NO-4</strong>: Project-related ferry noise levels would result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above existing ambient conditions. <em>(Less than Significant with Mitigation; Significant and Unavoidable if Mitigation Not Implemented by WETA)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation; Significant and Unavoidable if Mitigation Not Implemented by WETA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact NO-5</strong>: Proposed residences and other sensitive uses would be located in incompatible noise environments. <em>(Less than Significant with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact NO-6</strong>: Operation of stationary sources at the proposed public utility facilities (e.g., water distribution systems, wastewater collection and treatment facilities, electric substation facilities, etc.) would increase existing noise levels, potentially exceeding noise level standards. <em>(Less than Significant with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact NO-7</strong>: Project-related construction activities in combination with construction activities of other cumulative development would increase noise levels above existing ambient conditions. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact NO-8</strong>: Increases in traffic from the project in combination with other development would result in cumulative noise increases. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROPOSED PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic / Impact</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Development Alternative</th>
<th>No Ferry Service Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Parking Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV.G. Air Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact AQ-1</strong>: Construction of the Proposed Project would result in localized construction dust-related air quality impacts. <em>(Less than Significant with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact AQ-2</strong>: Construction of the Proposed Project could violate an air quality standard or contribute significantly to an existing or projected air quality violation. <em>(Less than Significant under Applicable 1999 Guidelines; Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation under 2010 Guidelines)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant under Applicable 1999 Guideline; Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation under 2010 BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines</td>
<td>Less than Significant under Applicable 1999 Guideline; Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation under 2010 BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines</td>
<td>Less than Significant under Applicable 1999 Guideline; Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation under 2010 BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact AQ-3</strong>: Construction of the Proposed Project could expose sensitive receptors to substantial levels of toxic air contaminants which may lead to adverse health effects. <em>(Potentially Significant and Unavoidable for both 1999 and 2010 BAAQMD thresholds in Phase 2)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Potentially Significant and Unavoidable for both 1999 and 2010 BAAQMD thresholds in Phase 2</td>
<td>Potentially Significant and Unavoidable for both 1999 and 2010 BAAQMD thresholds in Phase 2</td>
<td>Potentially Significant and Unavoidable for both 1999 and 2010 BAAQMD thresholds in Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact AQ-4</strong>: Construction of the Proposed Project would expose sensitive receptors to substantial levels of PM2.5 which may lead to adverse health effects. <em>(Not Applicable to 1999 BAAQMD Thresholds, Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation for 2010 BAAQMD Thresholds)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>(Not Applicable to 1999 BAAQMD Thresholds, Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation for 2010 BAAQMD Thresholds)</td>
<td>(Not Applicable to 1999 BAAQMD Thresholds, Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation for 2010 BAAQMD Thresholds)</td>
<td>(Not Applicable to 1999 BAAQMD Thresholds, Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation for 2010 BAAQMD Thresholds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact AQ-5</strong>: The Proposed Project’s operations would violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation for both 1999 and 2010 BAAQMD thresholds)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation for both 1999 and 2010 BAAQMD thresholds</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation for both 1999 and 2010 BAAQMD thresholds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED PROJECT</td>
<td>ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic / Impact</td>
<td>No Project Alternative</td>
<td>Reduced Development Alternative</td>
<td>No Ferry Service Alternative</td>
<td>Reduced Parking Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact AQ-6:</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation for both 1999 and 2010 BAAQMD thresholds</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation for both 1999 and 2010 BAAQMD thresholds</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation for both 1999 and 2010 BAAQMD thresholds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation of the proposed project could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation for both 1999 and 2010 BAAQMD thresholds)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact AQ-7:</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Proposed Project could generate odors. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact AQ-8:</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Significant for Reduced Development Alternative and for Expanded Transit Service</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
<td>Significant for Reduced Development Alternative and for Expanded Transit Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Proposed Project could conflict with adopted plans related to air quality. <em>(Significant for the Proposed Project and Less than Significant for Expanded Transit Service)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact AQ-9:</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Proposed Project could result in significant cumulative air quality impacts. <em>(Significant and Unavoidable)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.F. Greenhouse Gases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact GHG-1:</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Proposed Project would not generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact GHG-2:</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Proposed Project would not conflict with applicable plans, policies or regulations of an agency with jurisdiction over the Proposed Project adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.I. Wind and Shadow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact WS-1:</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadows from the Proposed Project would reach both existing and proposed parks, open spaces, and recreation areas on the Islands and could substantially affect their usability. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PROPOSED PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic / Impact</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Development Alternative</th>
<th>No Ferry Service Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Parking Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact WS-2: The Proposed Project, when combined with other cumulative projects, would not adversely affect the use of any park or open space under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission or substantially affect the usability of other existing publicly accessible open space or outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas. (Less than Significant)</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact WS-3: The phased development of the Proposed Project could temporarily result in the creation of a Section 148 wind hazard, an increase in the number of hours that the wind hazard criterion is exceeded or an increase in the area that is subjected to wind hazards. (Significant and Unavoidable)</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact WS-4: Section 148 wind hazards would occur at publicly accessible locations in the Development Plan Area. These wind hazards would represent a general reduction in the number of existing wind hazards and the overall duration of the wind hazards. Changes in building design, height, location, and orientation, as well as changes in the overall configuration of the Project could result in wind hazards that differ from those found for the representative design Project. The wind hazards could occur in different locations, could increase the number of hours that any wind hazard would occur, and/or could increase the area that would be subjected to wind hazards. (Significant and Unavoidable)</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact WS-5: The Proposed Project, when combined with other cumulative projects, could result in wind hazards that differ from those found for the representative design Project, either in the location of the hazard, in an increase in the number of hours that Section 148 wind hazards would occur or, in an increase in the area that is subjected to wind hazards. (Significant and Unavoidable)</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROPOSED PROJECT vs. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic / Impact</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Development Alternative</th>
<th>No Ferry Service Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Parking Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV.J  Recreation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact RE-1: Construction of about 300 acres of parks, recreation facilities, and open space proposed by the Area Plan/SUD would result in temporary physical effects on the environment. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact RE-2: The Proposed Project would result in an increase in on-site population that could result in the deterioration of existing recreational facilities. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact RE-3: The Proposed Project may include synthetic turf fields which could have an adverse physical effect on the environment. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact RE-4: Construction of the Proposed Project would not significantly contribute to cumulative impacts on the recreational use of existing parks, recreation facilities, and open space. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV.K. Utilities and Service Systems</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact UT-1: Construction activities associated with wastewater infrastructure for the Proposed Project could result in air quality, noise, water quality, transportation, hazardous materials, and biological impacts, as further evaluated under construction subsections in those EIR topics. <em>(See significance determinations in other topics.)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>See significance determinations in other topics</td>
<td>See significance determinations in other topics</td>
<td>See significance determinations in other topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact UT-2: Wastewater collection system blockages or lift/pump station failures could result in sanitary sewer overflows. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact UT-3: Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not significantly contribute to cumulative infrastructure deficits or result in the exceedance of wastewater discharge requirements. <em>(No Impact)</em></td>
<td>Existing infrastructure deficits would remain</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table: PROPOSED PROJECT VERSUS ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact UT-4: Construction activities associated with the Proposed Project’s recycled water infrastructure could result in air quality, noise, water quality, transportation, hazardous materials, and biological impacts, as further evaluated under those EIR topics. <em>(See significance determinations in other topics.)</em></th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Development Alternative</th>
<th>No Ferry Service Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Parking Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact UT-5: New recycled wastewater treatment and collection facilities would provide recycled water to reduce the Proposed Project’s water demand in conformance with City policies. <em>(No Impact)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact UT-6: Construction and operation of the Proposed Project including the recycled water plant would not significantly contribute to any cumulative impacts. <em>(No Impact)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact UT-7: Construction activities associated with the Proposed Project’s stormwater infrastructure could result in air quality, noise, water quality, transportation, hazardous materials, and biological impacts, as further evaluated under those EIR topics. <em>(See significance determinations in other topics.)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>See significance determinations in other topics</td>
<td>See significance determinations in other topics</td>
<td>See significance determinations in other topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact UT-8: Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not significantly contribute to cumulative infrastructure deficits or result in the exceedance of stormwater discharge requirements. <em>(No Impact)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact UT-9: Construction activities associated with water infrastructure of the Proposed Project could result in air quality, noise, water quality, transportation, hazardous materials, and biological impacts, as further evaluated under those EIR topics. <em>(See significance determinations in other topics.)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>See significance determinations in other topics</td>
<td>See significance determinations in other topics</td>
<td>See significance determinations in other topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact UT-10: There would be sufficient water supply available to serve the Proposed Project from existing entitlements and resources, and no new or expanded water supply resources or entitlements would be needed. <em>(No Impact)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROPOSED PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic / Impact</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Development Alternative</th>
<th>No Ferry Service Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Parking Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact UT-11:</strong> Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact on existing entitlements and resources, and no new or expanded water supply resources or entitlements would be needed. <strong>(No Impact)</strong></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact UT-12:</strong> The Proposed Project would be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity to accommodate the Proposed Project’s solid waste disposal needs. <strong>(Less than Significant)</strong></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact UT-13:</strong> The project would not fail to comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. <strong>(Less than Significant)</strong></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact UT-14:</strong> Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to regional impacts on landfill capacity. <strong>(Less than Significant)</strong></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact UT-15:</strong> Construction activities associated with energy and telecommunication infrastructure of the Proposed Project could result in air quality, noise, water quality, transportation, hazardous materials, cultural resources, and biological impacts, as further evaluated under those EIR topics. <strong>(See Significance Determinations in other topics.)</strong></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>See significance determinations in other topics</td>
<td>See significance determinations in other topics</td>
<td>See significance determinations in other topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact UT-16:</strong> Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not result in cumulative impacts on energy and telecommunication infrastructure. <strong>(No Impact)</strong></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV.L. Public Services

| Impact PS-1: Project construction activities could result in adverse physical impacts or in the need for new or physically altered facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for police protection. **(Less than Significant with Mitigation)** | No impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation | Less than Significant with Mitigation | Less than Significant with Mitigation |
### PROPOSED PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic / Impact</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Development Alternative</th>
<th>No Ferry Service Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Parking Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact PS-2: Implementation of the Proposed Project would increase demand for police services that would result in the need to construct new police facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives of the San Francisco Police Department. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact PS-3: The Proposed Project’s contribution to cumulative projects would not affect police department response times or performance objectives, nor would it contribute to the need to construct new police facilities. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact PS-4: Project construction activities could result in adverse physical impacts or in the need for new or physically altered facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection. <em>(Less than Significant with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact PS-5: Implementation of the Proposed Project would increase demand for fire services, which would result in the need to construct new fire service facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives of the San Francisco Fire Department. <em>(No Impact)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact PS-6: The Proposed Project’s contribution to cumulative impacts would not affect fire department response times or performance objectives, nor would it contribute to the need to construct new fire station facilities. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact PS-7: Project construction activities would not result in adverse physical impacts or in the need to construct new or physically altered facilities in order to maintain acceptable staffing ratios, prevent overcrowding, or to meet other performance objectives for school services. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# PROPOSED PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic / Impact</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Development Alternative</th>
<th>No Ferry Service Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Parking Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact PS-8</strong>: Implementation of the Proposed Project would increase demand for school services that would result in the need to construct new school facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives of the San Francisco Unified School District. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact PS-9</strong>: The Proposed Project cumulative contribution would not result in additional demand for educational facilities. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact PS-10</strong>: Project construction would not result in adverse physical impacts or in the need to construct new or physically altered facilities in order to maintain adequate staffing levels, acceptable morbidity and mortality rates, or other performance objectives for hospital services. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact PS-11</strong>: Implementation of the Proposed Project would not increase demand for hospital services that would result in the need to construct new hospital facilities in order to maintain adequate staffing levels, acceptable morbidity and mortality rates, or other performance objectives of the San Francisco Public Health Department. <em>(No Impact)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact PS-12</strong>: The Proposed Project’s cumulative contribution would not increase demand for hospital services that would result in the need to construct new hospital facilities in order to maintain adequate staffing levels, acceptable morbidity and mortality rates, or other performance objectives of the San Francisco Public Health Department. <em>(No Impact)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact PS-13</strong>: Project construction would not result in adverse physical impacts or in the need to construct new or physically altered facilities in order to maintain acceptable service objectives for library services. <em>(No Impact)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PROPOSED PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic / Impact</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Development Alternative</th>
<th>No Ferry Service Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Parking Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact PS-14</strong>: Implementation of the Proposed Project would not increase demand for library services to a level that would result in the need to construct new library facilities in order to maintain acceptable levels of service, or other performance objectives of the San Francisco Public Library system. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact PS-15</strong>: The Proposed Project’s cumulative contribution would not increase demand for library services that would result in the need to construct new library facilities in order to maintain acceptable levels of service, performance objectives, or need to construct new or physically altered facilities in order to maintain acceptable service objectives. <em>(No Impact)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## IV.M. Biological Resources

| Impact BI-1: The Proposed Project may adversely affect dune gilia and locally significant plants, special status animals, and protected or special-status marine species, such as marine mammals, salmon, steelhead, green sturgeon, longfin smelt, harbor seals and California sea lions. *(Less than Significant with Mitigation)* | No impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation | Less than Significant with Mitigation | Less than Significant with Mitigation |
| Impact BI-2: The project may adversely affect Central Coast Riparian Scrub (riparian habitat), California Buckeye, or SAV/eelgrass beds (other sensitive natural communities). *(Less than Significant with Mitigation)* | No impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation | Less than Significant with Mitigation for migratory birds; No impact on rafting waterfowl or fish passage | Less than Significant with Mitigation |
| Impact BI-3: The project may adversely affect biological resources regulated by the Clean Water Act or the Rivers and Harbors Act. *(Less than Significant with Mitigation)* | No impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation | Less than Significant with Mitigation | Less than Significant with Mitigation |
### PROPOSED PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic / Impact</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Project Alternative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Impact BI-4:
The project may adversely affect the movement of migratory birds, rafting waterfowl, and/or fish passage. *(Less than Significant with Mitigation for migratory birds and fish passage; Significant and Unavoidable for rafting waterfowl)*

- **No impact**
- **Less than Significant with Mitigation for migratory birds and fish passage**
- **Less than Significant with Mitigation for migratory birds; No impact on rafting waterfowl and fish passage**

#### Impact BI-5:
The Proposed Project may conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. *(Less than Significant)*

- **No impact**
- **Less than Significant**
- **Less than Significant**

#### Impact BI-6:
The Proposed Project may result in adverse effects on intertidal and subtidal marine habitat and biota located along Treasure Island’s shoreline and nearshore regions of the Bay as well as Bay waters. *(Less than Significant with Mitigation)*

- **No impact**
- **Less than Significant with Mitigation**
- **Less than Significant with Mitigation**

#### Impact BI-7:
The development planned as part of the Proposed Project, when combined with past, present, and other reasonably foreseeable development in the vicinity, could result in significant cumulative impacts to biological resources. *(Cumulative Impact: Significant and Unavoidable for rafting waterfowl; Less than Significant for other sensitive plants, animals and habitats)*

- **No impact**
- **Significant and Unavoidable for rafting waterfowl**
- **Less than Significant with Mitigation**

#### IV.N. Geology and Soils

- **Impact GE.1:** Construction activities within the Development Plan Area could loosen and expose surface soils. If this were to occur over the long term, exposed soils could erode by wind or rain, increasing the sediment load to San Francisco Bay. *(Less than Significant)*

- **Impact GE.2:** In the event of a major earthquake in the region, seismic ground shaking could potentially injure people and cause collapse or structural damage to proposed structures or the perimeter berm. *(Less than Significant)*
### PROPOSED PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic / Impact</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Development Alternative</th>
<th>No Ferry Service Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Parking Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact GE-3:</strong> In the event of a major earthquake in the region, seismic ground shaking could potentially expose people and property to liquefaction and earthquake-induced settlement. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact GE-4:</strong> Development in the Development Plan Area could be subject to settlement over time from static forces. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact GE-5:</strong> Development of the Proposed Project could result in potential damage or injury as a result of slope failures including the perimeter rock berms. <em>(Less than Significant with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact GE-6:</strong> In the event of a major earthquake in the region, structural damage to viaduct structures or the ferry quay could hinder emergency rescue efforts. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact GE-7:</strong> The development proposed as part of the Proposed Project, when combined with past, present and other reasonably foreseeable development in the vicinity, would not result in significant cumulative impacts with respect to geology, soils or seismicity. <em>(Cumulative Impact: Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV.O. Hydrology and Water Quality

| Impact HY-1: The Proposed Project would not violate a water quality standard or a waste discharge requirement, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. *(Less than Significant)* | No impact | Less than Significant | Less than Significant | Less than Significant |
| Impact HY-2: The Proposed Project could require disposal of dewatered groundwater during construction. *(Less than Significant with Mitigation)* | No impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation | Less than Significant with Mitigation | Less than Significant with Mitigation |
| Impact HY-3: The Proposed Project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge during construction. *(Less than Significant)* | No impact | Less than Significant | Less than Significant | Less than Significant |
### PROPOSED PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic / Impact</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Development Alternative</th>
<th>No Ferry Service Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Parking Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact HY-4:</strong> The Proposed Project would not alter the existing drainage patterns on the Islands, and would not result in substantial erosion or siltation or localized flooding. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact HY-5:</strong> The Proposed Project would not result in construction of housing within a 100-year flood hazard area if one is designated by FEMA. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact HY-6:</strong> The Proposed Project would not place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact HY-7:</strong> The Proposed Project would not result in the exposure of people or structures to loss due to flooding associated with levee or dam failure. <em>(No Impact)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact HY-8:</strong> Operation of the Proposed Project would not result in degradation of water quality. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact HY-9:</strong> The Proposed Project would not result in depletion of groundwater or reduction of groundwater levels during operation. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact HY-10:</strong> The Proposed Project would not create impervious surfaces that would collect pollutants that could cause water quality impacts from rainwater runoff. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact HY-11:</strong> The Proposed Project would not be susceptible to inundation by seiche, tsunami, mudflow, or wind waves. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact HY-12:</strong> The Proposed Project would not expose people or structures to increased risk of flooding due to climate-induced sea level rise. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact HY-13:</strong> The Project would not result in cumulative impacts related to hydrology and water quality. <em>(Not Cumulatively Considerable)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PROPOSED PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic / Impact</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Development Alternative</th>
<th>No Ferry Service Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Parking Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV.P. Hazards and Hazardous Materials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact HZ-1:</strong> Construction of the Proposed Project could expose construction workers to unacceptable levels of known or newly discovered hazardous materials as a result of disturbance of subsurface soils and/or groundwater with contaminants from historic uses. <em>(Less than Significant with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact HZ-2:</strong> Construction activities associated with the Proposed Project could expose the public, including existing and future residents as well as visitors and employees, to unacceptable levels of known or newly discovered hazardous materials as a result of disturbance of soil and/or groundwater with contaminants from historic uses. <em>(Less than Significant with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact HZ-3:</strong> Construction of the Proposed Project could expose the environment to unacceptable levels of known or newly discovered hazardous materials as a result of disturbance of soil and/or groundwater with contaminants from historic uses. <em>(Less than Significant with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact HZ-4:</strong> Construction of the Proposed Project could expose construction workers, the public or the environment to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials as a result of dewatering activities that extract contaminated groundwater from historic uses. <em>(Less than Significant with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact HZ-5:</strong> Construction activities associated with the Proposed Project could expose construction workers, the public or the environment to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials associated with encountering previously unidentified underground storage tanks. <em>(Less than Significant with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PROPOSED PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic / Impact</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Development Alternative</th>
<th>No Ferry Service Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Parking Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact HZ-6: Dredging activities associated with the Proposed Project would not expose construction workers, the public or the environment to unacceptable levels of known or previously unidentified hazardous materials as a result of disturbance of submerged sediments. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact HZ-7: Disturbance and release of hazardous structural and building components (i.e. asbestos, lead, PCBs) during the demolition phase of the Proposed Project, or transportation of these materials could expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to adverse conditions related to hazardous materials handling. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact HZ-8: Hazardous materials used on site during construction activities (e.g. solvents) could be released to the environment through improper handling or storage. <em>(Less than Significant with Mitigation)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact HZ-9: Temporary dewatering activities during construction would not affect or alter groundwater flow directions that would bring contaminated groundwater toward areas outside of the Development Plan Area including the Job Corps campus. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact HZ-10: Migration of residual contamination could expose existing and future residents, employees, or the general public to hazardous materials causing acute or chronic health effects. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact HZ-11: Project operations would not result in a significant impact involving the handling of general commercial/retail and household hazardous waste. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact HZ-12: The Proposed Project would include operation of a new or upgraded wastewater treatment plant. Water treatment chemicals would be necessary for standard operations and if not stored or handled appropriately could be released to the environment. <em>(Less than Significant)</em></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Impact HZ-13: The Proposed Project includes developing the existing school site into a K-8 school. The existing school is located in the vicinity of Site 12 where hazardous materials have been released to the subsurface. If not remediated appropriately, students, workers, or the public could be exposed to adverse conditions related to hazardous materials emissions. *(Less than Significant with Mitigation)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic / Impact</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Development Alternative</th>
<th>No Ferry Service Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Parking Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact HZ-13:</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impact HZ-14: Development of the Proposed Project, when combined with other past, present, and foreseeable development in the vicinity, would not result in cumulative hazardous materials impacts. *(Cumulative Impact: Less than Significant)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic / Impact</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Development Alternative</th>
<th>No Ferry Service Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Parking Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact HZ-14:</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV.Q. Mineral and Energy Resources

#### Impact ME-1: Construction activities associated with the Proposed Project would not result in the use of large amounts of energy, or use energy in a wasteful manner. *(Less than Significant)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic / Impact</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Development Alternative</th>
<th>No Ferry Service Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Parking Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact ME-1:</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Impact ME-2: During operation, the Proposed Project would not result in the use of large amounts of energy, or use energy in a wasteful manner. *(Less than Significant)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic / Impact</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Development Alternative</th>
<th>No Ferry Service Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Parking Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact ME-2:</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV.R. Agricultural and Forest Land

#### Impact AG-1: The Proposed Project would not convert designated farmland under the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, nor would it conflict with any existing agricultural zoning or a Williamson Act contract, nor would it involve any changes to the environment that would result in the conversion of designated farmland. *(No Impact)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic / Impact</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Development Alternative</th>
<th>No Ferry Service Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Parking Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact AG-1:</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Impact AG-2: The Proposed Project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberlands, or timberland zoned as Timberland Production, nor would it result in the loss of or conversion of forest land to non-forest uses. *(Less than Significant)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic / Impact</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Development Alternative</th>
<th>No Ferry Service Alternative</th>
<th>Reduced Parking Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact AG-2:</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The impact under the Reduce Development Alternative for Impact TR-48 in Table S.3 on EIR p. S.68 is revised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED PROJECT</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact TR-48: Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in significant project and cumulative impacts at the intersection of First/Folsom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic / Impact</td>
<td>No Project Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHAPTER I, INTRODUCTION

The third sentence of the second paragraph under “Conveyance of Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island” on p. 1.2 is revised as follows:

Under the agreement, the Treasure Island Homeless Development Initiative (“TIHDI”), a coalition of approximately 19 non-profit social service and homeless service organizations, manages approximately 250 units of the existing housing stock on Treasure Island for formerly homeless (extremely low income) families.

The third sentence in the last paragraph on p. I.6 is revised as follows:

As a result, TIDA, an Update to the Development Plan and Term Sheet (“Development Plan Update”) was endorsed by the TIDA Board and CAB in April 2010, and by the Board of Supervisors in May 2010, in which the proposed development was revised to increase housing up to 8,000 units, and an additional 100,000 sq. ft. of office space with planning elements similar to those proposed in the 2006 Term Sheet.

The following revision is made to the second sentence of the full paragraph on p. I.8:

The Proposed Project also includes a number of proposed plans and programs that would guide implementation of the Development Program, such as a Transportation Plan, Sustainability Plan, and transitional housing program.

CHAPTER II, PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The third full paragraph on p. II.12 is revised as follows (footnotes are not changed and have been omitted here):

Electric service to the Islands is provided by the SFPUC. Electrical service for the Islands comes from a PG&E substation in Oakland and is routed through a substation located at Seventh Street and Maritime Street on Port of Oakland property operated by the Port and leased to the Navy. From the substation, a Navy-owned 12-kV overhead line conveys power to a location near the Bay Bridge, where two recently installed submarine transmission cables on the Bay bottom connect to Treasure Island. Currently, one of the two submarine cables is capped at both ends and needs underground switches.
at both ends to be operational. A submarine cable from Treasure Island under Clipper Cove provides electricity to Yerba Buena Island. Natural gas, is provided by PG&E the SFPUC through a contract with the State of California Department of General Services (DGS). The contract with DGS provides for the transmission of natural gas through PG&E's transmission lines in the East Bay to Treasure Island, supplied through a submarine pipeline from Oakland. Portions of this gas pipeline have been replaced as part of the new Bay Bridge East Span project now underway.

Figure II.5: Yerba Buena View Corridors, on p. II.23, is amended by adding or correcting the numbers of the development blocks, adding development blocks, and correcting the boundaries of the development blocks on the key plan in the upper right corner of the figure. The revised figure is shown on the next page.

Figure II.6b: Yerba Buena Island Maximum Height Limit Plan, on p. II.27, is amended by changing the legend to show a maximum height of 35 feet in the “Low-rise YBI” height zone. The revised figure is shown on p. 3.113.

The following change is made to the heading “Transitional Housing Program” on p. II.28:

Transitional Housing Program

The last sentence on p. II.28, which continues on p. II.29, is revised as follows:

A transitional housing program would be established before existing residential units are deconstructed, to ensure that existing qualifying households have the opportunity to continue living on the Islands if they choose.

Figure II.7: Proposed Open Space, on p. II.30, is amended by adding the areas designated for SFPUC facilities and the wastewater treatment plant in the northeast corner of Treasure Island, labeling the Job Corps campus, and revising the scale. The revised figure is shown on p. 3.114.

Text is revised in the second and third paragraphs of EIR p. II.34 to clarify General Plan and Planning Code amendments proposed for the Project as follows:

The Proposed Project includes amendments to the General Plan and Planning Code that would identify the geographic and physical boundaries of Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island. The Planning Code amendments would add a new Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Island Special Use District (“SUD”) that establishes the land use controls for Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island and incorporates by reference the land use controls and design standards and guidelines specified in the Design for Development. The General Plan would be amended by adding a new Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Island Area Plan for the Redevelopment Plan Project Area that would include reference the new neighborhoods on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island and would reference the define City objectives and policies related to redevelopment of the Islands.

In connection with adoption of the proposed Redevelopment Plan, The City would consider adopting amendments to the Planning Code that would establish the SUD, incorporating by reference the consistent with the Redevelopment Plan Design for Development. The Planning Code text amendments would also modify the provisions of Section 105(f) by removing the portion that currently imposes a height limit of 40 feet on all of Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island pursuant to the Planning Code
Section 1: View Corridor A

Section 2: View Corridor B1

Section 3: View Corridor B2

View locations

SOURCE: Perkins+Will

TREASURE ISLAND AND TERBA BUENA ISLAND REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT EIR

(REVISED) FIGURE II.5: YERBA BUENA VIEW CORRIDORS
Height Zone | Maximum Height
---|---
Low-rise YBI | 35' measured per Figures Y4.g and Y4.h in the D4D
Mid-rise | Building permitted ONLY at flat bench portion of 4Y; Not allowed to encroach on Tidelands Trust View Cone (see Figures Y4.i and Y4.j in the D4D)
2Y | 35' measured per Figure Y4.p in the D4D

SOURCE: Perkins+Will
1 - Northern Shoreline Park *
2 - The Wilds *
3 - Sports Park
4 - Cityside Waterfront Park
5 - Eastern Shoreline Park & Pier 1
6 - Urban Agricultural Park
7 - Wetlands *
8 - Eastside Commons
9 - Cultural Park
10 - Waterfront Plaza
11 - Building 1 Plaza
12 - Clipper Cove Promenade
13 - Marina Plaza
14 - Cityside Neighborhood Park
15 - School Open Space
16 - Habitat Management Plan Areas
17 - Hilltop Park
18 - Senior Officers’ Quarters Historic District
19 - Beach Park

* This park is part of an area collectively known as the Great Park.
Chapter IX
3. DEIR Revisions
2. Staff-Initiated Changes

Code amendment process provided in Section 302; and would amend Section 201 to reference the new classes of land use districts on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island created by the SUD. The Planning Code would also be amended to establish a Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Island “TI Height and Bulk District” that would reference the permitted height and bulk standards from the SUD and Design for Development. Zoning Map amendments would add new Sheet ZN14 to change the zoning designation within the Development Plan Area from “Public” to the Treasure Island /Yerba Buena Island SUD an Redevelopment Agency – Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Island District that references the designations contained in the Redevelopment Plan. Areas remaining under the jurisdiction of the Job Corps, FJWA and Caltrans would remain as “P” districts within a 40-X height and bulk district. Zoning map amendments would also add new Sheet HT14 to change the height and bulk district within the Development Plan Area from 40-X to the TI Height and Bulk District, which would refer to include the designations contained in the SUD. Zoning Map amendments would also add a new Sectional Map Sheet SU14 to establish the Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Island SUD.

The following page reference is added to Footnote 25 on p. II.38:

25 See Section IV.E, Transportation, “Transit Improvements,” beginning on p. IV.E.33, for more detail about proposed bus service.

The following page reference is added to the first sentence of Footnote 29 on p. II.45:

29 Mitigation Measure M-TR-24, identified in Section IV.E, Transportation, p. IV.E.100, could create a transit-only lane and remove the bicycle lane on Treasure Island Road if congestion on Treasure Island Road adversely affects transit operations.

The first paragraph under the heading “Water” on p. II.52 is revised as follows:

The following discussion summarizes the preliminary design for proposed water supply, storage, and distribution. The preliminary design is based on an estimated average daily demand for potable water of 1.32 million gallons per day (“mgd”) if recycled water is able to be used for toilet flushing in residential units, or 1.32 mgd if recycled water cannot be used in residential units. or approximately 920 gallons per minute (“gpm”), and an estimated maximum daily demand of approximately 1,105 gpm. These estimates are for full project buildout, and include demand from the Coast Guard and Job Corps facilities that will remain. (The Proposed Project would also include the use of recycled water, described in “Recycled Water,” p. II.60.)

Footnote 32 on p. II.52 is also revised as part of this text change, as shown below:

32 Treasure Island Infrastructure Update, Section 7, Water System, Table 7.2, October 8, 2009. This potable water demand estimate is less than total water demand because of the production and use of recycled water. See Section IV.K, Utilities and Service Systems, pp. IV.K.17, IV.K.18, IV.K.55, and IV.K.60, for further explanation.

The second sentence under “Proposed Water Storage” on p. II.53 is amended as follows, and footnote 34 on p. II.55 is copied to this location as new footnote 33 (prior footnote 33 becomes footnote 34):

Proposed water storage is based on an estimated need for 4.0 million gallons of operational storage.33
The footnote for this text change is shown below:

“Operational storage” refers to the amount of recycled water that could be drawn from the storage tank at any one time. In addition to this operational storage, in any water storage tank there is a small amount of “dead storage,” which is water that cannot be accessed. The dead storage volume is typically small in relation to the overall tank volume.

The fifth sentence of the first paragraph under “Proposed Wastewater Treatment” on p. II.58 is revised as follows:

The new or upgraded treatment plant would be financed, built, owned, and operated by the SFPUC.

The second paragraph under “Proposed Wastewater Treatment” on p. II.58 is revised as follows:

The treatment process would start with primary and secondary treatment. The primary treatment process would remove settleable solids in a primary sedimentation tank. Solids would be dewatered and processed in a digester. The secondary treatment process would use trickling filters and solids contact tanks to remove suspended solids. Up to 0.42 mgd of the effluent would undergo further treatment by microfiltration and, to the extent required, reverse osmosis for use as recycled water in appropriate plumbing fixtures in commercial buildings and residential buildings to the extent permitted by regulations in effect at the time each building is constructed, and for irrigation (see “Recycled Water” on p. II.60). These additional processes remove solids and salts. Either ultraviolet light or chlorination would be used to disinfect both the treated water to be recycled and the remaining secondary-treated effluent prior to discharge through the existing outfall from the existing treatment plant to the Bay. If chlorination were selected, the treatment plant would use sodium hypochlorite to disinfect, and then sodium bisulfite to dechlorinate the effluent. Solids generated in the primary and secondary treatment processes would be digested and dewatered, and the resulting biosolids would be trucked to an off-island landfill for disposal, as with the existing treatment system.

The last sentence of the first paragraph on p. II.59 is revised as follows:

Effluent that is not recycled would be disinfected with ultraviolet light after tertiary treatment in the wetland, and then discharged through the existing outfall.

The second paragraph on p. II.59 is revised as follows:

Under Wastewater Wetland Variant D2, effluent would undergo microfiltration and ultraviolet light disinfection, and then the wetlands would further reduce pollutants such as nitrogen, phosphorus, and trace metals for most of the treated effluent, which would be discharged through the outfall. Recycled water, however, would not pass through the wetlands. About 0.2527 mgd would be diverted from the treatment plant and treated with reverse osmosis; this water would be used for landscape irrigation. An additional approximately 0.15 mgd would be diverted from the treatment plant and used for commercial and residential toilet flushing. The remainder of the ultraviolet light-disinfected effluent from the treatment plant (about 0.9 mgd) would be directed to the wetlands. The wetlands would be smaller than the Variant D1 wetlands, occupying about
2 to 4 acres of land. These wetlands would be suitable to serve as wildlife habitat. Public access to the constructed wetlands in Wastewater Wetlands Variant D2 would not be restricted because the wetlands water would be disinfected. The impacts of these variants are discussed briefly in Chapter VI, Project Variants, “D, Wastewater Wetlands Variants.”

The last sentence on p. II.59, which continues on p. II.60, is revised as follows:

This facility would use digester gas to generate electricity for a portion much or all of the wastewater treatment plant’s needs.

The second complete paragraph on page II.60 is amended as follows:

As noted elsewhere, the Proposed Project includes supplying 5 percent of the project’s peak electrical demand from on-site renewable sources. This can be met by means of rooftop solar photovoltaic facilities; thus, the Proposed Project would not depend on development of the 4- to 6-acre site to meet the 5 percent objective.

The following page reference is added to Footnote 37 on p. II.60:

37 This tank may be reduced in size if either of the Supplemental Firefighting Water System Variants is implemented, as described on pp. II.X, II.55-II.56, and in Chapter VI, Project Variants.

The next-to-last bulleted item in the list on p. II.78 is revised as follows:

- Affordable housing, including a transitional housing component; and

The following change is made to the third paragraph on p. II.79:

To ensure that existing households are accommodated in the proposed redevelopment, the Proposed Project would include a transitional housing program for all eligible residents of the Islands at the time of the execution of the DDA who continuously remain Island residents in good standing during project development.

The following bulleted item is added before the bulleted item “Approval of operating agreement for supplemental (emergency) water supply line from Oakland (EBMUD);” in the list of approvals on p. II.84:

- Approval of permits (such as Authority to Construct and Permit to Operate) if a new wastewater treatment plant is constructed (Bay Area Air Quality Management District);
CHAPTER IV, ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND IMPACTS

Section IV.A, Land Use

Footnote 19 on EIR p. IV.A.12 is revised as follows:


The third sentence of the first paragraph under Impact LU-2 on p. IV.A.23 is revised as follows:

Although the existing dwelling units in the Development Plan Area would be demolished, the Proposed Project would include a transitional housing program for current residents of Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island who are in good standing at the time the Disposition and Development Agreement (“DDA”) is signed between TIDA and TICD and who choose to continue living on Treasure Island or Yerba Buena Island until new housing is made available (refer to Chapter II, Project Description, p. II.28, for a discussion of the transitional housing program).

Section IV.C, Population and Housing

The first paragraph under Impact PH-2 on pp. IV.C.13-IV.C.14 and the first sentence of the first full paragraph on p. IV.C.14 are revised as follows:

There are approximately 805 households currently residing within the Development Plan Area. To ensure that the households occupying these units have the opportunity to continue living within the Project Area if they choose, the Proposed Project would include a transitional housing program detailed in the Disposition and Development Agreement (“DDA”). The DDA would require that all existing residents of the Islands who reside on the Islands as of the date of the DDA approval and who continuously remain residents in good standing during project construction and development be given an opportunity to move into new housing built during phased construction of the Proposed Project. The express intent of the transitional housing program is to avoid displacement of existing residents. The new housing would be leased to the existing residents eligible for transitional housing at a price no greater than their rent at the time of DDA approval, plus annual adjustments for inflation. Depending upon the income of the household, the housing may be leased at rents lower than the household’s rent at the time of DDA approval, plus annual adjustments for inflation. Transitioning households would also receive moving assistance to cover the costs associated with their move to the new units. Finally, the transitional housing program would include down payment assistance for eligible transitioning households who wish to purchase a home on the island, as long as they can qualify to do so.

Thus, the transitional housing program included in the Proposed Project would ensure that the Project would not result in the displacement of existing residents, which would necessitate the construction of new housing elsewhere or generate demand for new housing, beyond the number of units already provided as part of the Proposed Project…
Section IV.D, Cultural and Paleontological Resources

The second sentence of paragraph under the heading “Mitigation Measure M-CP-1: Archaeological Testing, Monitoring, Data Recovery and Reporting” on p. IV.D.18 is revised as follows:

The project sponsors shall retain the services of a qualified archaeological consultant from the pool of qualified archaeological consultants maintained by the Planning Department archaeologist having expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archaeology.

The last sentence of the first paragraph under the heading “Archaeological Testing Program” on p. IV.D.19 is revised as follows:

The purpose of the archaeological testing program will be to determine, to the extent possible, the presence or absence of previously undiscovered archaeological resources and to identify and to evaluate whether any archaeological resource encountered on the site constitutes an historical resource under CEQA.

Item “(B)” on p. IV.D.19 is revised as follows:

(B) A data recovery program shall be implemented, unless the ERO determines that the archaeological resource is of greater interpretive than research significance and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible, in which case interpretive reuse shall be required.

The following changes are made to the first paragraph under the heading “Archaeological Data Recovery Program” on p. IV.D.20:

The archaeological data recovery program shall be conducted in accord with an archaeological data recovery plan (“ADRP”). The archaeological consultant, project sponsors, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the ADRP prior to preparation of a draft ADRP. The archaeological consultant shall submit a draft ADRP to the ERO. The ERO shall review the draft ADRP to ensure adherence to this mitigation measure and the standards and requirements set forth in the ARDTP. The ADRP shall identify how the proposed data recovery program will preserve the significant information the archaeological resource is expected to contain. That is, the ADRP will identify what scientific/historical research questions are applicable to the expected resource, what data classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions. Data recovery, in general, should be limited to the portions of the resource that could be adversely affected by the proposed project. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be applied to portions of the archaeological resources if non-destructive methods are practical.
Section IV.E, Transportation

Table IV.E.19, on p. IV.E.113, is revised to reflect changes to the “Project Trips” and “Density” columns for the Existing plus Project conditions.

### (Revised) Table IV.E.19: Pedestrian Crosswalk Levels of Service, Existing and Existing plus Project Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crosswalk</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian Volumes</td>
<td>Density</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Project Trips</td>
<td>Density</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AM Peak Hour</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Street</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>25 26</td>
<td>27.64</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry Bldg (North)</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>82 87</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Street</td>
<td>1,964</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>403 427</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Chee Way</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>27 29</td>
<td>17.53</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Street</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>68 72</td>
<td>40.0 9.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PM Peak Hour</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Street</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>44 46</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry Bldg (North)</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>64 67</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Street</td>
<td>3,452</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>588 614</td>
<td>4.0 3.9</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Chee Way</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>31 33</td>
<td>13.0 12.9</td>
<td>A  B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Street</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>59 61</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saturday Peak Hour</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Street</td>
<td>3,718</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Chee Way</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1 Since the intersections of The Embarcadero with Washington Street and Mission Street each have two crosswalks, the north and south legs of each intersection were averaged.
2 Pedestrian counts provided by the City of San Francisco, taken from the Regional Signal Timing Program study conducted by Katz, Okitsu & Associates in 2006 and 2007.
3 The Ferry Building hosts a farmers market on Saturdays.
4 Density measured in square feet per pedestrian.

**Source:** Fehr & Peers, 2010.

Section IV.F, Noise

The following revision is made to the second bullet in Noise Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a on p. IV.F.16 (deleted text is shown in strike through and new text is underlined):

- Use construction equipment with lower noise emission ratings whenever possible, particularly for air compressors;
Section IV.G, Air Quality

In Table IV.G.5, p. IV.G.41, the following typographical error is corrected in the “ROG” column for “Motor Vehicles” listed under “Expanded Transit Service (2030)”: 403 115

The second sentence in the first paragraph in Mitigation Measure M-AQ-5 on p. IV.G.42 is revised as follows:

If diesel particulate filters are operated at the proper temperatures, they are reported to achieve up to 90\% reduction in particulate emissions.

VOLUME 2

CHAPTER IV, ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND IMPACTS (Continued)

Section IV.I, Wind and Shadow

The eight figures listed below are amended by adding a scale and correcting the configuration of the ferry terminal breakwaters.

- Figure IV.I.1: Shadows on March 21 at 9 AM, on p. IV.I.7
- Figure IV.I.3: Shadows on March 21 at 3 PM, on p. IV.I.9
- Figure IV.I.4: Shadows on June 21 at 9 AM, on p. IV.I.10
- Figure IV.I.6: Shadows on June 21 at 3 PM, on p. IV.I.12
- Figure IV.I.7: Shadows on September 21 at 9 AM, on p. IV.I.13
- Figure IV.I.9: Shadows on September 21 at 3 PM, on p. IV.I.15
- Figure IV.I.10: Shadows on December 21 at 9 AM, on p. IV.I.16
- Figure IV.I.12: Shadows on December 21 at 3 PM, on p. IV.I.18

The revised figures are shown on pp.3.122-3.129.

Section IV.J, Recreation

Figure IV.J.1: Proposed Open Space, on p. IV.J.15, is amended by adding the areas designated for SFPUC facilities and the wastewater treatment plant in the northeast corner of Treasure Island, labeling the Job Corps campus, and revising the scale. The revised figure is shown on p. 3.130.
1 - Northern Shoreline Park
2 - The Wilds
3 - Sports Park
4 - Cityside Waterfront Park
5 - Eastern Shoreline Park & Pier 1
6 - Urban Agricultural Park
7 - Wetlands
8 - Eastside Commons
9 - Cultural Park
10 - Waterfront Plaza
11 - Building 1 Plaza
12 - Clipper Cove Promenade
13 - Marina Plaza
14 - Cityside Neighborhood Park
15 - School Open Space

SOURCE: ESA, TICD, Turnstone Consulting
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Key - Proposed Parks and Open Spaces
1 - Northern Shoreline Park
2 - The Wilds
3 - Sports Park
4 - Cityside Waterfront Park
5 - Eastern Shoreline Park & Pier 1
6 - Urban Agricultural Park
7 - Wetlands
8 - Eastside Commons
9 - Cultural Park
10 - Waterfront Plaza
11 - Building 1 Plaza
12 - Clipper Cove Promenade
13 - Marina Plaza
14 - Cityside Neighborhood Park
15 - School Open Space

Job Corps Boundary

SOURCE: ESA, TICD, Turnstone Consulting
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(REVISED) FIGURE IV.1.9: SHADOWS ON SEPTEMBER 21 AT 3PM
Key - Proposed Parks and Open Spaces
1 - Northern Shoreline Park
2 - The Wilds
3 - Sports Park
4 - Cityside Waterfront Park
5 - Eastern Shoreline Park & Pier 1
6 - Urban Agricultural Park
7 - Wetlands
8 - Eastside Commons
9 - Cultural Park
10 - Waterfront Plaza
11 - Building 1 Plaza
12 - Clipper Cove Promenade
13 - Marina Plaza
14 - Cityside Neighborhood Park
15 - School Open Space

Job Corps Boundary

SOURCE: ESA, TICD, Turnstone Consulting
Key - Proposed Parks and Open Spaces
1 - Northern Shoreline Park
2 - The Wilds
3 - Sports Park
4 - Cityside Waterfront Park
5 - Eastern Shoreline Park & Pier 1
6 - Urban Agricultural Park
7 - Wetlands
8 - Eastside Commons
9 - Cultural Park
10 - Waterfront Plaza
11 - Building 1 Plaza
12 - Clipper Cove Promenade
13 - Marina Plaza
14 - Cityside Neighborhood Park
15 - School Open Space

Job Corps Boundary

SOURCE: ESA, TICD, Turnstone Consulting
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(REVISED) FIGURE IV.1.12: SHADOWS ON DECEMBER 21 AT 3PM
1 - Northern Shoreline Park *
2 - The Wilds *
3 - Sports Park
4 - Cityside Waterfront Park
5 - Eastern Shoreline Park & Pier 1
6 - Urban Agricultural Park
7 - Wetlands *
8 - Eastside Commons
9 - Cultural Park
10 - Waterfront Plaza
11 - Building 1 Plaza
12 - Clipper Cove Promenade
13 - Marina Plaza
14 - Cityside Neighborhood Park
15 - School Open Space
16 - Habitat Management Plan Areas
17 - Hilltop Park
18 - Senior Officers’ Quarters Historic District
19 - Beach Park

* This park is part of an area collectively known as the Great Park.

SOURCE: CMG, TICD
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(REVISED) FIGURE IV.J.1: PROPOSED OPEN SPACE
Section IV.K, Utilities and Service Systems

Footnote 2 on p. IV.K.2, regarding chemical use for chlorination in the existing wastewater treatment plant, is revised as follows:

2 Sodium hypochlorite and sodium bisulfite are used for disinfection. In fiscal year 2006-2007, 2009-2010, the total annual usage was 32,000 21,000 dry pounds of sodium hypochlorite and 65,000 50,000 dry pounds of sodium bisulfite.

The last sentence on p. IV.K.5, which continues on p. IV.K.6, is revised as follows:

(Under the Proposed Project, the SFPUC would continue to operate and maintain the wastewater treatment plant, and either the SFPUC or TIDA would become the permit holder, until such time as the wastewater treatment plant and wastewater collection system would be upgraded or rebuilt, and would be accepted into SFPUC’s system, at which point SFPUC would become the permit holder.)

The following changes are made to the twelfth sentence of the first full paragraph on p. IV.K.6:

Regarding other NPDES permit limits, coliform bacteria would be killed through ultraviolet light, a disinfection method that has become commonly used instead of chlorine, or by chlorination, which is the current disinfection method reducing the use of potentially toxic chemicals.

Footnote 17 on p. IV.K.8 is revised as follows to provide a more up-to-date source and to correct the statement that irrigation would use potable water, as the analysis actually assumes recycled water would be used for irrigation:

17 Brown and Caldwell, Evaluation of Wastewater and Recycled Water Treatment Alternatives for the Proposed Treasure Island Development (Revised Draft), August 13, 2006, p. 3, Appendix F in Infrastructure Update. This assumes that residential irrigation would use potable water, and that irrigation in open space and commercial areas would use recycled water. Infrastructure Update, Chapter 8, Section 8.4, July 2010.

The date in footnote 22 on p. IV.K.8 is corrected as follows:

22 Infrastructure Update, Chapter 8, Section 8.3 (December 1, 2008) (July 2010).

References to the “Jobs Corps” are corrected to “Job Corps” in the following locations in Section IV.K:

- p. IV.K.9, first and second lines in first full paragraph
- p. IV.K.28, last line on page
- p. IV.K.29 second line on the page
- p. IV.K.52, first and second lines in second full paragraph
- p. IV.K.78, first and second lines in second full paragraph
The second full paragraph on p. IV.K.9, regarding the proposed wastewater system, is revised as follows:

The eastern side of Yerba Buena Island would be served by gravity flow to the east, to an existing pump station under the east span of the Bay Bridge that would replace an existing pump station. **The existing pump station would be repaired or replaced as necessary.** This pump station would pump wastewater to the top of the island, where it would flow by gravity to the causeway pump station. The causeway pump station would send the flow, along with wastewater from the west side of the island, to the Treasure Island wastewater collection system over to the Treasure Island wastewater collection system through one of two routes: 1) the pump station would deliver wastewater back up to the top of Yerba Buena Island, from which point it would flow by gravity to the Treasure Island system; or 2) the pump station would deliver wastewater to the existing submarine force main that currently serves the eastern side of Yerba Buena Island and connects to the Treasure Island system.23

The first sentence of the first paragraph under “Proposed Wastewater Treatment System” on p. IV.K.10 is revised as follows:

The proposed wastewater treatment system consists of: 1) primary treatment using headworks and primary sedimentation, 2) secondary treatment using trickling filter and solids contact, 3) tertiary treatment with microfiltration and reverse osmosis for a portion of the flow to be used as recycled water (discussed in Section K.2, below), and 4) ultraviolet light disinfection either by ultraviolet light or chlorination.

The second sentence of the fourth paragraph on p. IV.K.10 is revised as follows:

The resulting solids would be dewatered and then land-applied in Solano County, or disposed of through similar, appropriate, reuse means.

Figure IV.K.1, Proposed Wastewater Treatment System, on p. IV.K.11, is amended by changing the words in the box on the lower right as follows. The revised figure is shown on the following page.

UV disinfection (UV or chlorination)

The first paragraph on p. IV.K.12 is revised as follows:

The remaining effluent would be disinfected with ultraviolet light or by chlorination and discharged through the existing outfall to the Bay. If chlorination were selected, the treatment plant would use sodium hypochlorite to disinfect, and then sodium bisulfite to dechlorinate the effluent.25
Wastewater
1.28 mgd
average dry weather flows

primary and secondary treatment
headworks / primary sedimentation
trickling filter / solids contact treatment

0.42 mgd
average recycled water demand

microfiltration / reverse osmosis *

0.90 mgd
discharge to bay

0.90 mgd
average recycled water demand for commercial flushing / irrigation / stormwater wetland system

disinfection (UV or chlorination)

0.42 mgd
recycled water average demand for flushing / irrigation / stormwater wetland system

* reverse osmosis applied to irrigation demand

SOURCE: Brown & Caldwell
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The new footnote for this text change, to be added at the bottom of p. IV.K.12, is shown below, and subsequent footnotes in this section will be renumbered accordingly:

25 To treat the estimated 1.3 mgd of dry weather flow, about 70,000 dry pounds of sodium hypochlorite and 166,000 dry pounds of sodium bisulfite would be used annually.

The first full paragraph on p. IV.K.18 is revised as follows:

As described in “Proposed Wastewater Treatment System,” on p. IV.K.10, the entire sanitary sewage flow would undergo primary and secondary treatment and UV disinfection at the wastewater treatment facility. The portion of the secondary effluent that would be used for recycled water would go through an additional (“tertiary”) treatment step at the facility’s recycled water plant. This step would involve microfiltration and, to the extent required, reverse osmosis. This effluent would meet California standards for recycled water.

The following change is made to the last sentence of the third full paragraph on p. IV.K.18:

Ultraviolet light or chlorination would be used to disinfect the recycled water.

The paragraph at the top of p. IV.K.28 is revised as follows:

The proposed stormwater drainage collection system would be a combination of gravity lines, lift stations, pump stations, and outfalls to the Bay. The stormwater drainage collection system would be designed to meet the following criteria:

The last two sentences in the third paragraph on p. IV.K.47 are revised as follows:

The SFPUC chlorinates this water prior to transmission; additional treatment on Treasure Island is not required. A standby chlorine booster station is available for emergencies where the pipeline touches down on Yerba Buena Island.

The fourth sentence of the paragraph under “Recycled Water Supply” on p. IV.K.55 is revised as follows:

Wastewater effluent would be treated with microfiltration, reverse osmosis (to the extent required), and disinfection to meet California standards for recycled water.

The following corrections are made to Footnote 100, on p. IV.K.57:

100 The Proposed Project would either comply with the San Francisco Green Building Ordinance or with a set of equivalent or superior requirements adopted by TIDA as part of the Proposed Project’s Green Building specifications.
Two new sentences are added at the beginning of the first paragraph under “Existing Natural Gas System” on p. IV.K.72, and the existing first sentence is deleted, as follows:

Natural gas on the Islands is provided by the SFPUC through a contract with the State of California Department of General Services (DGS). The contract with DGS provides for the transmission of natural gas through PG&E transmission lines in the East Bay to a submarine pipeline from Oakland to Treasure Island. Transmission from the PG&E natural gas system begins in Oakland.

The last sentence of the partial paragraph at the top of p. IV.K.80 is revised as follows:

Details would be worked out during the design process for each major phase.

Section IV.M, Biological Resources

Mitigation Measure M-BI-2b, on p. IV.M.49, is clarified as follows:

Mitigation Measure M-BI-2b: Seasonal Limitations on Construction Work

Construction work on the Islands’ shoreline shall be conducted between the months of March 1 and November 30 to avoid any disturbance to herring spawning occurring in SAV surrounding Treasure Island.

Section IV.N, Geology and Soils

The following change is made to the last sentence of the partial paragraph at the top of p. IV.N.29:

These geotechnical engineering controls are proven mitigations against techniques to reduce the hazards identified at the Development Plan Area.

The following clarification is made to the text of Mitigation Measure M-GE-5 on p. IV.N.31:

Mitigation Measure M-GE-5: Slope Stability

New improvements proposed for Yerba Buena Island shall be located at a minimum of 100 feet from the top of the existing slope along Macalla Road unless a site-specific geotechnical evaluation of slope stability indicates a static factor of safety of at least 1.5 and a seismic factor of safety of 1.1 are present or established geotechnical stabilization measures are implemented to provide that level of safety. Any geotechnical recommendations regarding slope stability made in site-specific geotechnical investigations for the site shall be incorporated into the specifications for building on that site.

Section IV.O, Hydrology and Water Quality

Figure IV.O.1: Proposed FEMA Flood Zone, on p. IV.O.8, is amended to be more legible. The information in the figure has not changed. The revised figure is shown on the following page.
LEGEND
APPROXIMATE PRELIMINARY SPECIAL FLOOD HAZARD AREAS

ZONE V – COASTAL FLOOD ZONE (WAVE ACTION)

ZONE A – INLAND AREAS SUBJECT TO 100-YEAR FLOOD

SOURCE: BKF
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Chapter IX
3. DEIR Revisions
2. Staff-Initiated Changes

The first subhead on p. IV.O.22 is revised as follows:

Stormwater Control Management Ordinance and Stormwater Design Guidelines

The last sentence in the first paragraph under “Residential Areas” on p. IV.O.26 is revised as follows:

For areas farther away from the treatment wetland, stormwater would be pumped to the wetland via force mains, or would be treated locally, as discussed in the next paragraph.

The third sentence in the last paragraph on p. IV.O.36 is revised as follows:

Specific BMPs would be implemented based on final construction drawings and are subject to review and approval by the RWQCB and the SFPUC.

The following typographical error is corrected in the sixth sentence of the paragraph at the top of p. IV.O.37:

The following permits would be required for the construction of the Ferry Terminal and construction of the Sailing Center launch facilities: BCDC Dredging Permit; U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Permit for dredging; and Clean Water Action Section 401 Water Quality Certification issued by the RWQCB, as managed via the DMMO and individual permitting agencies.

The fourth and fifth sentences in the last paragraph on p. IV.O.45 are revised as follows (note that the Stormwater Management Ordinance has been adopted and is discussed on p. IV.O.22):

This system would be designed to treat stormwater to the maximum extent practicable in accordance with RWQCB standards. Assuming the Stormwater Control Ordinance is adopted soon by the Board of Supervisors, the Proposed Project would have to comply with the ordinance, and where applicable, with the SFPUC Stormwater Design Guidelines.

The beginning of the third sentence in the first paragraph on p. IV.O.46 is revised as follows (the list that makes up the remainder of the sentence is not changed):

Typical BMPs to manage urban runoff can include, but are not limited to, the following:

The first sentence in the second paragraph on p. IV.O.46 is revised as follows:

With implementation of the proposed stormwater treatment system and adherence to the proposed Stormwater Control Plan (as developed pursuant to the Stormwater Control Management Ordinance and Stormwater Design Guidelines), urban runoff from the Proposed Project would not result in water quality degradation.
The second to last sentence in the paragraph under Impact HY-10 on p. IV.O.47 is revised as follows:

This system would be designed to treat stormwater to the maximum extent practicable in accordance with RWQCB standards, and, where applicable, the SFPUC Stormwater Design Guidelines.

Section IV.P, Hazards and Hazardous Materials

A reference mark for a new footnote is added to the end of the first complete sentence of the paragraph at the top of p. IV.P.4:

It is generally accepted that detections of chemicals at concentrations below their applicable screening levels means that the chemicals pose no significant, long-term threat to human health or the environment.7

The text of new footnote 7, to be added to the bottom of p. IV.P.4, is as follows, and subsequent footnotes in the section will be renumbered accordingly.

7 The soil screening levels at Treasure Island also consider the existing ambient or background concentrations for metals.

The fourth bullet on p. IV.P.5 is revised as follows:

- Prepare an RI that includes findings of each phase of investigation and a Human Health Risk Assessment and Ecological Risk Assessment, if applicable. The Human Health Risk Assessment and Ecological Risk Assessment determines human health-based and ecological-based remediation goals for a site based on calculated risk management factors according to established risk assessment protocols.

The fourth sentence under the heading “Overview,” under “Current Conditions,” on p. IV.P.9 is revised as follows:

All investigation and cleanup requirements for the sites are overseen by the California EPA, DTSC, and/or the RWQCB.

Figure IV.P.1: Installation Restoration Site Inventory, on p. IV.P.10, is amended to show Site 27 with a blue boundary, indicating that it is an open installation restoration site. The revised figure is shown on the following page.

Table IV.P.1: Treasure Island Installation Restoration Site Inventory, on pp. IV.P.12-IV.P.13, is revised as follows:

- For Site 11, in the “Status” column: Open. Interim-Final RI is being finalized submitted on January 21, 2010.
- For Site 12, in the “Status” column: Active. RI report being prepared. Soil/debris removal action is ongoing.
LEGEND:
- CLOSED INSTALLATION RESTORATION SITE
- CLOSED INSTALLATION RESTORATION SITES 2, 18, 23 ARE APPROXIMATE
- OPEN INSTALLATION RESTORATION SITE

REQUEST FOR CLOSURE
SUBMITTED JANUARY 29, 2010

NOTES:
INSTALLATION RESTORATION SITES 5 AND 17 MERGED INTO SITE 24

CLOSSED INSTALLATION RESTORATION
SITE 26 IS THE UNDERGROUND
STORAGE TANKS ON BOTH TREASURE ISLAND
AND YERBA BUENA ISLAND. NOT SHOWN ON MAP.

SOURCE: ARCADIS
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- For Site 27, in the “Status” column: **Open.** Revised FS report, inclusive of the sediment investigation results, was finalized on August 13, 2010.

- For Site 28, in the “Status” column: **Open.** RI Report was submitted in February 2009. NFA PP and Final ROD was completed in November 2010 are being prepared.

Under the Notes at bottom of table, two definitions of abbreviations used in the table are added: PP – Proposed Plan, added after “PA/SI – Preliminary Assessment/Site Investigation,” and FS – Feasibility Study, added after “FFS – Focused Feasibility Study.”

The second sentence of the paragraph at the top of p. IV.P.14 is revised as follows:

All investigation and cleanup requirements for the sites are overseen by the California EPA, DTSC, and the RWQCB.

The second sentence of the paragraph under the heading “Inactive Fuel Pipeline Sites” on p. IV.P.14 is revised as follows:

Six main fuel lines were installed on Treasure Island as early as the 1940s and transported gasoline, diesel, bunker C fuel, and other petroleum products.

The second sentence in the third paragraph under the heading “Radiological Assessment Program” on p. IV.P.15 is revised as follows:

Since preparation of that report, however, the Navy has conducted, or has plans for additional screenings, additional investigations, at these sites. To date, the existing data indicated that the only known remaining low-level radiological material contamination at the Naval base is isolated to small portions of Site 12 and Building 233.

The paragraph under the heading “Polychlorinated Biphenyls Program” on p. IV.P.16 is revised as shown below, and a new footnote is added:

The Navy performed investigations of all known former PCB-containing equipment across both Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island within the FOST and non-FOST area in 2004 and 2006, including transformers and fluid-filled electrical equipment. PCB abatement was performed at some locations in 2008 and a removal action was completed at Site 32 under the Toxic Substances Control Act (“TSCA”) PCB remediation program in early 2010. IR Sites 3, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 21, 24, 31, and 32 have been investigated under CERCLA for PCBs along with other contaminants.23

New footnote 23, to be added to the bottom of p. IV.P.16, is shown below, and subsequent footnotes in the section will be renumbered accordingly.

The two paragraphs under the heading “Residential Lead-Based Paint Program” on p. IV.P.16 are revised as follows:

The Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992, Title X of the Housing and Community Development Act (Public Law No. 102-550), applies at NSTI. To date, lead-based paint at all pre-1978 housing on Treasure Island (TI) and Yerba Buena Island (YBI) has been assessed and either abated or covered with encapsulating paint. Re-evaluation surveys are conducted every two years. Housing on both Treasure Island (TI) and Yerba Buena Island (YBI) will be re-evaluated again in 2011 or within 1 year of transfer, whichever comes first.

Soil samples of planter boxes, drip line and mid-yard areas at representative Treasure Island (TI) and Yerba Buena Island (YBI) residential buildings were also taken and, based on analytical results, soil abatement was conducted in accordance with Title X, Department Housing and Urban Development and Navy Policy. Any future disturbance of the grasses, concrete or asphalt over soil on these building sites (located at Quarters 1 through 7, 10, and Buildings 62, 83, 205, and 230 on Yerba Buena Island) will require further soil evaluation for lead. The Navy will either abate or require the transferee to abate lead-based paint hazards found in existing residential facilities within 1 year of being transferred. If an existing residential facility is scheduled for demolition or nonresidential use, it will not be inspected or abated for lead-based paint.

The paragraph under the heading “Asbestos-Containing Material Program” on p. IV.P.17 is revised as follows:

Beginning in 1995, surveys were completed at NSTI to identify the presence of asbestos-containing material (“ACM”). All known damaged, friable or accessible ACM has been that was known about at that time was abated within the Treasure Island (TI) and Yerba Buena Island (YBI) FOST areas, and remaining ACM does not currently pose a threat to human health. Buildings with remaining ACM are subject to notices and restrictions related to asbestos. ACM was identified in the FOST for both Treasure Island (TI) and Yerba Buena Island (YBI) dated February 15, 2006 and March 23, 2006, and all remaining ACM are periodically re-evaluated. Re-evaluations of the remaining ACM occurred in 2008 and another is planned in 2011 or within one year of transfer, whichever occurs first. The 2009 re-evaluation identified additional damaged, friable, or accessible ACM in some buildings. The Navy’s deed transferring the property is expected to contain a restriction requiring that TIDA prohibit occupancy and use of the buildings and structures, or portions thereof, containing known asbestos hazards before abatement of such hazards.

Footnote 24 on p. IV.P.17 is revised as follows:

Tetra Tech, Inc., Draft 2010 Site Management Plan, Naval Station Treasure Island, San Francisco, CA, April 19, 2010 (hereinafter referred to as “Draft 2010 Site Management Plan, NSTI”). A copy of this document is available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in Case File No. 2007.0903E.
The last sentence of the second complete paragraph on p. IV.P.18 is revised as follows:

The Navy will conduct a multi-agency radiation survey (Final Status Survey using MARSSIM method) and site investigation at Site 6 (following completion of IR site 12 radiological clean up) prior to final transfer of Site 6.32

The text of footnote 28 on p. IV.P.18 is revised as follows:

Historically, IR Site 12 was used as a waste disposal site that included disposal of radiological materials. As a result, some low level radiological waste was encountered in near-surface soils up to five feet below ground surface.

The fourth sentence of the second complete paragraph on p. IV.P.19 is revised as follows:

All items found in the excavated soil located at these three areas have been are being removed and disposed of in accordance with regulatory requirements.

The last paragraph on p. IV.P.19 is revised as follows:

In certain areas, the shallow groundwater on a small portion of Site 12 has been contaminated with petroleum hydrocarbons, arsenic, and copper.33 manganese. The Navy is currently monitoring seven nine groundwater monitoring wells at Site 12 in the area of Buildings 1311 and 1313 for the presence of total petroleum hydrocarbons, arsenic, and other metals manganese. In 2009, the Navy conducted some additional investigation for the arsenic pilot study at the Building 1321 area of Site 12 where free floating petroleum hydrocarbons were found on the water table.

The last sentence of the first paragraph on p. IV.P.20 is revised as follows:

Confirmation soil sampling associated with the removal actions in the areas was also completed in 2009; removal actions included radiological surveys.

The third sentence of the second paragraph on p. IV.P.20 is revised as follows:

The FS RI will use all the collected data from the RI and the risk assessment assessments to guide the selection of appropriate remediation alternatives.

The following typographical error is corrected in the second sentence of the paragraph under the heading “Site 27 – Clipper Cove Skeet Range (Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island) on p. IV.P.22:

Site 27 encompasses approximately 19 off-shore acres in the cover area, as well as approximately 1 acre of onshore land on Treasure Island.

The next-to-last sentence of the same paragraph is revised as follows:

The final An FS report is being finalized that was published on August 13, 2010 and includes these sediment investigation results.38

There is no change to footnote 38 on EIR p. IV.P.22, cited in the above text.
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The third complete sentence of the partial paragraph at the top of p. IV.P.23 is revised as follows:

The RI was finalized in 2009 and the Navy has just recently issued the Final ROD Draft Proposed Remedial Action Plan in November 2010.

The last two sentences of the first paragraph under the heading “Site 30 – Daycare Center (Treasure Island)” on p. IV.P.23 are revised as follows:

Since then, a subsequent radiological screening for health and safety of workers survey has been conducted for Site 31, which is immediately adjacent to Site 30, and negative results for this screening survey indicated no potential radiological contamination was present. Additional radiological screening will be included in the upcoming soil removal workplan amendment for the site.

There are no changes to footnote 43 on EIR p. IV.P.23, cited in the above text.

The last paragraph on p. IV.P.24, which continues on p. IV.P.25, is revised as follows:

The COPCs at the site include petroleum hydrocarbons, PCBs, dioxins, PAHs, metals and pesticides in the soil. Several metals including arsenic, copper, lead, mercury, nickel, silver, and zinc have been detected in the groundwater. Numerous site investigations have been performed at the site. Most recently, the Navy has completed a significant excavation to address PCB and petroleum contaminated soils as well as dioxin, pesticides and metals, primarily arsenic. The majority of the site has been excavated and backfilled. As a result of this work and other findings, the Navy intends to update the RI and HHRA to reflect this removal of source material; in the meantime, the recent soil PCB removal was completed in March 2010. The final site closure has been estimated for September 2014.

There are no changes to footnotes 49, 50, and 51 on EIR p. IV.P.25, cited in the above text.

The fifth sentence of the second paragraph under the heading “Site 33 – Water Line Replacement Area (Treasure Island)” on p. IV.P.25 and footnote 53, cited in that sentence, are deleted, as follows:

In addition, radiological screening conducted at neighboring Site 32, was negative.


The seventh sentence of that paragraph is revised as follows:

Remediation will most likely involve excavation and removal of the debris unless shown to present no adverse effects to human health or the environment as overseen and approved determined by the DTSC.

The third sentence of the second paragraph under the heading “Ongoing Asbestos Containing Materials Activities” on p. IV.P.26 is revised as follows:
To date, all known damaged, friable, or accessible ACM has been abated within the Treasure Island TI and Yerba Buena Island YBI FOST areas, and remaining ACM does not pose a threat to human health.

The sixth complete sentence at the top of p. IV.P.39 is revised as follows:

The existing Emergency Response Plan for the City and County of San Francisco consists of a description of the City’s actions during a response to an emergency, the role of the Emergency Operations Center (EOC), and the coordination between the EOC and City departments and agencies.

A date is corrected in footnote 66 on p. IV.P.39, as follows:

66 Jack Sylvan, Treasure Island Redevelopment Project Director, Mayor’s Office of Economic and Workforce Development, memorandum to Gary Massetani, Deputy Chief of Administration, San Francisco Fire Department, March 1 June 29, 2010. A copy of this document is available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in Case File No. 2007.0903E.

The second paragraph on p. IV.P.40 is revised as follows:

Since first identified for base closure, a substantial amount of work has been performed by the Navy regarding the identification and cleanup of subsurface contamination. A FOST has been completed for approximately 170 acres of the former naval base. The anticipated transfer terms between the Navy and TIDA state that the Navy will continue to complete cleanup requirements and prepare a FOST for the remaining areas, including the IR sites that are still active prior to conveyance. If a FOST is not completed either a FOSET or LIFOC would be prepared for the site that would similarly disclose the history of investigations and remaining contamination, if any. The two parties are also cooperatively working to align the Navy’s cleanup schedule for the remaining remediation responsibilities with the proposed phasing of redevelopment activities. In general, the Proposed Project would not commence construction on any one parcel until a FOST, FOSET, or LIFOC has been completed for that area. In some cases, the resultant FOST or ROD may include additional cleanup requirements for any proposed land uses that vary from the 1996 Reuse Plan. In those limited instances, TIDA or TICD would assume responsibility for additional remediation actions as overseen by the responsible agency (likely the DTSC but also potentially the RWQCB) prior to redevelopment. TIDA or TICD may also assume responsibility for remediation for any parcels that are transferred under Early Transfer (also known as a FOSET). At this time, it is not known whether affected areas will be transferred to TIDA by means of a FOSET, or whether additional clean-up obligations will accompany such transfer. Regardless, any additional remediation required would be performed either by TICD or each parcel developer on behalf of TIDA under the oversight of the responsible agency, either DTSC or RWQCB.

The first full paragraph on p. IV.P.41 is revised as follows:

As stated above in “Regulatory Framework,” p. IV.P.30, Cal OSHA assumes primary responsibility for developing and enforcing standards for safe workplaces and work practices. At sites known to be contaminated, a Site Health and Safety Plan must be
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prepared to protect workers. With implementation of Mitigation Measure M-HZ-1, Soil and Groundwater Management Plan ("SGMP"), construction activities would require development of a SGMP that would contain all the worker safety requirements found that must be included in a Site Health and Safety Plan prepared in accordance with Cal OSHA requirements for working at a site with contaminants that have been detected at Treasure Island. The SGMP would require evaluation of soil contamination data for existing soils prior to ground disturbance, if not already analyzed under the Navy program. If unexpected contaminated soils or unexpected USTs were encountered, protocols for appropriate disposal would be included in the SGMP. The SGMP would include notification and response protocols for any suspect soils or groundwater encountered during construction.

The first paragraph of Mitigation Measure M-HZ-1: Soil and Groundwater Management Plan, on pp. IV.P.41-IV.P.42, is revised as follows:

Prior to issuance of a building or grading permit for any one or more parcels, there shall be regulatory approval by DTSC or RWQCB for the proposed land use, the applicant shall demonstrate that its construction specifications for each parcel shall include implementation of a Soil and Groundwater Management Plan ("SGMP") prepared by a qualified environmental consulting firm and reviewed and agreed to by DTSC and RWQCB. For parcels transferred from the Navy under a Lease in Furtherance of Conveyance (LIFOC), or Early Transfer (FOSET) or parcels where conditionally recommended transferred by under a FOST which specifies that additional remediation of petroleum contamination is necessary or additional remediation is necessary to meet the proposed land use, all additional or remaining remediation on those parcels shall be completed as directed by the responsible agency, DTSC or RWQCB, prior to commencement of construction activities, unless (i) those construction activities are conducted in accordance with the requirements of any applicable land use covenant, lease restriction or deed restriction and in accordance with the Site Health and Safety requirements of the SGMP, or (ii) those construction activities are otherwise given written approval by either DTSC or RWQCB, in cases such as constructing infrastructure improvements. Parcels transferred under a Lease in Furtherance of Conveyance, shall not change site occupancy or usage until all remediation is completed as determined by DTSC or RWQCB. Where necessary, additional remediation shall be accomplished by the project sponsors prior to issuance of any building or grading permits in accordance with any requirements set by the overseeing agency, either DTSC or RWQCB. The SGMP shall be present on site at all times and readily available to site workers.

The last sentence of the second paragraph under Impact HZ-6 on p. IV.P.46 is revised as follows:

Disposal could occur off site or the sediments could potentially be reused on site as fill material in a non-structural location (e.g., parks, open space, etc.) with regulatory agency approval.

The second sentence of the third paragraph under Impact HZ-6 on p. IV.P.46 is revised as follows:

An FS report was finalized on August 13, 2010 which includes the latest sediment investigation results.
The fourth sentence of the paragraph under Impact HZ-9 on p. IV.P.51 is revised as follows:

There are two main areas in the vicinity of the Job Corps campus on the island where groundwater is contaminated: IR Sites 21 and 24.

The following typographical error is corrected in the last sentence on p. IV.P.51, which continues on p. IV.P.52:

As part of the ongoing regulatory process for these sites, contamination of soil and groundwater will be remediated in accordance with DTSC and RWQCB requirements that assure each IR site is protective of human health and the environment, whether or not the Proposed Project is implemented.

The sixth complete sentence in the partial paragraph at the top of p. IV.P.52 is revised as follows:

Neither site closure would not be approved by the overseeing regulatory agency unless the data clearly indicate that no significant risks to human health or the environment remain. The Navy would not recommend a site for transfer via a FOST, FOSET, or LIFOC would be approved by the overseeing regulatory agency unless the data clearly indicate that no significant risks to human health or the environment remains.

Mitigation Measure M-HZ-10: Soil Vapor Barriers, on p. IV.P.52, is revised as follows:

Proposed building plans on parcels with vapor permeable soil in IR Sites 21 or 24 or within any area where the FOST or site closure documentation specifies that vapor barriers are necessary or that additional sampling must be conducted to determine if vapor barriers are necessary due to the presence of residual contamination that have volatile components (such as chlorinated solvents (PCE and TCE) or certain petroleum hydrocarbons), the applicant shall demonstrate either that the building plans include DTSC-approved vapor barriers to be installed beneath the foundation for the prevention of soil vapor intrusion, or that DTSC has determined that installation of vapor barriers is not necessary. Specifically, building plans coinciding with IR Sites 21 and 24 shall contain vapor barriers that are reviewed and approved by DTSC prior to issuance of building permit.

Section IV.Q, Mineral and Energy Resources

The last sentence on p. IV.Q.3, which continues on p. IV.Q.4, is revised as follows:

Within the SFPUC, the Power Enterprise focuses on providing adequate and reliable supplies of electric power to meet the municipal requirements of the City and County of San Francisco and the non-municipal requirements of Hunters Point Shipyard and Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Island.11

The last sentence of the first full paragraph on p. IV.Q.6 is revised, and a new sentence and footnote are added, as follows:

For example, in 2008, PG&E served 11.9 percent of its retail electricity sales with renewable power.23 SFPUC obtains a majority of its electricity from Hetch Hetchy hydroelectric sources, which are renewable resources (although only hydroelectric...
facilities smaller than 30 MW are included within the Renewable Portfolio Standard's definition of “renewable”24).

The new footnote for this text change is shown below, and subsequent footnotes in the section will be renumbered accordingly:


CHAPTER V, OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

The following new paragraphs are added on EIR p. V.3, at the end of Section V.A, Growth Inducing Impacts:

The America’s Cup sailing races are expected to be held in San Francisco Bay in the summer and fall in 2012 and again in the summer and fall in 2013. No special facilities for these races are proposed to be constructed on Treasure Island or Yerba Buena Island. It is expected that interested spectators would use Treasure Island as a viewing area for some of these races, as would many other shoreline locations in San Francisco, such as Herb Caen Way along The Embarcadero, the Marina Green, and shoreline sites in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

The spectator activities likely to occur on Treasure Island would be short term, similar to the special events that occur there now, such as the annual Treasure Island Music Festival. For those events, a special transportation demand management (“TDM”) program is used to coordinate access to and egress from the Islands. Therefore, a mechanism is already in place to address any temporary transportation issues that might arise during the six- to eight-week period that the America’s Cup races would occur. It is not likely that regular ferry service would have been initiated by the time that the America’s Cup races were held; therefore, the existing TDM program would likely be used.

Based on the information about phasing of the Proposed Project (see Chapter II, Project Description, Section K, Project Phasing and Construction, p. II.79 – II.82), it is not likely that substantial amounts of new housing or commercial space would have been constructed and be available for occupancy by 2012 – 2013 when the America’s Cup races would occur. Therefore, it is not expected that spectator activities would result in substantial impacts on new businesses or new residents of the Islands. Spectator activity at Treasure Island during the America’s Cup races would not be a long term or permanent activity. Therefore, it would not result in growth-inducing impacts on Treasure Island.

There is likely to be new development on the mainland along the San Francisco waterfront to support the America’s Cup. Specifics of that development are currently being developed, and environmental review of that development has been initiated by the San Francisco Planning Department.2 It is possible that some of the temporary waterfront development for the race activities would block pedestrian views of Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island from The Embarcadero and Herb Caen Way. Impacts will be
identified in detail in the EIR that is now in preparation for that project. Permanent improvements to Piers 30-32, 26 and 28, 19 and 19-1/2, and 27-29 and 29-1/2 have not been designed in detail. The improvements known at this time mainly include seismic upgrades and repairs and improving the pier structures and aprons. These and other improvements along the mainland shoreline would not directly affect Treasure Island or Yerba Buena Island.

A new footnote is added on p. V.3:


CHAPTER VI, PROJECT VARIANTS

The first three sentences of the last paragraph on p. VI.39 are revised as follows:

Wastewater Wetlands Variant D2 would use wetlands to polish the majority of the treated wastewater effluent to be discharged through the outfall, after microfiltration and UV disinfection. In this process, recycled water would not pass through the wetlands; about 0.42 mgd would be diverted from the treatment plant and further treated, to the extent necessary, with reverse osmosis for use in landscape irrigation and appropriate plumbing fixtures in commercial and residential buildings. Wastewater Wetlands Variant D2 would receive the remainder of the UV-disinfected effluent from the treatment plant (about 0.9 mgd).

CHAPTER VII, ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The following addition is made to the list of alternatives on p. VII.2:

A. No Project Alternative;
B. Reduced Development Alternative; and
C. No Ferry Service Alternative; and
D. Reduced Parking Alternative.

The second complete paragraph on p. VII.2 is revised as follows:

The differences between the Proposed Project and the development programs for Alternative B, Reduced Development Alternative, and Alternative C, No Ferry Service Alternative, and Alternative D, Reduced Parking Alternative, are shown in Table VII.1.

Table VII.1, on p. VII.3, is revised to add the Reduced Parking Alternative. The revised table is shown on the following page.
### (Revised) Table VII.1: Comparison of Alternatives to the Proposed Project

**Topic** | **Proposed Project** | **No Project Alternative** | **Reduced Development Alternative** | **No Ferry Service Alternative** | **Reduced Parking Alternative**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
**Land Uses** | | | | | |
Residential | 8,000 units | No change from existing 1,005 units | 6,000 units | 5,100 units | 8,000 units
Retail | 207,000 sq. ft. | No change from existing conditions | 207,000 sq. ft. | 207,000 sq. ft. | 207,000 sq. ft.
Commercial office | 100,000 sq. ft. | No change from existing conditions | No office space | 100,000 sq. ft. | 100,000 sq. ft.
Hotel | 500 hotel rooms | No hotel rooms | 500 hotel rooms | 500 hotel rooms | 500 hotel rooms
Parking | 1,145 spaces | No change from existing conditions | 8,955 spaces | 8,255 spaces | 6,653 spaces
**Parks and public open space** | 300 acres | No change from existing 170 acres | 300 acres | 300 acres | 300 acres
**New/Upgraded public services, infrastructure and utilities** | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes
**Historic Resources** | | | | | |
Rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of historic structures\(^5\) | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes
Preservation of Historic Resource (U.S.S. Buttercup) | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes
**Transportation** | | | | | |
New ferry service | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes
Improved bus transit service | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes
New bicycle and pedestrian facilities | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes
Subject to Tidelands Trust Exchange Agreement | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes
Geotechnical Stabilization of TI and YBI causeway | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes
Development of Non-Renewable Resources Infrastructure | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes
Implementation of Sustainability Plan | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes
Implementation of Habitat Management Plan for YBI | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes

**Notes:**
1. Compared to the Proposed Project, the Reduced Development Alternative would likely include less neighborhood-serving retail uses (25 percent less) and more regional-serving retail uses.
2. This total is based on a reduced number of residential units, no new commercial office space, and a smaller proportion of neighborhood-serving retail uses.
3. This total is based on a reduced number of residential units.
4. This total includes the 6 acres on Blocks E5 and E7, the site of the Damage Control Trainer (U.S.S. Buttercup), which would be retained in the No Ferry Service Alternative.
5. Historic rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of Buildings 1, 2, and 3 on Treasure Island, and the Nimitz House, Senior Officers’ Quarters Historic District, Quarters 10, Building 267, and Torpedo Assembly Building on Yerba Buena Island.
6. This total is based on providing 0.5 space for each residential unit and reduced parking ratios for the hotel, office, and adaptively reused space in historic buildings.

Source: Turnstone Consulting, June 2010
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The second sentence of the paragraph at the top of p. VII.4 is revised as follows:

These include a No Tidelands Trust Exchange Alternative; a 2,800 Housing Unit Alternative with an Amusement Park; a Reduced Parking Alternative; an Off-Site Location Alternative; and an alternative with Measures to Reduce Automobile Ownership.

The following change is made to the second paragraph on p. VII.18:

The Reduced Development Alternative was included to evaluate if a reduced number of residential units on Treasure Island would avoid or substantially lessen traffic (and related air quality and noise) impacts, as well as reduce an aesthetic impact on scenic vistas of the Proposed Project.

Table VII.9, on p. VII.30, is revised to reflect changes to the “Project Trips” and “Density” columns for the Existing plus Project conditions. The revised table is shown on the next page.

The following new paragraph is added after the third paragraph under the heading “Cumulative Conditions” on p. VII.31:

Similar to the Proposed Project, the Reduced Development Alternative would result in less-than-significant impacts at the eastbound on-ramp and eastbound off-ramp on the east side of Yerba Buena Island, and the westbound off-ramp on the east side of Yerba Buena Island.

The following revisions are made to first and third items in the bulleted list at the top of p. VII.32:

- The Reduced Development Alternative would result in project-specific impacts at six study intersections that would operate at LOS D or better and deteriorate to LOS E or LOS F, or that would operate at LOS E and deteriorate to LOS F under Existing plus Project conditions (listed on p. VII.22). Because the Reduced Development Alternative would result in significant project-specific impacts at these intersections, it would also result in cumulative impacts at these six intersections (First/Market, First/Mission, First/Folsom, First/Harrison/I-80 Eastbound On-Ramp, Bryant/Fifth/I-80 Eastbound On-Ramp, Fifth/Harrison/I-80 Westbound Off-Ramp).
- The Reduced Development Alternative would contribute considerably to critical movements at one study intersection that would operate at LOS E or LOS F under 2030 Cumulative plus Reduced Development Alternative conditions, resulting in a project impact (Second/Folsom).
- The Reduced Development Alternative would have less-than-significant contributions at seven study intersections that would operate at LOS E or LOS F under 2030 Cumulative No Project conditions (Fremont/Howard, Fremont/Folsom, Fremont/I-80 Westbound Off-Ramp/Harrison, First/Howard, Essex/Harrison/I-80 Eastbound On-Ramp, Second/Bryant, and The Embarcadero/Harrison and First/Folsom).
- The Reduced Development Alternative would contribute considerably to significant cumulative impacts at two uncontrolled study intersections (Folsom/Essex and Bryant/Sterling).
(Revised) Table VII.9: Pedestrian Crosswalk Levels of Service – Existing plus Project and Existing plus Reduced Development Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crosswalk</th>
<th>Existing plus Project</th>
<th>Existing plus Reduced Development Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Trips</td>
<td>Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM Peak Hour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Street</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry Bldg (North)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Street</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>6.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Chee Way</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Street</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Peak Hour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Street</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry Bldg (North)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Street</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Chee Way</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Street</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday Peak Hour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Street</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Chee Way</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1 Since the intersections of The Embarcadero with Washington Street and Mission Street each have two crosswalks, the north and south legs of each intersection were averaged.
2 The Ferry Building hosts a farmers market on Saturdays.
3 Density measured in square feet per pedestrian.

Source: Fehr & Peers 2010

The second sentence of the paragraph under “Biological Resources” on p. VII.46 is revised as follows:

The reduced footprint and lower number of residents would proportionately lessen the human-induced wildlife disturbance such as foot and vehicle traffic, off-leash dogs and feral cats.

The first complete sentence of the partial paragraph at the top of p. VII.47 is revised as follows:

The Reduced Development Alternative would include implementation of installation of stormwater Best Management Practices (“BMPs”) and adherence to water discharge and other permit conditions during construction, as described for the Proposed Project in Impacts HY–1 and HY–2 on pp. IV.O.35-IV.O.38, and an adaptive management strategy
to protect Treasure Island from potential flooding due to sea level rise as described for the Proposed Project on pp. IV.O.32-IV.O.35.

The following changes are made to the last sentence of the first paragraph on p. VII.51:

This facility is identified as an historical resource for the purposes of CEQA; thus, the No Ferry Alternative would preserving the structure identified as historically important that would be demolished with the Proposed Project.

The heading “D. Alternatives Considered but Rejected” on p. VII.73 and the paragraph that follows it are revised as follows:

**D. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED**

This section discusses three (four) alternatives that were considered by the project sponsors, but are not analyzed further in this Chapter of the EIR because they either would not achieve most of the project sponsors’ objectives, would not reduce significant environmental project impacts, would result in greater impacts than the Proposed Project, and/or do not represent feasible alternatives for other economic, social or environmental reasons. These considered and rejected alternatives include the No Public Trust Exchange Agreement; and the Maximum Development Alternative proposed in the 2005 Transfer and Reuse of Naval Station Treasure Island Final EIR; and the Reduced Parking Alternative. An off-site location, and an alternative including measures to reduce automobile ownership are also briefly discussed.

Heading D.1 on p. VII.73 is revised as follows:

**D.1 NO PUBLIC TRUST EXCHANGE AGREEMENT**

Heading D.2 on p. VII.74 is revised as follows:

**D.2 2800 HOUSING UNIT ALTERNATIVE WITH AN AMUSEMENT PARK**

Heading D.4 on p. VII.77 is revised as follows:

**D.4 OFF-SITE LOCATION**

Heading D.5 on p. VII.77 is revised as follows:

**D.5 MEASURES TO REDUCE AUTOMOBILE OWNERSHIP**

The third sentence of the paragraph under heading D.5, Measures to Reduce Automobile Ownership, is revised as follows:

A reduced parking alternative is discussed above in Section IV.D.3 VII.D., and reasons why this alternative was not analyzed for this EIR are presented there.
A typographical error is corrected in the last sentence on p. VII.77, which continues on the top of p. VII.78:

Other fine-grained measures such as grocery delivery services could be implemented as appropriate by the Treasure Island Transportation Management Agency (“TITMA”).

Heading E on p. VII.78 is revised as follows:

E. ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE